

Dec. 7, 1888

Dr. Goodspeed to Mr. Gates:

"I am moved to write you by a letter from Dr. Harper. Dr. Strong and Dr. Galusha Anderson seem to me to have got into their minds a wholly erroneous impression which I hope you can remove from Dr. Strong's mind. They seem to have the idea that the institution proposed for Chicago is to be a great National Bap. University. It is the National feature they object to. Dr. A. says if we have a National University, Washington is the place. Strong seems to feel that it is his great National University that is to be founded here or something that will take its place.

"Now this is all wrong - an utter misconception. What is proposed, as I understand it is a University for the West, such as the West needs and must have, if possible. No wise and unselfish Baptist can object to the location of such an institution here. But if we talk of it as in any sense national we shall awaken widespread, general and bitter hostility. I do not for a moment suppose that you speak of it in this way. But some such idea is in Dr. Strong's mind, certainly in G. Anderson's. But it is all wrong. We want only what is needed by Chicago and the denomination in the West.

"We don't want the Great University Dr. S. has planned. I feel just as strongly as he can that this is not the place for that institution. This institution is not designed at all to take the place of that; cannot come into competition with that, but is something wholly different. I think you should state this to him in the strongest terms, so strongly as to wholly allay his apprehensions. If I were in your place I would lay myself out to do this.

"This institution will not call for any such sum of money from Mr. R. as to delay his entrance into Strong's plans for a day.

"When these plans were communicated to me they received my warm approval. I hope the time may come when they can be carried out and if I can ever help them on I will do so. It is the farthest thing from our thought to get in Dr. Strong's way, to lay a straw in his way, and it is my positive conviction that we shall not be doing it, if we realize all we hope for him.

"I cannot but feel that if Dr. Strong antagonizes the movement for the University here, he will assume a very grave responsibility. If he should defeat us he will incur wide-reproach and tarnish his great reputation and do the denomination an incalculable and irremediable injury.

"I have heard of the Washington meeting with much gratification

Dec. 7, 1888

Dr. Goodspeed to Mr. Gates:

"I am moved to write you by a letter from Dr. Harper. Dr. Strong and Dr. Galusha Anderson seem to me to have got into their minds a wholly erroneous impression which I hope you can remove from Dr. Strong's mind. They seem to have the idea that the institution proposed for Chicago is to be a Great National Baptist University. It is the National Baptist University. Dr. A. says if we have a National University, Washington is the place. Strong seems to feel that it is his great National University that is to be founded here or something that will take its place.

"Now this is all wrong - an utter misconception. What is proposed, as I understand it is a University for the West, such as the West needs and must have, if possible. No wise and unselfish Baptist can object to the location of such an institution here. But if we talk of it as in any sense national we shall awaken widespread, general and bitter hostility. I do not for a moment suppose that you speak of it in this way. But some such idea is in Dr. Strong's mind, certainly in G. Anderson's. But it is all wrong. We want only what is needed by Chicago and the denomination in the West.

"We don't want the Great University Dr. S. has planned. I feel just as strongly as he can that this is not the place for that institution. This institution is not designed at all to take the place of that; cannot come into competition with that, but is something wholly different. I think you should state this to him in the strongest terms, so strongly as to wholly ally his apprehensions. If I were in your place I would lay myself out to do this.

"This institution will not call for any such sum of money from Mr. R. as to delay his entrance into Strong's plans for a day.

"When these plans were communicated to me they received my warm approval. I hope the time may come when they can be carried out and if I can ever help them on I will do so. It is the farthest thing from our thought to get in Dr. Strong's way, to lay a straw in his way, and it is my positive conviction that we shall not be doing it, if we realize all we hope for him.

"I cannot but feel that if Dr. Strong antagonizes the movement for the University here, he will assume a very grave responsibility. If he should defeat us he will incur wide-spread and certain his great reputation and do the denomination an incalculable and irreparable injury.

"I have heard of the Washington meeting with much gratification

and through Dr. Smith of your work since that meeting. May you have wisdom and grace to say to Dr. Strong the right thing. If you can win him you will win the battle. His opposition is all I fear. If he will give us his sympathy, if he will not discourage Mr. R., he will do the denomination in the West an unspeakable service and win for himself the gratitude of all our people."

and through Dr. Smith of your work since that meeting.
wisdom and grace to say to Dr. Strong the right thing.
him you will win the battle. His opposition is all I fear. If he
will give us his sympathy, if he will not discourage Mr. R., he will do
the denomination in the West an unpayable service and win for himself
the gratitude of all our people."

May you have
If you can win

Dr. Goodspeed to Dr. Harper, December 7, 1888.

"Your letter is at hand. I am much gratified at the action taken in Washington. What you write about G. Addison fills me with astonishment and sorrow. It seems incredible and monstrous. Is this the way he rewards the men who always stood by him, Drs. N. & S., Blake, and myself and you? Can a man thus go back on all the claims and professions he himself made for eight years, thus stultify himself, thus convict himself of selfishness and a spirit of revenge against innocent brethren for his own failure? Alas, alas. Cannot the man see that he is more likely to forfeit the confidence of Mr. R. than to do anything else? There is no man who can more quickly detect a selfish motive and a disingenuous cause of action. He will see through this in a moment and withdraw his confidence from a man who can be guilty of such crookedness, or I have failed to understand his character. I am *disturbed* over this, for it has destroyed my own confidence in G.A. I am also very sorry that we are to have the opposition of A. & S. I fear both have influence with Mr. R. and their determined hostility may hurt us. The only thing that can prevent this is the transparency of their motives. Their opposition is too thin. Its animus is evident and can, one would think, impose on no one. But we are apparently in for a serious conflict. The encouraging thing is, that, aside from a few men who are evidently moved by selfish and unworthy motives, public opinion is practically unanimous on our side. Mr. R. will doubtless see this and it will help us. But you will need wisdom and grace to enable you to steer a right cause. I am quite content to leave the Presidency question where it is till we have the main question decided. It will, as you say, give you the immense advantage of using all your influence and giving no one a chance to say that you are moved by selfish motives, although no one who knows you would suspect you of that.

I have tonight seen Dr. S. and N. and suggested to Dr. S. to quote in next week's Standard some of G.A.'s strong statements of five years ago in favor of a University in Chicago.

Dr. S. read me a letter from Gates which gave me great satisfaction. He is evidently working in the right line. I am very much pleased to hear from Dr. S. that Dr. Wood was so favorable and friendly. Altogether that Washington meeting seems to me to have been a wonderful meeting. I am very glad you went. I hope the time will soon come when Mr. R. and Gates will meet. I think Mr. R. will take to Mr. G. He is the kind of man who will commend himself to Mr. R. and quickly win his way to his confidence. And that will be a great point gained. If you have another conference with him soon, if the way opens, have Gates with you. He ought not to return West till they have met.

Dr. Goodspeed to Dr. Harper, December 7, 1888.

"Your letter is at hand. I am much gratified at the action taken in Washington. What you write about G. A. A. fills me with astonishment and sorrow. It seems incredible and monstrous. In this way he rewards the man who always stood by him, Dr. H. & S., Blake, and myself and you? Can a man thus go back on all the claims and professions he himself made for eight years, thus satisfy himself, thus doubt himself of selfishness and a spirit of revenge against innocent brethren for his own failure? Alas, alas. Cannot the man see that he is more likely to forfeit the confidence of Mr. H. & S. than to do anything else? There is no man who more quickly detects a selfish motive and a disingenuous course of action. He will see through this in a moment and withdraw his confidence from a man who can be guilty of such crookedness, or I have failed to understand his character. I am disappointed over this, for it has destroyed my own confidence in G. A. A. I am also very sorry that we are to have the opposition of A. & S. I fear both have influence with Mr. H. and their determined hostility may hurt us. The only thing that can prevent this is the transparency of their motives. Their opposition is too thin. The animus is evident and can, one would think, impose on no one. But we are apparently in for a serious conflict. The encouraging thing is, that, aside from a few men who are evidently moved by selfish and unworthy motives, public opinion is practically unanimous on our side. Mr. H. will doubtless see this and it will help us. But you will need wisdom and grace to enable you to steer a right course. I am quite content to leave the Presidential question where it is till we have the main question decided. It will, as you say, give you the immense advantage of using all your influence and giving no one a chance to say that you are moved by selfish motives, although no one who knows you would suspect you of that.

I have tonight seen Dr. H. and A. and suggested to Dr. H. to quote in next week's Standard some of G. A. A.'s strong statements of five years ago in favor of a University in Chicago.

Dr. H. read me a letter from Gates which gave me great satisfaction. He is evidently working in the right line. I am very much pleased to hear from Dr. H. that Dr. Wood was so favorable and friendly. Altogether that Washington meeting seems to me to have been a wonderful meeting. I am very glad you went. I hope the time will soon come when Mr. H. and Gates will meet. I think Mr. H. will take to Mr. G. He is the kind of man who will commend himself to Mr. H. and quickly win his way to his confidence. And that will be a great point gained. If you have another conference with him soon, in the way opens, have Gates with you. He ought not to return West till they have met.

"I don't wish you to approve of those last suggestions of mine to Mr. R. but if possible to get a better proposition, when the decisive moment comes.

It occurs to me that both Strong and Anderson are opposing a man of straw, something that we do not have in mind. They are opposing the establishment of a great national Baptist University here. That is not what we are proposing, but a great Western University. Don't let us make a mistake here. We can command all but unanimous consent and approval for a Western University, but if we talk about a National University we shall awaken widespread jealousy and opposition. This is a big country and any locality that puts on airs and assumes to be the centre of the whole country and talks about its institution being National will have every one jumping on it. A University for the West, for the Northwest, is big enough for us. This is an important point, I am sure. Plenty of men will oppose bitterly the founding of a National University here. But no man can oppose the planting of one here for the Northwest without convicting himself of selfishness or folly. We can carry the country for the one. We shall carry no one for the other. And it is this apparently that S. & A. are opposing. Let us take ground that no one can honestly and wisely oppose. What the institution we have in mind will become after you and I are gone no man can tell. Perhaps it will become far more than any man now foresees, but we should think of it and talk of it as the University of the Northwest or the West. Such an one as this great region needs and not as the National Baptist University or such an one as the United States needs. If we claim everything we may lose everything. If we are reasonably modest we may gain all. 'The meek shall inherit the earth.'

This you will see is consistent with all I have written you and reflects what I meant in that Strong letter.

The National Baptist University should have \$25,000,000. put into it at the outset.

We really need \$8,000,000. for the institution I have in mind here. But we cannot have just what we would like. And since we cannot let us give brethren, who have got it into their minds that we are plotting to build an Oxford here, every assurance that they are on the wrong track, and that we are really planning far more moderately and modestly than they suspect."

"I don't wish you to approve of those last suggestions of mine to Mr. R. but it is possible to get a better proposition, when the decisive moment comes."

It occurs to me that both Strong and Anderson are opposing a man of straw, something that we do not have in mind. They are opposing the establishment of a great National Baptist University here. That is not what we are proposing, but a great Western University. Don't let us make a mistake here. We can command all but unanimous consent and approval for a Western University, but if we talk about a National University we shall awaken widespread jealousy and opposition. This is a big country and any locality that puts on airs and assumes to be the center of the whole country and talks about its institution being National will have every one jumping on it. A University for the West, for the Northwest, is big enough for us. This is an important point, I am sure. Plenty of men will oppose bitterly the founding of a National University here. But no man can oppose the planing of one here for the Northwest without convicting himself of selfishness or jealousy. We can carry the country for the one. We shall carry no one for the other. And it is this apparently that S. & A. are opposing. Let us take ground that no one can honestly and wisely oppose. What the institution we have in mind will become after you and I are gone no man can tell. Perhaps it will become far more than any man now foresees, but we should think of it and talk of it as the University of the Northwest or the West. Such an one as this great region needs and not as the National Baptist University or such an one as the United States needs. If we claim everything we may lose everything. If we are reasonably modest we may gain all. "The meek shall inherit the earth."

This you will see is consistent with all I have written you and reflects what I meant in that Strong letter.

The National Baptist University should have \$25,000,000. but into it at the outset.

We really need \$25,000,000. for the institution I have in mind here. But we cannot have that and we would like. And since we cannot let us give provision, who have got it into their minds that we are plotting to build an Oxford here, every resource that they are on the wrong track, and that we are really planning for more moderately and modestly than they suspect."

✓
Dec. 8, 1888

Mr. Rockefeller to Dr. Northrup:

Acknowledges his letter of the 4th with thanks.

Dec. 8, 1888

Mr. Rockefeller to Dr. Northrup:

Acknowledges his letter of the 4th with thanks.

Dr. Goodspeed to Dr. Harper, December 9, 1888.

"Dr. Northrup is writing to G. Anderson something after this fashion. 'You will be interested in knowing that we have some prospect of a new University for Chicago. You gave years of service to this cause and cannot fail to wish us success. The men here who always stood faithfully by you, Blake, Dr. Smith, etc., are the men who are now especially interested in this undertaking. What we shall get we don't know, but the best thing we can. It may come in your way to speak a good word for us. We feel that our relations to you have been such that we have a right to expect this from you. We do not ask any active effort on your part, but we want your sympathy and if opportunity offers we ask you to encourage and commend the enterprise.' The letter is not yet written, but something like this will be the drift of it I judge.

On Wednesday or Thursday Dr. Smith will write saying that he understands from Dr. N. that he has written on the subject and that he feels moved to add a line on his own account. He will remind Dr. A. of the way in which he always sustained him and made over to him absolutely all the influences of the Standard. He will say that Dr. A. well knows that for many years the establishment of a University here has been nearer to his, Dr. Smith's, heart than anything else and that now he counts confidently on Dr. A's sympathy, etc., etc.

These gentlemen, of course, will say all this far better than I can, but this will indicate to you the line to be followed.

If Dr. A. is prepared to break with them, the opportunity will be open to him. If he shrinks from doing so, he will at least cease his opposition. There will be no suggestion that they fear his opposition. They will rather convey the impression that opposition from him is impossible and incredible.

I thought this item would please you and possibly relieve your mind a little, although I do not know that you have any fears or doubts.

For my own part I am afraid to be too confident and I hope and tremble. I pray daily and often many times a day that you may have great wisdom. I quite agree with you that we must now simply wait and forbear to urge Mr. R. in any way. I have said all I shall say until I am asked to say more. You have done all a man could do, and we know that what is possible in the future you will attempt and accomplish. We have entire confidence in your intentions and in your practical skill and wisdom."

Dr. Goodspeed to Dr. Harper, December 9, 1888.

"Dr. Northrup is writing to G. Anderson something after this fashion. 'You will be interested in knowing that we have some prospect of a new University for Chicago. You gave years of service to this cause and cannot fail to wish us success. The men here who always stood faithfully by you, Blake, Dr. Smith, etc., are the men who are now especially interested in this undertaking. What we shall get we don't know, but the best thing we can. It may come in your way to speak a good word for us. We feel that our relations to you have been such that we have a right to expect this from you. We do not ask any active effort on your part, but we want your sympathy and if opportunity offers we ask you to encourage and commend the enterprise.' The letter is not yet written, but something like this will be the drift of it I judge.

On Wednesday or Thursday Dr. Smith will write saying that he understands from Dr. H. that he has written on the subject and that he feels moved to add a line on his own account. He will remind Dr. A. of the way in which he always sustained him and made over to him absolutely all the influence of the Standard. He will say that Dr. A. will know that for many years the establishment of a University here has been nearer to his, Dr. Smith's, heart than anything else and that now he counts confidently on Dr. A.'s sympathy, etc., etc.

These gentlemen, of course, will say all this far better than I can, but this will indicate to you the line to be followed.

If Dr. A. is prepared to break with them, the opportunity will be open to him. If he shrinks from doing so, he will at least cease his opposition. There will be no suggestion that they fear his opposition. They will rather convey the impression that opposition from him is impossible and incredible.

I thought this item would please you and possibly relieve your mind a little, although I do not know that you have any fears or doubts.

For my own part I am afraid to be too confident and I hope and tremble. I pray daily and often many times a day that you may have great wisdom. I quite agree with you that we must now simply wait and forbear to urge Mr. H. in any way. I have said all I shall say until I am asked to say more. You have done all a man could do, and we know that what is possible in the future you will attempt and accomplish. We have entire confidence in your intentions and in your practical skill and wisdom."

✓

December 10, 1888.

Dr. Harper to Dr. Goodspeed:-

"Your favor of the 7th inst. reached me this morning. I appreciate the points that you make. There is undoubtedly danger of difficulty in the case of Strong and Anderson. Gates is in Rochester today. He spent yesterday with me at Poughkeepsie. I did not see Mr. Rockefeller for we did not think it wise just now to push the thing any further. He (Gates) will let me know at once the condition of Strong's mind, for that is the purpose of his going there. Arrangements have been made with all the papers North and South to come out this week with editorials and articles, and public sentiment will be worked up as rapidly as possible. I shall make an attempt to see Mr. Rockefeller next Sunday or Saturday night and will get before him the clippings from these papers. He has the thing in mind and is thinking of it, and it will do no good to push it on him as you say. Landrum of Richmond declared that he told him he was going to give fifteen hundred thousand dollars. I do not think he ever said this, but the fact that he said something that Landrum could understand to be this is considerable. It seems he has talked with many others. I was glad to receive yesterday from Gates a message from Wood in which he expressed his regret for past hostility, and wished to be counted as one of us in the effort to bring the university into good position. Gates will publish in the "Standard" within a short time opinions from all the leading men. Two or three things seem to be taking shape, but of these I will speak again. I write hurriedly."

"N.B.-- Your idea of a Western University rather than a national university is, I have no doubt, the correct one, and this is what we are working for. The resolution of the Board of Trustees had the word "national," but I erased that so that there will be no ground for trouble."

December 10, 1888.

Dr. Harper to Dr. Goodspeed:-

"Your favor of the 7th inst. reached me this morning. I appreciate the points that you make. There is undoubtedly danger of difficulty in the case of Strong and Anderson. Gates is in Rochester today. He spent yesterday with me at Poughkeepsie. I did not see Mr. Rockefeller for we did not think it wise just now to push the thing any further. He (Gates) will let me know at once the condition of Strong's mind, for that is the purpose of his going there. Arrangements have been made with all the papers North and South to come out this week with editorials and articles, and public sentiment will be worked up as rapidly as possible. I shall make an attempt to see Mr. Rockefeller next Sunday or Saturday night and will get before him the clippings from these papers. He has the thing in mind and is thinking of it, and it will do no good to push it on him as you say. Landrum of Richmond declared that he told him he was going to give fifteen hundred thousand dollars. I do not think he ever said this, but the fact that he said something that Landrum could understand to be this is considerable. It seems he has talked with many others. I was glad to receive yesterday from Gates a message from Wood in which he expressed his regret for past hostility, and wished to be counted as one of us in the effort to bring the university into good position. Gates will publish in the "Standard" within a short time opinions from all the leading men. Two or three things seem to be taking shape, but of these I will speak again. I write hurriedly."

"N.B.--Your idea of a Western University rather than a national university is, I have no doubt, the correct one, and this is what we are working for. The resolution of the Board of Trustees had the word "national," but I erased that so that there will be no ground for trouble."

✓

Dr. Northrup to Dr. Harper, December 10, 1888.

(Dr. A's letter turned out to be a private letter)
to Mr. Gates.

"Dr. Goodspeed read me your last letter in which you indicate the nature of Dr. Anderson's letter to the Examiner. Thinking that he might write to Mr. R. in a similar way reflecting upon Chicago Baptists, or that like misrepresentations might reach him from some other quarter, I wrote the enclosed letter. But upon reflection it occurred to me that I might be a little too 'previous' and so I concluded to send the letter to you that you may make such use of it as may seem best. If you should happen to know that representations had reached him such as these referred to, it might be well to hand him the letter with a statement of my reasons for sending it to you. It looks as if there was to be a pretty sharp and earnest discussion of the question of the location of the great university, New York, Washington, Chicago, which? I don't think we are out of the woods yet. Our chief visible reliance is upon yourself and the worthiness of our cause. I think Anderson's course an unspeakable outrage. His worst enemy could not desire him a worse evil than the publication of that letter. The only reply that need be made to it is one made up of extracts from his own letters and addresses while President. Ninety-nine persons out of every hundred would regard his motives in writing the letter as utterly unworthy, disappointed ambition, ill will towards those who stood by him in his troubles, and a fear that the institution with which he is now connected would be overshadowed."

Dr. Northrup to Dr. Harper, December 10, 1888.

(Dr. A's letter turned out to be a private letter)
to Mr. Gates.

"Dr. Goodspeed read me your last letter in which you indicate the nature of Dr. Anderson's letter to the Examiner. Thinking that he might write to Mr. N. in a similar way reflecting upon Chicago Baptists, or that like misrepresentations might reach him from some other quarter, I wrote the enclosed letter. But upon reflection it occurred to me that I might be a little too 'provocative' and so I concluded to send the letter to you that you may make such use of it as may seem best. If you should happen to know that representations had reached him such as those referred to, it might be well to hand him the letter with a statement of my reasons for sending it to you. It looks as if there was to be a pretty sharp and earnest discussion of the question of the location of the great university, New York, Washington, Chicago, which? I don't think we are out of the woods yet. Our chief visible reliance is upon yourself and the worthiness of our cause. I think Anderson's course an unparliamentary outrage. His worst enemy could not desire him a worse evil than the publication of that letter. The only reply that need be made to it is one made up of extracts from his own letters and addresses while President. Ninety-nine persons out of every hundred would regard his motives in writing the letter as utterly unworthy, disappointed ambition. It will towards those who stood by him in his troubles, and a fear that the institution with which he is now connected would be overthrown."

✓

Dr. Northrup to Mr. Rockefeller, December 10, 1888.

This was sent to Dr. Harper, but not delivered by him to Mr. R., it appearing that Dr. Anderson's letter was a private letter to Mr. Gates.

"My apology for writing to you at this time is my profound conviction that the Baptists of Chicago have been and still are suffering from a most unjust and grievous reproach on account of their supposed failure to meet their obligations towards the late university. I have been on the ground twenty-two years and am thoroughly acquainted with the chief actors and the main events in the history of the university, and simple truth and justice require me to say that our people are deserving of all honor for the fidelity and devotion shown to that enterprise, considering its discreditable history. The ruin of that educational undertaking, of such magnificent promise in its beginning, was due, mainly, if not exclusively, to the mismanagement of its Board, a close corporation, sustaining no direct relation to our churches, and having among its most influential members, Jews, Swedenborgians, Unitarians and men of no religious belief. It was this body, whose history was marked by bitter personal conflicts, perversion of trust funds, and violation of sacred pledges, that utterly destroyed, in the course of twenty-five years, the confidence, interest and hopes of our people. In making these statements I am moved solely by the interests of truth and justice and a desire to vindicate the good name of our churches in relation to a matter of great public concern. The history of the seminary is a demonstration of the untruth of the charges made as to the lack of interest and liberality in our denomination in the cause of Christian education. The Board of the seminary has always been composed of judicious and capable men who have managed its affairs with such prudence and wisdom that they have secured the confidence and liberal support of the Baptists in Chicago and of others, both in the West and the East, and so have been able to carry the institution forward for nearly twenty-five years, and amidst manifold and great difficulties, to its present position of prosperity and power. Should a new university enterprise be undertaken in such a way as to insure wisdom of management and ultimate success, the response of our people would be so spontaneous, general, and liberal, as to surprise the country and to show the injustice of the criticism and reproach to which I have referred."

Dr. Northrup to Mr. Rockefeller, December 10, 1888.

This was sent to Dr. Harper, but not delivered by him to Mr. A., it appearing that Dr. Anderson's letter was a private letter to Mr. Gates.

"My apology for writing to you at this time is my profound conviction that the Baptists of Chicago have been and still are suffering from a most unjust and grievous reproach on account of their supposed failure to meet their obligations towards the late university. I have been on the ground twenty-two years and am thoroughly acquainted with the chief actors and the main events in the history of the university, and simple truth and justice require me to say that our people are deserving of all honor for the fidelity and devotion shown to that enterprise, considering the discreditable history. The ruin of that educational undertaking, of such magnificent promise in its beginning, was due, mainly, if not exclusively, to the mismanagement of its Board, a close corporation, sustaining no direct relation to our churches, and having among its most influential members, Jews, Swedes, Germans, Unitarians and men of no religious belief. It was this body, whose history was marked by bitter personal conflicts, perversion of trust funds, and violation of sacred pledges, that utterly destroyed, in the course of twenty-five years, the confidence, interest and hopes of our people. In making these statements I am moved solely by the interests of truth and justice and a desire to vindicate the good name of our churches in relation to a matter of great public concern. The history of the university is a demonstration of the untruth of the charges made as to the lack of interest and liberality in our denomination in the cause of Christian education. The Board of the university has always been composed of judicious and capable men who have managed its affairs with such prudence and wisdom that they have secured the confidence and liberal support of the Baptists in Chicago and of others, both in the West and the East, and so have been able to carry the institution forward for nearly twenty-five years, and amidst manifold and great difficulties, to its present position of prosperity and power. Should a new university enterprise be undertaken in such a way as to insure wider of support and ultimate success, the response of our people would be so spontaneous, general, and liberal, as to warrant the country and to show the injustice of the criticism reproach to which I have referred."

✓ ✓

Mr. Gates to Dr. Harper, December 12, 1888.

"I had a long talk with Dr. Strong. Both before beginning and at the close Dr. Strong insisted on the strictest confidence. He declined to accede to my urgent request to be allowed to print some sentiments which he uttered or even to mention them to any person whomsoever privately. He talked very freely. He is, I should say, profoundly melancholy. He has no criticisms and no reproaches. Incidentally I explained Mr. Rockefeller's initiative to you. I went away feeling sad for Dr. Strong. On reflection I can in some degree sympathize with his refusal to say a word for us. Under all circumstances, if you reflect on them in detail, one can not wonder if he should prefer to await some request for his views from Mr. Rockefeller himself before venturing to give them."

Mr. Gates to Dr. Harper, December 12, 1888.

"I had a long talk with Dr. Strong. Both before beginning and at the close Dr. Strong insisted on the strictest confidence. He declined to accede to my urgent request to be allowed to print some sentiments which he uttered or even to mention them to any person whomsoever privately. He talked very freely. He is, I should say, profoundly melancholy. He has no criticisms and no reproaches. Incidentally I explained Mr. Hockefeller's initiative to you. I went away feeling sad for Dr. Strong. On reflection I can in some degree sympathize with his refusal to say a word for us. Under all circumstances, if you reflect on them in detail, one can not wonder if he should prefer to await some request for his views from Mr. Hockefeller himself before venturing to give them."

✓ ✓

Mr. Gates to Dr. Harper, December 13, 1888.

"Dr. Anderson of Rochester thinks the establishment of a University in Chicago especially of a college proper, with a very heavy endowment, the largest thing now to be done by us as a denomination. He wishes me to express his hearty sympathy with any endeavor to do a really great thing for Chicago. He thinks no small and feeble institution should be contemplated and that the work should begin with a large and unconditional gift. He prefers not to make a statement for the public lest some of the benefactors of Rochester should misunderstand him. He makes this statement for private use. I feel bound to say that while the Doctor makes this statement freely it grinds him some to see a large sum go over the head of Rochester to the west. He thinks a wise use of a good deal of money could be made in Rochester. But he is not selfish enough to be blind to the tremendous needs and possibilities of the West. His concentration of interest in Rochester makes his statement the more valuable."

✓ ✓
Mr. Gates to Dr. Harper, December 15, 1888.

"Dr. Anderson of Rochester thinks the establishment of a University in Chicago especially of a college proper, with a very heavy endowment, the largest thing now to be done by us as a denomination. He wishes me to express his hearty sympathy with any endeavor to do a really great thing for Chicago. He thinks no small and feeble institution should be contemplated and that the work should begin with a large and unconditional gift. He prefers not to make a statement for the public lest some of the benefactors of Rochester should misunderstand him. He makes this statement for private use. I feel bound to say that while the Doctor makes this statement freely it grinds him some to see a large sum go over the head of Rochester to the west. He thinks a wise use of a good deal of money could be made in Rochester. But he is not selfish enough to be blind to the tremendous needs and possibilities of the West. His concentration of interest in Rochester makes his statement the more valuable."

✓

Dec. 13, 1888

Dr. Harper to Mr. Rockefeller:

"Your kind favor of December 12th with check for one hundred dollars is at hand. I desire to thank you for your kind help so frequently given me before. I wish I could show you how thoroughly I appreciate it.

"But for fear of troubling you I should have written you some time since in reference to the very interesting meeting of the National Board of Education at Washington City which, at the last moment, I decided to attend. Several matters came up, but in every case the attention of the Board turned toward Chicago and, as a matter of fact, the entire time of the Board was practically given to the consideration of this question. You have seen the report of the secretary in the "Examiner", doubtless. I have never seen such unanimity on a subject. Men from Virginia, Kentucky, New Jersey, Connecticut, - all agreed that the pressing need of the denomination today was the establishment of a good university at Chicago. I venture to hope that in spite of your many business cares, you are able to give the matter some attention. I believe that the thing which you wanted, viz., an uprising on the part of the denomination in its behalf, - at all events so far as concerns a unanimous sentiment, - has come.

"Trusting that Mrs. Rockefeller continues to improve, x x x x x

"I shall be in New York City a part of Sunday (next). If anything comes up, for which you would care to see me, I shall be glad to call upon you."

Dec. 13, 1888

Dr. Harper to Mr. Rockefeller:

"Your kind favor of December 12th with check for one hundred dollars is at hand. I desire to thank you for your kind help so frequently given me before. I wish I could show you how thoroughly I appreciate it."

"But for fear of troubling you I should have written you some time since in reference to the very interesting meeting of the National Board of Education at Washington City which, at the last moment, I decided to attend. Several matters came up, but in every case the attention of the Board turned toward Chicago and, as a matter of fact, the entire time of the Board was practically given to the consideration of this question. You have seen the report of the secretary in the 'Examiner'. I have never seen such unanimity on a subject. Men from Virginia, Kentucky, New Jersey, Connecticut, - all agreed that the pressing need of the denomination today was the establishment of a good university at Chicago. I venture to hope that in spite of your many business cares, you are able to give the matter some attention. I believe that the thing which you wanted, viz., an uprising on the part of the denomination in its behalf, - at all events so far as concerns a unanimous sentiment, - has come."

"Trusting that Mrs. Rockefeller continues to improve, x x x x x"

"I shall be in New York City a part of Sunday (next). If any-thing comes up, for which you would care to see me, I shall be glad to call upon you."

Dec. 13, 1888

Mr. Gates to Dr. Morehouse:

* * * * * I am under strictest injunctions not to utter one word of the conversation with Dr. Strong either in print or privately. Some things he said I begged very hard to be allowed to say but he was inexorable. Dr. Anderson is with us and gave me a message of encouragement for Mr. Rockefeller through Dr. Harper.

"I did not see Mr. Rockefeller in Poughkeepsie. I think, however, he is arranging his finances for the gift and that it will certainly come in time."

Dec. 13, 1888

Mr. Gates to Dr. Morhouse:

*** I am under strictest injunctions not to utter one word of the conversation with Dr. Strong either in print or privately. Some things he said I begged very hard to be allowed to say but he was inexorable. Dr. Anderson is with us and gave me a message of encouragement for Mr. Rockefeller through Dr. Harper.

"I did not see Mr. Rockefeller in Poughkeepsie. I think, however, he is arranging his finances for the gift and that it will certainly come in time."

✓

Dr. Goodspeed to Dr. Harper, December 13, 1888.

P. S. "A line from Gates at Rochester before he had seen Dr. S. I learn from it that Anderson's letter was written to him, which relieves my mind somewhat but not much. He asked Anderson's help and this was what he got!"

Dr. Goodspeed to Dr. Harper, December 18, 1888.

P. S. "A line from Gates at Rochester before he
had seen Dr. S. I learn from it that Anderson's letter
was written to him, which relieves my mind somewhat
but not much. He asked Anderson's help and this was
what he got!"

December 13, 1888.

Editor's Note

A report of the action of the Executive Board of the American Baptist Education Society on December 4th in Washington, written by Mr. Gates, appeared in The Examiner on December 13th, 1888.

The chief reason for calling the Board together was to secure authoritative executive action on the question of a new University at Chicago. Deliberation on this subject formed the main business of the Board. The Secretary, in a paper first read October 15th, 1888, to the ministers of Chicago, presented to the Board the importance of establishing a powerful institution of learning in Chicago. Discussion resulted in the unanimous adoption of a series of resolutions, of which the more important were reported by the Secretary to The Examiner. The following is quoted from the Secretary's report of the meeting to The Examiner:-

"RESOLVED, That the establishment of a thoroughly equipped Baptist institution of learning in Chicago is an immediate and imperative denominational necessity.

RESOLVED, That we rejoice in the powerful sentiment favorable to such an institution that prevails not only in Chicago and the West, but also throughout the denomination at large.

RESOLVED, That we invite brethren of means to unite in the endeavor to found such an institution and pledge the hearty cooperation of this Board, and that the Secretary of the Society be directed to use every means in his power to originate and encourage such a movement.

The addresses preceding the adoption of the report were numerous and animated.

A great variety of powerful considerations were adduced in illustration of the ^{present} ~~permanent~~ present need of a Baptist University in Chicago. It was agreed that the city itself and not a suburb is the true location to be chosen, and that the proposed University ought to be so endowed as to rank with any in the country.

The entire unanimity of brethren from all parts of the land in adopting the strong resolutions was as hearty as it was significant of the breadth and depth of the denominational feeling on this subject. The question came before the Board through a communication from a Provisional Committee of prominent pastors and laymen of Chicago, inviting the Board to establish and endow an institution of learning in that city and pledging hearty cooperation.

The subject is given additional interest and importance also by the profound attention it has recently secured in influential quarters in the East. It can hardly be supposed that the Board took action without having grounds for hoping that the movement will succeed.

EDITORIAL NOTE: Dr. Harper was present and intimated to the Board in a semi-confidential way his reasons for believing that Mr. Rockefeller was deeply interested in the movement and would take an active part in the establishment of the institution. While many present were deeply interested in the establishment of Columbian University at Washington on a sound financial basis, and while Dr. Welling, the President of that institution, was a member of the Board and spoke urgently in its favor, it was felt by all, Dr. Welling and his friends included, that the movement in behalf of Chicago should take present precedence.

December 13, 1888.

Editorial Note

A report of the action of the Executive Board of the American Baptist Education Society on December 4th in Washington, written by Mr. Gates, appeared in The Examiner on December 13th, 1888. The chief reason for calling the Board together was to secure authoritative executive action on the question of a new University at Chicago. Deliberation on this subject formed the main business of the Board. The Secretary, in a paper first read October 15th, 1888, to the ministers of Chicago, presented to the Board the importance of establishing a powerful institution of learning in Chicago. Discussion resulted in the unanimous adoption of a series of resolutions, of which the more important were reported by the Secretary to The Examiner. The following is quoted from the Secretary's report of the meeting to

The Examiner:

"RESOLVED, That the establishment of a thoroughly equipped Baptist institution of learning in Chicago is an immediate and imperative denominational necessity.

RESOLVED, That we rejoice in the powerful sentiment favorable to such an institution that prevails not only in Chicago and the West, but also throughout the denomination at large.

RESOLVED, That we invite brethren of means to unite in the endeavor to found such an institution and pledge the hearty cooperation of this Board, and that the Secretary of the Society be directed to use every means in his power to originate and encourage such a movement. The addresses preceding the adoption of the report were numerous and animated.

A great variety of powerful considerations were adduced in illustration of the present need of a Baptist University in Chicago. It was agreed that the city itself and not a suburb is the true location to be chosen, and that the proposed University ought to be so endowed as to rank with any in the country.

The entire unanimity of brethren from all parts of the land in adopting the strong resolutions was very hearty as it was significant of the breadth and depth of the denominational feeling on this subject. The question came before the Board through a communication from a Provisional Committee of prominent pastors and laymen of Chicago, inviting the Board to establish and endow an institution of learning in that city and pledging hearty cooperation.

The subject is given additional interest and importance also by the profound attention it has recently secured in influential quarters in the East. It can hardly be supposed that the Board took action without having grounds for hoping that the movement will succeed.

EDITORIAL NOTE:

Dr. Harper was present and interested to the Board in a semi-confidential way his reasons for believing that Mr. Rockefeller was deeply interested in the movement and would take an active part in the establishment of the institution. While many present were deeply interested in the establishment of a Baptist University at Washington on a sound financial basis, and while Dr. Walling, the President of that institution, was a member of the Board and spoke strongly in its favor, it was felt by all, Dr. Walling and his friends included, that the movement in behalf of Chicago should take present precedence.

December 13, 1888.

Fred T. Gates to Dr. Goodspeed:

"I did my best with Dr. Strong spending several hours with him. But he stipulated in the beginning, and renewed his request at the close that the conversation should be strictly confidential. He would not grant my very urgent and repeated request that I might print or at least make private use of some things he said.

"On the whole, when I consider the rebuffs he has received from Mr. Rockefeller--these were not subject of conversation--I am not surprised that he should prefer to be asked now by Mr. R. before he says another word.

"I think Mr. R. is now waiting only to arrange his business for the proposed gift and possibly to hear the voice of denomination. Dr. Bright and Dr. Anderson both think Mr. R. should make his first large gift unconditional. Harper thinks he has settled on that course. I am inclined to believe that not less but more can be got in Chicago in this way, and that it is every way the true course.

"I would like at your convenience to spend a day with you working over and taking accurate measurements of the old property, and examining other grounds, also laying out successive steps to be wisely taken in initiating the movement without friction and with best promise. I think if these steps could be made clear, and the course chosen could be demonstrated to be wise, matters would be simplified and perhaps hastened. Can you name an early day in which we can meet at the office of 'The Standard'?"

Prof. Harper has asked a programme.

December 12, 1938.

Fred T. Gates to Dr. Goodspeed:

"I did my best with Dr. Strong spending several hours with him. But he stipulated in the beginning, and renewed his request at the close that the conversation should be strictly confidential. He would not grant my very urgent and repeated request that I might print or at least make private use of some things he said.

"On the whole, when I consider the results he has received from Mr. Rockefeller-these were not subject of conversation-I am not surprised that he should prefer to be asked now by Mr. R. before he says another word.

"I think Mr. R. is now waiting only to arrange his business for the proposed gift and possibly to hear the voice of denunciation from Dr. Bright and Dr. Anderson both think Mr. R. should make his first large gift unconditional. Harper thinks he has settled on that course. I am inclined to believe that not less but more can be got in Chicago in this way, and that it is every way the true course.

"I would like at your convenience to spend a day with you working over and taking accurate measurements of the old property, and examining other grounds, also laying out successive steps to be wisely taken in initiating the movement without friction and with best promise. I think if these steps could be made clear, and the course chosen could be demonstrated to be wise, matters would be simplified and perhaps hastened. Can you name an early day in which we can meet at the office of 'The Standard'?"

Prof. Harper has asked a programme.

Dec. 15, 1888

Dr. Harper to Mr. Gates:

Your favor of Wednesday, Dec. 12th has just reached me. I am very sorry indeed for Dr. Strong. I hope that he will not take the matter so much to heart. Perhaps something will turn out that may be of help to him. There is nothing new so far as I am concerned. I have been trying in a delicate way to get an interview with Mr. Rockefeller tomorrow; probably I shall not succeed. I will keep you posted. Everything is moving on pleasantly."

Dec. 15, 1888

Dr. Harper to Mr. Gates:

Your favor of Wednesday, Dec. 13th has just reached me. I am very sorry indeed for Dr. Strong. I hope that he will not take the matter so much to heart. Perhaps something will turn out that may be of help to him. There is nothing new so far as I am concerned. I have been trying in a delicate way to get an interview with Mr. Rockefeller tomorrow; probably I shall not succeed. I will keep you posted. Every-
thing is moving on pleasantly."

Dec. 15, 1888

Dr. Morehouse to Mr. Gates:

"Yours of the 13th is just at hand. I have a note from Mr. Levering, saying, that he sent you a check for \$100 a few days ago as I requested him. We will see about some more pretty soon. x x x x x

"Dr. Strong's statements to you must have been of considerable importance one way or the other if he insisted so strenuously upon their being regarded strictly private. But you know that things that are said in secret sometimes get told on the house-tops after all. In matters which have occurred, so many people have been in the secret that the matter is now an 'open secret'. I am glad that you have additional reason for believing that Mr. Rockefeller will soon come to a decision in the matter which so interests us. At the Social Union of New York City, last Thursday night, Crandall made a very effective address against the establishing of a great university at an expense of Ten million dollars or so in New York City, holding that the money could be more wisely used in strengthening other institutions and in supplying greater educational needs elsewhere. S. P. Merrill, of Rochester, unwisely opened his guns against the Chicago scheme but with very little effect so far as I can judge. Mac Arthur indulged in his customary rhetoric about a great university in New York City. As near as I can judge the business men take the view of the case as presented by Crandall. I do not think the meeting will be very decisive in influencing public opinion one way or the other.

"I wrote Drs. Thomas and Robinson for an expression of opinion about the Chicago University matter. I have not heard from Dr. Robinson. Dr. Thomas was at the Rooms today but says that as he has in one way and another been mixed up in the old Chicago University matters he prefers to say nothing on the subject now. Although I told him how the situation had changed and what was hoped yet he had his reasons for not putting anything on paper. I will at once send you Dr. Robinson's opinion if he gives it."

Dec. 15, 1888

Dr. Robinson to Mr. Gates:

"Yours of the 13th is just at hand. I have a note from Mr. Levering, saying, that he sent you a check for \$100 a few days ago as I requested him. We will see about some more pretty soon. x x x x

"Dr. Strong's statement to you must have been of considerable importance one way or the other if he insisted so strenuously upon their being regarded strictly private. But you know that things that are said in secret sometimes get told on the house-tops after all. In matters which have occurred, so many people have been in the secret that the matter is now an 'open secret'. I am glad that you have additional reason for believing that Mr. Rockefeller will soon come to a decision in the matter which so interests us. At the Social Union of New York City, last Thursday night, Grandall made a very effective address against the establishing of a great university at an expense of ten million dollars or so in New York City, holding that the money could be more wisely used in strengthening other institutions and in supplying greater educational needs elsewhere. S. P. Merrill, of Rochester, unwisely opened his guns against the Chicago scheme but with very little effect so far as I can judge. Mac Arthur indulged in his customary rhetoric about a great university in New York City. As near as I can judge the business men take the view of the case as presented by Grandall. I do not think the meeting will be very decisive in influencing public opinion one way or the other.

"I wrote Dr. Thomas and Robinson for an expression of opinion about the Chicago University matter. I have not heard from Dr. Robinson. Dr. Thomas was at the Rooms today but says that as he has in one way and another been mixed up in the old Chicago University matters he prefers to say nothing on the subject now. Although I told him how the situation had changed and what was hoped yet he had his reasons for not putting anything on paper. I will at once send you Dr. Robinson's opinion if he gives it."

✓

Dr. Goodspeed to Dr. Harper, December 15, 1888.

"I take the liberty of sending you some tentative plans. Please give them your serious consideration and submit any or all of them to Mr. Rockefeller. It may be that he will take advantage of your vacation to consider the whole subject with you. I should be willing to see either of these plans or the one I submitted to him adopted. No. 1 is my ideal of what we want, but it will probably seem to him one sided. I do not think it really is, for we should be forced to raise the \$1,000,000. by the necessities of the University. As I look at it this plan would not only give us the largest power of appeal, but would put us under the greatest pressure. We should have to have the equipment. We should feel the strongest pressure of obligation to Mr. Rockefeller and our brethren and the city would feel it.

I am myself confident that this plan would more certainly secure the full \$4,000,000. within 6 or 10 years than any other. It seems to me it would be wise to lay it before him. You can lay the responsibility on me, if you wish, while you explain to him its great advantages. It would reflect greater credit on him than any other plan I can conceive and would at the same time accomplish more, I believe, than any other.

I am to meet Gates on Monday. We can, however, lay no plans, so far as I can see, until we know fully what Mr. Rockefeller intends. All our plans are vain till he indicates what he wishes to do and what he wishes us to do. We shall have to be extraordinarily careful not to undertake more than we can perform, and in your conferences impress it upon him that we are ready to assume all we can possibly do, but that it would be foolish and criminal in us to assume more than there is any probability that we can accomplish. I shall be glad to have him put us under pressure to do our utmost, but I earnestly hope he will not make such conditions as will endanger the whole undertaking if we fail and disappoint him and the denomination.

Ask him to make such a working plan that it cannot fail if we are faithful and wise and do the best that is in us. I think I know him well enough to know that he will not ask more than this."

Dr. Goodspeed to Dr. Harper, December 18, 1888.

"I take the liberty of sending you some tentative plans. Please give them your serious consideration and submit any or all of them to Mr. Rockefeller. It may be that he will take advantage of your vacation to consider the whole subject with you. I should be willing to see either of these plans or the one I submitted to him adopted. No. 1 is my ideal of what I want, but it will probably seem to him one-sided. I do not think it really is, for we should be forced to raise the \$1,000,000 by the necessities of the University. As I look at it this plan would not only give us the largest power of appeal, but would put us under the greatest pressure. We should have to have the equipment. We should feel the strongest pressure of obligation to Mr. Rockefeller and our brethren and the city would feel it."

I am myself confident that this plan would more certainly secure the full \$4,000,000 within 5 or 10 years than any other. It seems to me it would be wise to lay it before him. You can lay the responsibility on me, if you wish, while you explain to him its great advantages. It would reflect greater credit on him than any other plan I can conceive and would at the same time accomplish more, I believe, than any other.

I am to meet Gates on Monday. We can, however, lay no plans, so far as I can see, until we know fully what Mr. Rockefeller intends. All our plans are vain till he indicates what he wishes to do and what he wishes us to do. We shall have to be extraordinarily careful not to undertake more than we can perform, and in your conference impress it upon him that we are ready to assume all we can possibly do, but that it would be foolish and criminal in us to assume more than there is any probability that we can accomplish. I shall be glad to have him put us under pressure to do our utmost, but I earnestly hope he will not make such conditions as will endanger the whole undertaking. We fail and disappoint him and the denomination.

Ask him to make such a working plan that it cannot fail if we are faithful and wise and do the best that is in us. I think I know him well enough to know that he will not ask more than this."

✓

"Plan I

1. Mr. Rockefeller to give \$3,000,000. in six annual instalments of \$500,000. each, or if he prefers in ten of \$300,000. each.

2. This entire sum to be set apart and forever preserved intact as an endowment fund.

3. We, on our part, will agree to purchase a site to be approved by him, erect buildings, provide libraries, scientific apparatus and all the necessary external equipment of a first class University, undertaking to raise for this purpose within the six years \$1,000,000.

If we find it impossible to accomplish this in six years, we will continue to urge on the work and hold ourselves under obligation to Mr. Rockefeller till we have matched his \$3,000,000. endowment with a \$1,000,000. equipment.

Plan II

1. Mr. Rockefeller shall give \$1,500,000. in five equal annual instalments for the establishment of the University.

2. We shall raise \$500,000. to make up the first \$2,000,000.

3. To secure the second \$2,000,000.--as often as we raise \$100,000. Mr. Rockefeller shall give \$300,000.

Plan III

1. Mr. Rockefeller shall give \$500,000. outright to establish the University.

2. As often as we raise \$100,000. he shall give \$300,000. until a total of \$5,000,000. have been secured for the endowment and equipment of the institution.

3. This proffer shall remain in force ten years.

Plan IV:

1. This plan contemplates a \$5,000,000. University, and a conditional proposition throughout.

2. It shall be in force ten years.

3. As often as we raise \$100,000. in cash or good investments Mr. Rockefeller shall give \$400,000. until the ten years expire or the sum above named is reached.

On this plan we ought to raise from 2 to \$300,000. the first year. If it is something like this or nothing, give us this.

Plan I

1. Mr. Rockefeller to give \$5,000,000 in six annual installments of \$800,000 each, or if he prefers in ten of \$500,000 each.

2. This entire sum to be set apart and forever preserved intact as an endowment fund.

3. We, on our part, will agree to purchase a site to be approved by him, erect buildings, provide libraries, scientific apparatus and all the necessary external equipment of a first class University, undertaking to raise for this purpose within the six years \$1,000,000. If we find it impossible to accomplish this in six years, we will continue to urge on the work and hold ourselves under obligation to Mr. Rockefeller till we have reached his \$5,000,000 endowment with a \$1,000,000 equipment.

Plan II

1. Mr. Rockefeller shall give \$1,500,000 in five equal annual installments for the establishment of the University.
2. We shall raise \$500,000 to make up the first \$2,000,000.
3. To secure the second \$2,000,000--as often as we raise \$100,000 Mr. Rockefeller shall give \$300,000.

Plan III

1. Mr. Rockefeller shall give \$500,000 outright to establish the University.
2. As often as we raise \$100,000 he shall give \$300,000. Until a total of \$5,000,000 have been secured for the endowment and equipment of the institution.
3. This proffer shall remain in force ten years.

Plan IV

1. This plan contemplates a \$5,000,000 University, and a conditional provision throughout.
2. It shall be in force ten years.
3. As often as we raise \$100,000 in cash or good investments Mr. Rockefeller shall give \$400,000. Until the ten years expire or the sum above named is reached.

On this plan we ought to raise from \$ to \$500,000 the first year. It is somewhat like this or nothing, give us this.

✓

Dr. Goodspeed to his sons, December 16, 1888.

"Nothing new yet about the University. I presume Mr. R. and Dr. H. will go over the whole ground during Dr. H's vacation, and we may have something definite before you return to Denison. Indeed I may have something by the time you reach home, as I suppose Dr. H. is with Mr. R. today or at least saw him yesterday,

I have sent Dr. H. four forms of a proposition for his consideration and Mr. R's and one of them, wholly different from the one I submitted to Mr. R., I have pressed very urgently. It is the one I want, but have little hope I shall get it. It will be a great thing if we can get a proposition under which we can work freely and happily without the constant fear that we are going to fail and lose much that is at stake.

Mr. Gates has returned and I am to see him tomorrow. He has visited Dr. S. in Rochester. He is very confident Dr. Smith tells me about the outcome."

.....

Dr. Goodspeed to his sons, December 12, 1882.

"Nothing new yet about the University. I presume Mr. R.

and Dr. H. will go over the whole ground during Dr. R's

vacation, and we may have something definite before you

return to Denison. Indeed I may have something by the time

you reach home, as I suppose Dr. H. is with Mr. R. today

or at least saw him yesterday.

I have sent Dr. H. four forms of a proposition for his

consideration and Mr. R's and one of them, wholly different

from the one I submitted to Mr. R., I have pressed very

urgently. It is the one I want, but have little hope I shall

get it. It will be a great thing if we can get a proposition

under which we can work freely and happily without the

constant fear that we are going to fail and lose much that

is at stake.

Mr. Gates has returned and I am to see him tomorrow.

He has visited Dr. E. in Rochester. He is very confident

Dr. Smith tells me about the outcome."

.....

Dr. Goodspeed to Dr. Harper, December 16, 1888.

"If Plan I should commend itself, what assurance could we give Mr. Rockefeller that we should do our part after he had done his? As I turn this plan over it looks as tho' if he will consider it carefully, he must see that it will require more of us than any other hopeful one that can be devised. For example, the external, material equipment of Yale is worth far more than \$1,000,000. That of Harvard is worth \$2,000,000. Columbia, according to official report four years ago, \$2,000,000. and still more now. Cornell, out in the country where everything is cheap, four years ago, \$1,200,000., \$1,500,000. at least now.

It is an institution similar to these that we propose for Chicago. This external equipment will cost \$2,000,000. By Plan I we assume that part of the work, so that by this plan we propose to do double what we do on any other. What assurance can we give that we will do it? This, that necessity will compel us to do it. If we can have an endowment of \$3,000,000., Chicago will do far more than under any other plan. Local pride and liberality will provide an equipment to match such an endowment. We can reach every public spirited man in the city, of all denominations, and of none. This Plan possesses many advantages, both for us and for Mr. Rockefeller. Let me set down a few in order-

1. It secures absolutely a great endowment and thus assures the high character of the institution. It will be at once and everywhere recognized that we have the foundation of a University that will rank with Harvard, Yale, Cornell, and Columbia.

2. Such an endowment will make an adequate external equipment certain. Men will take pleasure in providing all that is needed to make such an endowment most useful.

3. It will secure from the city and the denomination a larger sum than can be secured on any other plan, for the site, buildings, libraries, and apparatus will cost \$2,000,000. instead of one. We will make our appeals on that basis.

4. By eliminating everything conditional universal confidence will be awakened at the outset. If Mr. R. makes the larger part of his subscription conditional, no one will know what we are really going to have. Many will doubt, perhaps whether much will come of it after all. Men will say, 'We would help you more liberally,

Dr. Goodspeed to Dr. Harper, December 16, 1888.

"If Plan I should command itself, what assurance could we give Mr. Rockefeller that we should do any part after he had done his? As I turn this plan over to look at the 'if he will consider it carefully, he must see that it will require more than any other hospital one that can be devised. For example, the external material equipment of Yale is worth far more than \$1,000,000. That of Harvard is worth \$2,000,000. Columbia, according to official report four years ago, \$2,000,000. and still more now. Cornell, but in the country where everything is cheap, four years ago, \$1,200,000. \$1,500,000. at least now.

It is an institution similar to those that we propose for Chicago. This external equipment will cost \$2,000,000. By Plan I we assume that part of the work, so that by this plan we propose to do double what we do on any other. What assurance can we give that we will do it? This, that necessarily will compel us to do it. If we can have an endowment of \$2,000,000, Chicago will do far more than under any other plan. Local pride and liberality will provide an equipment to match such an endowment. We can reach every public spirited man in the city, of all denominations, and of home. This plan possesses many advantages, both for us and for Mr. Rockefeller. Let me set down a few in order.

1. It secures absolutely a great endowment and thus assures the high character of the institution. It will be at once and everywhere recognized that we have the foundation of a University that will rank with Harvard, Yale, Cornell, and Columbia.

2. Such an endowment will make an adequate external equipment certain. Men will take pleasure in providing all that is needed to make such an endowment most useful.

3. It will secure from the city and the denomination a larger sum than can be secured on any other plan. For the site, buildings, libraries, and apparatus will cost \$2,000,000. Instead of one. We will make our appeal on that basis.

4. By eliminating everything conditional universal confidence will be awakened at the outset. If Mr. A. makes the larger part of his subscription conditional, no one will know what we are really going to have. Many will doubt, perhaps whether much will come of it after all. Men will say, 'We would help you more liberally,

"if there was any certainty you would succeed.' Some will tie us up with other conditions, saying 'I will give you so much if you raise \$1,000,000. in such a time.'

5. This plan will reflect the greatest credit on Mr. R. It will be universally hailed with approval as a most liberal and wise way of putting the matter, and I believe will commend itself as no conditional plan will.

6. It has this supreme advantage, that it makes Mr. R's contribution a perpetual endowment fund, preserves it intact forever and thus assures forever the high character of the University. Not one dollar of the principal will be dissipated and such a fund will, in addition to making an adequate external equipment certain, gather about it and insure other endowment funds. The fund itself will grow. Many men will say, 'I will give you so much for endowment, but nothing to be used up in expenses.' Money for endowment will be bequeathed to us.

7. This plan will enable us to lay our hands on the man we want for President and to secure the ablest corp of instructors obtainable in the land. If the proposition is in large part conditional and any great success problematical, the President we want may hesitate. He may say, 'I am not at all sure what you are going to have there.' And so with the eminent men we want for professors. But an institution with \$3,000,000. endowment and an income that promises at the end of 6 or 10 years to be \$250,000. annually can command the best talent in the land. And a brilliant faculty will, in turn, command buildings and apparatus and fill the departments with students and thus will make new buildings and new facilities necessary. And ~~thus~~ the work will grow.

8. It will put us under a threefold pressure to raise the largest amount of money possible.

First, necessity will compel us. We shall be as bare handed, so far as external equipment is concerned, as tho' we had not a dollar. And we shall be compelled to put forth every exertion to secure a site and erect the necessary buildings, buy books and provide scientific apparatus. The growth of the University will hold us under the pressure of this necessity for many years. And the plea of necessity is a great and powerful one. Second, we shall be under the continual pressure and spur of obligation to Mr. R. We shall owe it to him to provide an equipment to match his endowment. The men

"If there was any certainty you would succeed," some will tie us up with other conditions, saying "I will give you as much as you raise \$1,000,000. In such a time."

5. This plan will reflect the greatest credit on Mr. H. It will be universally hailed with approval as a most liberal and wise way of putting the matter, and I believe will command itself as no conditional plan will.

6. It has this supreme advantage, that it makes Mr. H's contribution a perpetual endowment fund, preserves it intact forever and thus assures forever the high character of the University. Not one dollar of the principal will be dissipated and such a fund will, in addition to making an adequate external endowment certain, gather about it and insure other endowment funds. The fund itself will grow. Many men will say, "I will give you as much for endowment, but nothing to be used up in expenses." Money for endowment will be peddled to us.

7. This plan will enable us to lay our hands on the man we want for President and to secure the chief corp of instructors obtainable in the land. If the proposition is in large part conditional and any great success problematical, the President we want may hesitate. He may say, "I am not at all sure what you are going to have there." And so with the eminent men we want for professors. But an institution with \$3,000,000 endowment and an income that promises at the end of 5 or 10 years to be \$250,000 annually can command the best talent in the land. And a brilliant faculty will, in turn, command buildings and apparatus and fill the departments with students and then will make new buildings and new facilities necessary. And that the work will grow.

8. It will put us under a threefold pressure to raise the largest amount of money possible.

First, necessarily will compel Mr. H. to sell his own lands, so that an external endowment is concerned as the "we had not a dollar." And we shall be compelled to put forth every exertion to secure a site and erect the necessary buildings, buy books and provide scientific apparatus. The growth of the University will hold us under the pressure of this necessity for many years. And the idea of necessity is a great and powerful one. Second, we shall be under the continual pressure and spur of solicitation to Mr. H. We shall owe to him to provide an equipment to match his endowment. The man

in whose care he will place this trust will feel this sense of obligation and it will impel them to the most strenuous and unremitting exertions. Third, common honesty and self respect will compel our most earnest efforts. To fail will be a betrayal of trust that would disgrace us, and we should not fail. We would rather die than fail to do the work entrusted to us. Well, this is enough. I want you, if this commends itself to you, to lay the case before Mr. R. with all the earnestness and power you can command, so that he may have it fully and fairly in mind for consideration.

One objection will occur to you, that it leaves us without funds at the outset for the purchase of the old University property. I am not so sure of that. I believe we can raise \$200,000. the first year and perhaps as much more the second. A plea for means to recover that property will avail, if we have this magnificent endowment behind us.

The plan has one feature that cannot but commend it to Mr. R.--the preservation intact of his contributions as the endowment of the institution. He can secure this by providing a legal penalty if he sees fit.

The old University building as it now stands cost, main building \$122,000., Observatory \$30,000., South wing \$30,000. To add the North wing will cost \$40,000. I send you cuts of it, as it now stands and as it was originally designed. The north wing was designed for an art gallery and library. It can be changed, if we like to correspond with the south wing and be made like that a dormitory. The library building should be detached and fireproof I should think. To repair the old building and make such reconstruction as is necessary will cost not more than \$20,000. I believe \$300,000. will buy it and put it in shape for use, and the land itself is worth almost if not quite that sum.

I have written you all this in the hope that Mr. R. may take advantage of your vacation to go over the whole question with you.

Mr. Rockefeller should name the institution, name the President, name the Board, indicate the purpose and scope of the University and the spirit in which he would have it conducted. If he could see his way to commit this great endowment to the Baptist Denomination and the City of Chicago with no other condition than that they shall provide for its largest usefulness by a worthy external, material equipment, I am confident he would secure all the ends he has in view and do it in a way that will be universally recognized as the wisest and the best."

in whose care he will place this trust will feel this sense of obligation and it will inspire them to the most strenuous and unflinching exertions. This common honesty and self-respect will compel our most earnest efforts. To fail will be a betrayal of trust that would disgrace us, and we should not fail. We would rather die than fail to do the work entrusted to us. Well, this is enough. I want you, if this committee itself to you, to lay the case before Mr. R. with all the earnestness and power you can command, so that he may have it fully and fairly in mind for consideration.

One objection will occur to you, that if we leave us without funds at the outset for the purchase of the old University property. I am not aware of that. I believe we can raise \$200,000 the first year and perhaps as much more the second. A plan for means to recover that property will avail, if we have this magnificent endowment behind us.

The plan has one feature that cannot but commend itself to Mr. R.--the preservation intact of his contributions as the endowment of the institution. We can secure this by providing a legal penalty if he does it.

The old University building on its new stands cost main building \$122,000. Observatory \$50,000. South wing \$30,000. To add the North wing will cost \$40,000. I send you cuts of it, as its new stands and as it was originally designed. The North wing was designed for an art gallery and library. It can be changed, if we like to correspond with the South wing and be made like that a dormitory. The library building should be detached and fireproof. I should think to repair the old building and make such reconstruction as is necessary will cost not more than \$80,000. I believe \$300,000 will buy it and put it in shape for use, and the land itself is worth almost if not quite that sum.

I have written you all this in the hope that Mr. R. may take advantage of your vacation to go over the whole question with you.

Mr. Rockefeller should name the institution, name the President, name the Board, indicate the scope of the University and the rights it shall be would have it conferred. It is a noble way to donate this great endowment to the United States and the City of Chicago with no other condition than that they shall provide for its largest usefulness by a worthy external, material equipment. I am confident he would secure all the ends he has in view and do it in a way that will be universally recognized as the wisest and the best."

✓
December 19, 1888.

Dr. Harper to Dr. Goodspeed:-

"Your favor of the 15th inst. with the three plans enclosed has been received and carefully noted. I am much obliged to you for putting the matter in this definite shape so that when the time comes I may be in a position to act intelligently. I have been hoping to receive word from Mr. Rockefeller in reference to the matter soon. Nothing has come. Perhaps he has reached the same point with me that he has with Dr. Strong. It is possible that I pushed things too rapidly for him, but we can only wait and see. You may be sure that everything will be done that is possible."
(P.S.) "Your last just at hand with picture of Aniv. All is carefully preserved for the interview when it comes."

December 19, 1938.

Dr. Harper to Dr. Goodspeed:-

"Your favor of the 15th inst. with the three plans enclosed has been received and carefully noted. I am much obliged to you for putting the matter in this definite shape so that when the time comes I may be in a position to act intelligently. I have been hoping to receive word from Mr. Rockefeller in reference to the matter soon. Nothing has come. Perhaps he has reached the same point with me that he has with Dr. Strong. It is possible that I pushed things too rapidly for him, but we can only wait and see. You may be sure that everything will be done that is possible." (P.S.) "Your last just at hand with picture of Aniv. All is carefully preserved for the interview when it comes."

✓ ✓

Mr. Gates to Dr. Harper, December 20, 1888.

"With Dr. Lorimer I had an interview yesterday with Mr. Geo. C. Walker of the Blue Island Land Company. He accepts the action of the Board as a rejection of his proposals. He takes it manfully and not unkindly. But we certainly misjudge him in supposing his offer is solely or chiefly for speculative purposes. I could prove this if necessary.

What I wanted him to do was to make the same offer for a good classical Academy to be at once started in preparation for the University. This he is willing to do. The Provisional committee will meet on Monday at my call to consider whether we shall go to work at once to found an Academy at Morgan Park. The land you know is contiguous to the Seminary property. It contains 28 acres. The Ladies' Seminary building is on it. Besides the land the company is to give five thousand dollars in cash, and Mr. Walker personally subscribes twenty thousand. One hundred thousand more will need to be raised. It seems to me that if we can do this, we ought to. An Academy is a good and useful thing in itself. Chicago has nothing of the kind. Morgan Park would prove a good place for it. The attempt to raise the money will keep the ball rolling here. The country will be pleased to see the Chicago people moving. The Academy will be a

Mr. Gates to Dr. Harper, December 20, 1888.

"With Dr. Lathrop I had an interview yesterday with Mr. Geo. C. Walker of the Blue Island Land Company. He accepts the action of the Board as a rejection of his proposals. He takes it manfully and not unkindly. But we certainly misjudge him in supposing his offer is solely or chiefly for speculative purposes. I could prove this if necessary.

What I wanted him to do was to make the same offer for a good classical Academy to be at once started in preparation for the University. This he is willing to do. The Provisional Committee will meet on Monday at my call to consider whether we shall go to work at once to found an Academy at Morgan Park. The land you know is contiguous to the Seminary property. It contains 28 acres. The Ladies' Seminary building is on it. Besides the land the company is to give five thousand dollars in cash, and Mr. Walker personally subscribes twenty thousand. One hundred thousand more will need to be raised. It seems to me that if we can do this, we ought to. An Academy is a good and useful thing in itself. Chicago has nothing of the kind. Morgan Park would prove a good place for it. The attempt to raise the money will keep the ball rolling here. The country will be pleased to see the Chicago people moving. The Academy will be of

necessary adjunct to the University. It will be a proper initiative. The movement will rescue to us the sympathy and active helpfulness of Mr. Walker, and he will in the end be a great financial help.

Now what will be the effect of such a movement on the mind of Mr. Rockefeller, that will be the question everywhere asked? Will it interfere with his plans? Will he recognize this work in any conditions he may wish to make? Will it interfere with or will it facilitate any plans he may be cherishing? There will be a general unwillingness to move until it can be ascertained just what Mr. Rockefeller would think of it. I submit the question to you. Do about it just what you think best?"

necessary adjunct to the University. It will be a proper initiative. The movement will render to us the sympathy and active helplessness of Mr. Walker, and he will in the end be a great financial help.

Now what will be the effect of such a movement on the mind of Mr. Rockefeller, that will be the question everywhere asked? Will it interfere with his plans? Will he recognize this work in any conditions he may wish to make? Will it interfere with or will it facilitate any plans he may be cherishing? There will be a general unwillingness to move until it can be ascertained just what Mr. Rockefeller would think of it. I submit the question to you. Do about it just what you think best?"

Dec. 20, 1888

Dr. Harper to Mr. Gates:

"Yours of December 13th was duly received. I am obliged to you for the details of Dr. Anderson's opinion. I can understand his situation and can see why he declines to publish anything. Be ready for disappointment. I have heard nothing from Mr. Rockefeller; he is evidently taking time to collect his thoughts. Perhaps he feels that I have overdone the business; this is where I am afraid I have erred. I wrote him last week calling his attention to the meeting and speaking of it in great detail. When anything happens you shall hear."

Dec. 30, 1888

Dr. Harper to Mr. Gates:

"Yours of December 13th was duly received. I am obliged to you for the details of Dr. Anderson's opinion. I can understand his situation and can see why he declines to publish anything. Be ready for disappointment. I have heard nothing from Mr. Rockefeller; he is evidently taking time to collect his thoughts. Perhaps he feels that I have overdone the business; this is where I am afraid I have erred. I wrote him last week calling his attention to the meeting and speaking of it in great detail. When anything happens you shall hear."

Dec. 22, 1888

Dr. Harper to Mr. Gates:

"Yours of December 20th from Racine is at hand. I have considered the matter which you lay before me in your letter. I am at some loss what to say; on the whole my sentiments may be summed up in the following statements:

"(1) There is nothing in the world, next to a university, more to be desired at Chicago than the establishment of a good classical academy. If Mr. Walker is ready to take hold of this plan he is undertaking a thing for which future generations will bless him. I do not think the importance of the plan can possibly be overestimated. Nothing should be done in any way to discourage such a plan; everything should be done to encourage it. Mr. Walker's proposition is a most generous one and shows his interest in the work and his benevolent disposition.

"(2) I am entirely uncertain as to what effect an effort to raise one hundred thousand dollars will have on Mr. Rockefeller just at present while he is considering the plan of the university. He may say to himself: "If these people put their money in an academy they will not do anything for the university but will let that rest entirely upon me. Perhaps they think the university matter is settled and so they do not need to trouble themselves further about it. I think under the circumstances I will not go further". On the other hand he may soliloquize as follows: "The Chicago people show great judgment in beginning with an academy; they see the necessity of having such a training-school; this shows their good sense; if they take care of the academy then it devolves upon me to take care of the university." On the whole I am of the opinion that he will take the former view; and still, I am uncertain. I do not know that any one can determine beforehand what would be directly the effect upon him. If it were possible to pay it before him and sound him upon the matter it seems to me it would be a wise thing to do. Such a thing, however, is impossible before your meeting on Monday, when some action will be taken. I can only say, therefore, in reply to your letter that you must do what, under all the circumstances, seems to you the right thing to do without reference to anything in the East; for certainly nothing can be definitely stated as to how your action will be received.

"I am myself a little anxious as to the matter, for I am afraid that it will divert attention from the main scheme. The academy matter could easily be arranged after the other; but go ahead. I shall take lunch with Mr. Rockefeller next Wednesday or Thursday."

Dec. 22, 1888

Dr. Harper to Mr. Gates:

"Yours of December 20th from Racine is at hand. I have considered the matter which you lay before me in your letter. I am at some loss what to say; on the whole my sentiments may be summed up in the following statements:

"(1) There is nothing in the world, next to a university, more to be desired at Chicago than the establishment of a good classical academy. If Mr. Walker is ready to take hold of this plan he is undertaking a thing for which future generations will bless him. I do not think the importance of the plan can possibly be overestimated. Nothing should be done in any way to discourage such a plan; everything should be done to encourage it. Mr. Walker's proposition is a most generous one and shows his interest in the work and his benevolent disposition.

"(2) I am entirely uncertain as to what effect an effort to raise one hundred thousand dollars will have on Mr. Rockefeller just at present while he is considering the plan of the university. He may say to himself: "If these people put their money in an academy they will not do anything for the university but will let that rest entirely upon me. Perhaps they think the university matter is settled and so they do not need to trouble themselves further about it. I think under the circumstances I will not go further." On the other hand he may soliloquize as follows: "The Chicago people show great judgment in beginning with an academy; they see the necessity of having such a training-school; this shows their good sense; if they take care of the academy then it devolves upon me to take care of the university." On the whole I am of the opinion that he will take the former view; and still, I am uncertain. I do not know that any one can determine beforehand what would be directly the effect upon him. If it were possible to pay it before him and sound him upon the matter it seems to me it would be a wise thing to do. Such a thing, however, is impossible before your meeting on Monday, when some action will be taken. I can only say, therefore, in reply to your letter that you must do what, under all the circumstances, seems to you the right thing to do without reference to anything in the East; for certainly nothing can be definitely stated as to how your action will be received.

"I am myself a little anxious as to the matter, for I am afraid that it will divert attention from the main scheme. The academy matter could easily be arranged after the other; but go ahead. I shall take lunch with Mr. Rockefeller next Wednesday or Thursday."

Dec. 22, 1888

Dr. Morehouse to Mr. Gates:

"Enclosed I send you a letter from Dr. Robinson concerning the University at Chicago. In a personal note accompanying it he says: 'If you think the second clause of the first sentence had better be omitted it can be erased, but it expresses my feelings in the case'. My own judgment is that although it may contain an implied reflection upon previous mismanagement it will do good to let it stand as it is; for there is no doubt that what Dr. Robinson expresses is a prevalent feeling in the denomination. There are some who will give money for the institution only upon satisfactory assurance that the control shall be placed in a board composed of the best men that can be found whether in or outside of Chicago.

"Your letter concerning the communication for the Standard relating to the drift of sentiment here concerning the relative claims of a university in New York and an institution in Chicago was received. I wrote to Goodman that as I was not present at the Social Union I could not write definitely of the drift of sentiment and there were special reasons why it did not seem to me best to write at all about it. But I have requested Dr. Wood, who is warmly interested in Chicago, to write an article. I presume he will do so although I have not heard from him. You probably know that the Inquirer of next week will contain the Addresses of Crandall and MacArthur. There are no new developments in this quarter that I have heard of."

Dec. 22, 1888

Dr. Morehouse to Mr. Gates:

"Enclosed I send you a letter from Dr. Robinson concerning the University at Chicago. In a personal note accompanying it he says: 'If you think the second clause of the first sentence had better be omitted it can be erased, but it expresses my feeling in the case.' My own judgment is that although it may contain an implied reflection upon previous mismanagement it will do good to let it stand as it is; for there is no doubt that what Dr. Robinson expresses is a prevalent feeling in the denomination. There are some who will give money for the institution only upon satisfactory assurance that the control shall be placed in a board composed of the best men that can be found whether in or outside of Chicago.

"Your letter concerning the communication for the Standard relating to the drift of sentiment here concerning the relative claims of a university in New York and an institution in Chicago was received. I wrote to Goodman that as I was not present at the Social Union I could not write definitely of the drift of sentiment and there were special reasons why it did not seem to me best to write at all about it. But I have requested Dr. Wood, who is warmly interested in Chicago, to write an article. I presume he will do so although I have not heard from him. You probably know that the Inquiry of next week will contain the Address of Grandall and MacArthur. There are no new developments in this quarter that I have heard of."

✓✓

Mr. Gates to Dr. Harper, December 24, 1888.

"Your most thoughtful and excellent letter came to hand just in time.

On the whole we think it best to endeavor to get Mr. Walker to hold the thing open, without committing ourselves to it definitely until we have further light.

Besides the question of Mr. Rockefeller's opinion, there is the fear that any action taken before we receive some proposition from him will not succeed, and he would not give us in advance such counsel as would seem to commit him to the University. Such counsel would I think be necessary to success here.

I am inclined to the opinion that it will not be wise even to sound Mr. Rockefeller or intimate to him that we could get the Morgan Park property, for an Academy. I am afraid he will wait for us to do it, and I dare not risk the venture or delay. We can act far more certainly, wisely and successfully after we know for certain what Mr. R. will do.

I send you proofs of an article which will appear in Standard of this week, so that you can give it to Mr. R. on 'Wednesday or Thursday' if you think best."

Mr. Gates to Dr. Harper, December 24, 1888.

"Your most thoughtful and excellent letter came to

hand just in time.

On the whole we think it best to endeavor to get Mr. Walker to hold the thing open, without committing ourselves to it definitely until we have further light. Besides the question of Mr. Rockefeller's opinion, there is the fear that any action taken before we

receive some proposition from him will not succeed, and he would not give us in advance such counsel as would

seem to commit him to the University. Such counsel would I think be necessary to success here.

I am inclined to the opinion that it will not be wise even to sound Mr. Rockefeller or intimate to him that we could get the Morgan Park property, for an Academy. I am afraid he will wait for us to do it, and I dare not risk the venture or delay. We can act far

more certainly, wisely and successfully after we know for certain what Mr. M. will do. I send you proofs of an article which will appear in Standard of this week, so that you can give it to Mr. R. on Wednesday or Thursday if you think best."

Dec. 24, 1888

Dr. Morehouse to Mr. Gates:

x x x x x "I have heard nothing further about Mr. Rockefeller's plans. The Journal & Messenger of last week had a paragraph which seemed to me an attempt to ride two horses. Next Monday the Pastors' Conference is to have a discussion of the question about the establishment of a University in New York City. MacArthur and Crandall will be the principal speakers, and the Conference will be a general free-lance affair, I presume.

"Dr. Wood feels disinclined to write anything for the Standard in opposition to the views of Stuart as expressed in his report of the Social Union meeting. I think it may be as well to let the matter drop for probably that report will not have any special weight in these quarters and particularly in influencing Mr. Rockefeller. I shall be interested in seeing the Standard which gives the views of leading brethren about the matter of establishing an institution at Chicago."

Dec. 24, 1933

Dr. Morehouse to Mr. Gates:

"I have heard nothing further about Mr. Rockefeller's plans. The Journal & Messenger of last week had a paragraph which seemed to me an attempt to ride two horses. Next Monday the Pastor's Conference is to have a discussion of the question about the establishment of a University in New York City. MacArthur and Randall will be the principal speakers, and the Conference will be a general free-lance affair. I presume."

"Dr. Wood feels disinclined to write anything for the Standard in opposition to the views of Sturt as expressed in his report of the Social Union meeting. I think it may be as well to let the matter drop for probably that report will not have any special weight in these quarters and particularly in influencing Mr. Rockefeller. I shall be interested in seeing the Standard which gives the views of leading brethren about the matter of establishing an institution at Chicago."

December 25, 1888.

Dr. Strong to Mr. Rockefeller:-

"We remember you all on this Christmas day with sincere gratitude and affection. We delight to hear that Mrs. Rockefeller is so much improved and we wish you all the merriest sort of a Christmas and the happiest sort of a New Year.

I regret to say that I have a sorry subject to write you about. Prof. Harper, whom I have greatly admired and from whom I have hoped great things for the service of our denomination, has I fear departed from the sound faith as to inspiration and prophecy, and is no longer to be trusted in his teachings. Dr. Northrup had prepared my mind for this, but I had hoped with him that reflection would bring Dr. Harper round right. His surroundings at New Haven have not been favorable, and he has unfortunately made progress in the wrong direction, so much so that I cannot have any further responsibility as respects the continuance of his teaching at Vassar. In order that you may appreciate the exact state of the case, I send you the following copy of a letter I have just written to him.

'My present object in writing is to ask you some questions about your Bible Lectures at Vassar. My daughter has brought home her note-books, and I have been interested in looking them over. I find in them some things that surprise me as coming from you; for I had not believed that you accepted the views of the Critical School. But in these notes I find you saying: 'Prophecies were oral until the time of Joel and Amos.' Now I find Jesus Christ, in John 5:46,47, speaking of 'Moses...his writings...' and saying 'He wrote of me.' So I find Peter in Acts 3:22, declaring that 'Moses said,' and Paul in Rom. 10:5 saying 'Moses writeth.' Your words, if they are your words, seem to imply that there was no such early prophetic writing by Moses. In Mat. 22:43,44, Jesus refers to the 110th Psalm, declaring that in that Psalm David in the spirit calls Christ 'Lord.' This surely a testimony from our Lord that there was a prophetic Psalm written by David, and therefore long before the time of Joel and Amos. I might multiply passages from Christ and the Apostles, but you know them quite as well as I. Now it seems to me that unless we attribute to our Lord false teaching, we are bound to accept his witness to the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch and to the Davidic authorship of the 110th Psalm. You know that in "Robert Elsmere" the turning-point in the hero's experience is when he in the first place concludes, on very indifferent evidence as it seems to me, that the so-called book of Daniel was written 250 years or so after Daniel's time, and then in the second place because Jesus refers to a passage of the book and calls it 'the book of the Prophet Daniel' concludes that Jesus Christ is not God, but only man. This is logical, and the conclusion is correct if the premises are granted. Are you willing to grant the premises, when the conclusion can be nothing less than the subversion of your faith in Christ? For notice that here is not simply ignorance, but such actual false teaching as is inconsistent with any well-grounded belief that Christ is the truth of God, or is God himself.

I was very sorry to see you printing in the 'Hebrew Student' Dr. Toy's recent essay, coolly admitting that Paul was mistaken in his interpretation of the Old Testament. I do not see what inspiration worth

December 22, 1888.

Dr. Strong to Mr. Rockefeller:-

"We remember you all on this Christmas day with sincere gratitude and affection. We delight to hear that Mrs. Rockefeller is so much improved and we wish you all the merriest sort of a Christmas and the happiest sort of a New Year.

I regret to say that I have a sorry subject to write you about. Prof. Harper, whom I have greatly admired and from whom I have hoped great things for the service of our denomination, has I fear departed from the sound faith as to inspiration and prophecy, and is no longer to be trusted in his teachings. Dr. Northrup had prepared my mind for this, but I had hoped with him that reflection would bring Dr. Harper round right. His surroundings at New Haven have not been favorable, and he has unfortunately made progress in the wrong direction, so much so that I cannot have any further responsibility as respects the continuance of his teaching at Vassar. In order that you may appreciate the extent of the case, I send you the following copy of a letter I have just written to him.

"My present object in writing is to ask you some questions about your Bible lectures at Vassar. My daughter has brought home her note-books, and I have been interested in looking them over. I find in them some things that surprise me as coming from you; for I had not believed that you accepted the views of the Critical School. But in these notes I find you saying: 'Prophecies were oral until the time of Joel and Amos.' Now I find Jesus Christ, in John 5:46, 47, speaking of 'Moses... his writings...', and saying 'He wrote of me.' So I find Peter in Acts 3:22, declaring that 'Moses said,' and Paul in Rom. 10:5 saying 'Moses wrote.' Your words, if they are your words, seem to imply that there was no such early prophetic writing by Moses. In Matt. 22:43, 44, Jesus refers to the 110th Psalm, declaring that in that Psalm David in the spirit calls Christ 'Lord.' This surely is testimony from our Lord that there was a prophetic Psalm written by David, and therefore long before the time of Joel and Amos. I might multiply passages from Christ and the Apostles, but you know them quite as well as I. Now it seems to me that unless we attribute to our Lord false teaching, we are bound to accept his witness to the Messianic authorship of the Pentateuch and to the Davidic authorship of the 110th Psalm. You know that in 'Robert Elamers' the turning-point in the hero's experience is when he in the first place concludes, on very indifferent evidence as it seems to me, that the so-called book of Daniel was written 250 years or so after Daniel's time, and then in the second place because Jesus refers to a passage of the book and calls it 'the book of the Prophet Daniel' concludes that Jesus Christ is not God, but only man. This is logical, and the conclusion is correct if the premises are granted. Are you willing to grant the premises, when the conclusion can be nothing less than the subversion of your faith in Christ? For notice that here is not simply ignorance, but such actual false teaching as is inconsistent with any well-grounded belief that Christ is the Son of God, or is God himself.

I was very sorry to see you printing in the 'Hebrew Student' Dr. Toy's recent essay, coolly suggesting that Paul was mistaken in his interpretation of the Old Testament. I do not see what inspiration worth

December 25, 1888.

talking about is left after such an admission is made, and I am sorry that the 'Student' with such teaching uncriticized and uncontradicted gets into our colleges. But I am more concerned about your own personal views and personal teaching. I find you saying that 'if words of a prophecy belong to an early age, they must have a more general meaning than if they belong to a later age'.....'In the Pentateuch is no definite prediction of Christ.' But Jesus himself declares to the contrary: Moses, he says, 'wrote of me;' 'All things must be fulfilled which are written in the law of Moses and the prophets and the psalms concerning me.' What is this but setting up a priori improved dictum of educational philosophy against the plain words of Christ himself? I object very much to other things in the Notes as I find them, such as your definition of a type so that the element of divine design in the prefiguration is left out, and the type is confounded with a mere chance coincidence; and your definition of prophecy, so that the element of divine inspiration is left out. It seems to me that your aim ~~is~~ in the interpretation of separate prophecies is to leave as little in them as can possibly be left consistently with the claim that they are religious at all. You still, it is true, maintain that you do not "take from the supernatural." It seems to me that the supernatural you leave is not worth the having, and that the logical conclusion is the conclusion of Kuehnen, that there is no supernatural element at all, other than the working of an immanent divinity such as excludes all real miracle and all real prophecy.

I feel sorry to say this, and I am still sorrier to see before me the notes that compel my saying it. I have a daughter at Vassar and I am unwilling to have the unsuspecting child under the influence of this teaching, if you are correctly reported. I am a Trustee of the College also, and I am unwilling to sanction any such teaching there. If you can assure me that you are incorrectly reported, and that you still believe Jesus was a true witness when he testified that Moses wrote specific predictions of him, it will greatly relieve my mind.'

So far my letter to Dr. Harper. I have sent a copy of it to Dr. Taylor. Dr. Osgood and Dr. Stevens here fully agree with me. Prof. Harper's doctrine is the same as that for which Dr. Broadus and his Board were compelled to dismiss Dr. Toy from Louisville Seminary a few years ago. It will prevent Dr. Harper from being of any use to Baptists."

December 25, 1888

-2-

talking about is left after such an admission is made, and I am sorry that the 'Student' with such teaching unscrutinized and unexamined gets into our colleges. But I am more concerned about your own personal views and personal teaching. I find you saying that 'if words of a prophecy belong to an early age, they must have a more general meaning than if they belong to a later age'..... In the Pentateuch is no definite prediction of Christ. But Jesus himself declares to the contrary: Moses, he says, 'wrote of me'; 'All things must be fulfilled which are written in the law of Moses and the prophets and the psalms concerning me.' What is this but setting up a priori improved dictum of educational philosophy against the plain words of Christ himself? I object very much to other things in the Notes as I find them, such as your definition of a type so that the element of divine design in the prediction is left out, and the type is confounded with a mere chance coincidence; and your definition of prophecy, so that the element of divine inspiration is left out. It seems to me that your aim is in the interpretation of separate prophecies is to leave as little in them as can possibly be left consistently with the claim that they are religious at all. You still, it is true, maintain that you do not 'take from the supernatural.' It seems to me that the supernatural you leave is not worth the having, and that the logical conclusion is the conclusion of Kierkegaard, that there is no supernatural element at all, other than the working of an immanent divinity such as exchanges all real miracle and all real prophecy. I feel sorry to say this, and I am still sorry to see before me the notes that compel my saying it. I have a daughter at Vassar and I am unwilling to have the unsuspecting child under the influence of this teaching, if you are correctly reported. I am a trustee of the College also, and I am unwilling to sanction any such teaching there. If you can assure me that you are incorrectly reported, and that you still believe Jesus was a true witness when he testified that Moses wrote specific predictions of him, it will greatly relieve my mind. So far my letter to Dr. Harper. I have sent a copy of it to Dr. Taylor, Dr. Osgood and Dr. Stevens here fully agree with me. Prof. Harper's doctrine is the same as that for which Dr. Broadus and his Board were compelled to denounce Dr. Fay from Louisville Seminary a few years ago. It will prevent Dr. Harper from being of any use to Baptists."

✓

Dr. Strong to Dr. Harper, December 25, 1888.

"I have not written you in reply to your letter of November 27, for the reason that to reply would only be to repeat what I had said before. My views have not changed. I favor a strong college in Chicago, but I would make the institution nothing but a College, in order that our University proper may be in New York, near to our base of supplies in the Colleges, and in order that we may not leave behind us untaken the greatest stronghold of all. To put an institution for advanced and professional instruction in Chicago, would be simply to compel another generation to undo our work and take the wind out of the sails of the Chicago institution, by founding under far more unfavorable circumstances the institution we ought ourselves to have founded in the greatest of our cities. The success of Boston University with its 487 scientific and professional students as against 537 at Harvard, shows that we can hold our own against Columbia. We have our own constituency, and we can draw from other denominations also.

But my present object in writing is quite another, namely to ask you some questions about your Bible Lectures at Vassar. My daughter has brought home her note books and I have been interested in looking them over. I find in them some things that surprise me, as coming from you, for I had not believed that you accepted the views of the critical school. But in these notes I find you reported as saying: 'Prophecies were oral until the time of Joel and Amos.' Now I find Jesus Christ in John 5: 46, 47, speaking of 'Moses-----his writings,' and saying 'he wrote of me.' So I find Peter in Acts 3:22, declaring 'Moses said' and Paul in Roman 10:5, 'Moses writeth.' Your words, if they are your words, seem to imply that there was no such early prophetic writing by Moses. In Mat. 22:43, 44, Jesus refers to the 110th Psalm declaring that in that Psalm David in the Spirit calls Christ 'Lord.' This is surely a testimony that there was a prophetic psalm written before the time of Joel and Amos. I might multiply passages from Christ and the Apostle, but you know them quite as well as I. Now it seems to me that unless we attribute to our Lord false teaching, we are bound to accept his witness to the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch and to the Davidic authorship of the 110th Psalm. You know that in 'Robert Elsmere' the turning point in the hero's experience is when he in the first place concludes, on very insufficient evidence as it seems to me, that the so-called book of Daniel was written 250 years or so after Daniel's time, and then because Jesus refers to a passage of the book and calls it 'the book of the prophet Daniel,' concludes in the second place that Jesus Christ is not God, but man only. This is logical, and the conclusion is correct, if the premises are granted. Are you willing to grant the premises, when the conclusion can be nothing less than the subversion of our faith in Christ? For notice that here is not simply ignorance, but such actual false teaching as is inconsistent with any well grounded belief that Christ is either God or the truth of God."

Dr. Strong to Dr. Harper, December 28, 1888.

"I have not written you in reply to your letter of November 27, for the reason that to reply would only be to repeat what I had said before. My views have not changed. I favor a strong college in Chicago, but I wish to make the institution something like a College, in order that our University proper may be in New York, near to our base of supplies in the Colleges, and in order that we may not leave behind us untrained the greatest strength of all. To put an institution for advanced and professional instruction in Chicago, would be simply to annual another generation to make our work and take the wind out of the sails of the Chicago institution, by founding under far more unfavorable circumstances the institution we ought ourselves to have founded in the present of our cities. The success of Boston University with its 1500 scientific and professional students as against 500 at Harvard shows that we can hold our own against Columbia. We have our own constituency, and we can draw from other constituencies also.

But my present object in writing is quite another, namely to ask you some questions about your Bible lectures at Vassar. My daughter has brought home her note books and I have been interested in looking them over. I find in them everything that surprises me, as coming from you, for I had not believed that you accepted the views of the critical school. But in these notes I find you reported as saying: 'Prophecies were exact until the time of Joel and Amos.' Now I find Jesus Christ in John 12:37, speaking of 'Moses'---his writings, and saying 'he wrote of me.' So I find Peter in Acts 3:22, declaring 'Moses said,' and Paul in Roman 10:5, 'Moses wrote.' Your words, if they are your words, seem to imply that there was no such early prophetic writing by Moses. In Matt. 23:35, Jesus refers to the Jews as 'killing the prophets that in Christ Jesus David in the spirit said: Lord! This is surely a testimony that there was a prophetic pen written before the time of Joel and Amos. I might multiply passages from Christ and the Apostles, but you know themselves as well as I. Now it seems to me that unless we attribute to our Lord Jesus something, we are bound to accept his witness to the Jewish authorities of the Pentateuch and to the Jewish authorities of the Old Testament. You know that in 'Robert M. La Follette's' turning point in the State's experience is what he is in the first place concerned, as very intelligently explained in his book or me, that the so-called book of Daniel was written 200 years or so after Daniel's time, and that because Jesus refers to a prophecy of the book and calls it 'the book of the prophet Daniel,' mentioned in the second place that Jesus Christ is not God, but man only. This is logical, and the conclusion is correct. If the prophecies are genuine, and you are willing to grant the evidence, when the conclusion can be nothing less than the substitution of our Lord Jesus Christ for Jesus Christ here is not simply ignorance, but a most serious error. It is inconsistent with our own knowledge that Christ is either God or the Son of God."

Toys

"I was very sorry to see you printing Dr. ~~Hay's~~ recent essay coolly admitting that Paul has mistaken in his interpretations of the Old Testament. I do not see what inspiration worth talking about is left after such an admission is made, and I am sorry that the 'student' with such teaching uncriticised and uncontradicted gets into our Colleges. But I am more concerned about your own personal views and personal teaching- I find you saying that 'if the words of a prophecy belong to an early age, they must have a more general meaning than if they belonged to a later age'. 'In the Pentateuch is no definite prediction of Christ.' But Christ himself declares to the contrary: Moses 'wrote of me'; 'all things must be fulfilled which are written in the law of Moses and the prophets, and the psalms, concerning me.' What is this but setting up an a-priori, unproved dictum of evolutionist philosophy against the plain words of Christ himself? I object very much to other things in the notes as I find them, such as your definition of a type, so that the element of Divine design in the prefiguration is left out; of prophecy, so that the element of divine inspiration is left out; and it seems to me that your aim in the interpretation of separate prophecies is to leave as little in them as can possibly be left consistently with the claim that they are religious at all. You still maintain that you do not 'take from the supernatural.' It seems to me that the supernatural you leave is not worth the having, and that the logical conclusion is the conclusion of Kuehnen that there is no supernatural element at all, other than that of the working of an ~~eminent~~ divinity such as excludes all real miracle and all real prophecy.

I feel sorry to say this, and I am still sorrier to see before me the notes that compel my saying it. I have a daughter at Vassar, and I am unwilling to have the unsuspecting child under the influence of this teaching, if you are correctly reported. I am a Trustee of the College also, and I am unwilling to sanction any such teaching there. If you can assure me that you are incorrectly reported, and that you still believe that Jesus was a true witness when he testified that Moses wrote specific predictions of him, it will greatly relieve my mind."

704
"I was very sorry to see you publishing Dr. [unclear] recent
essay about admitting that Paul has mistaken in his inter-
pretation of the Old Testament. I do not see what inspiration
worth talking about is left after such an admission is made,
and I am sorry that the 'student' with such teaching unqualified
and uncontradicted goes into our Colleges. But I am more
concerned about your own personal views and personal teaching-
I find you saying that 'if the words of a prophecy belong
to an early age, they must have a more general meaning than
if they belonged to a later age'. 'In the Testament is no
definite prediction of Christ.' But Christ himself declares
to the contrary: 'Moses wrote of me'; 'all things must be
fulfilled which are written in the law of Moses and the
prophets, and the gospels, concerning me.' What is this but
setting up an a-priori, unproved datum of evolution?
Philosophy against the plain words of Christ himself? I object
very much to other things in the notes as I find them, such
as your definition of a type, so that the element of living
design in the prediction is left out; of prophecy, so that
the element of living inspiration is left out; and it seems
to me that your aim in the interpretation of separate prophecies
is to leave as little in them as can possibly be left.
Consistently with the claim that they are religious at all.
You still maintain that you do not 'take from the supernatural'.
It seems to me that the supernatural you leave is not worth
the having, and that the logical conclusion is the conclusion
of Eusebius that there is no supernatural element at all.
Other than that of the working of an inherent divinity such as
excludes all real miracle and all real prophecy.

I feel sorry to say this, and I am still sorry to
see before me the notes that I have just written. I have a
daughter at Vassar, and I am unwilling to have the unquali-
fied child under the influence of this teaching, if you are
correctly reported. I am a trustee of the College also, and
I am unwilling to sanction any such teaching there. If you
can assure me that you are honestly reported, and that
you still believe that Jesus was a true witness when he
testified that Moses wrote special predictions of him, it
will greatly relieve my mind."

Mr. Gates to Dr. Harper, December 27, 1888.

"I am sure you have not overpressed Mr. Rockefeller. I hope you will not allow any self reproach. I can see many reasons why he may wish to hold the matter in abeyance for a time. He is too broad and too conscientious a man to decide this matter on any other grounds than its own merits and his ability. It is a great thing. You or I might want time, and it may be quiet if so ~~yast~~ a responsibility were placed upon us.

Whatever may be the event I beg you not to allow a thought of the kind your last letter hints. For certain he will decide the matter on its merits alone. That is what you want. He is not to be kept from doing a right thing by "overpressure."

Mr. Gates to Dr. Harper, December 27, 1888.

"I am sure you have not overpressed Mr. Rockefeller.

I hope you will not allow any self reproach. I can see many reasons why he may wish to hold the matter in abeyance for a time. He is too broad and too conscientious a man to decide this matter on any other grounds than its own merits and his ability. It is a great thing. You or I might want time, and it may be that it is well a responsibility were placed upon us.

Whatever may be the event I beg you not to allow a thought of the kind your last letter hints. For certain he will decide the matter on its merits alone. That is what you want. He is not to be kept from doing a right thing by "overpressure."

Dec. 28, 1888

Dr. Harper to Mr. Gates:

"Yours of December 24th from Chicago is at hand. I have also received the material from the "Standard" but it reached New Haven too late for me to make any use of it. I am in a great hurry this morning but will write you a brief letter and will explain more at length later. I spent one hour and a half yesterday with Mr. Rockefeller. I had begun to be afraid that my personal relations with him had been disturbed because I had not seen him, but I concluded to see what the trouble was and went to his office and lunched with him. We went off to a private table by ourselves and discussed the situation. His position is just this: 'I have made very little progress since I saw you in New Haven. All kinds of influences have been brought to bear upon me and are still coming to me. You would be surprised at the volunteer opinions and representations which come to me almost daily! The reason why I have made no progress is because I have not had time to catch my breath. I have never known so many applications for help in a long time. The Montreal people are down and are pressing me; the Richmond people have been re-inforced and are working at me. Everybody seems to be coming to me; I am tired. I would have seen you last Sunday but I was so tired I spent the day in bed; Christmas too I spent most of the time in bed. I am keeping my eyes open and am asking questions, and will see how things move. Meanwhile, I want you to come to me at any time and talk over matters, and whenever you are in the City take lunch with me.'

"This was the substance of what he said, let me add three points: Young Strong is at his house now and confidently asserts that Chicago is not the place for the University, only for the college. Schurmann of Cornell, in whom Mr. R. has great confidence, visited him and made the same statement. Dr. Strong has taken a new tack. The last point - and this is confidential - is a letter written to Mr. Rockefeller in which he takes me to task for my teachings at Vassar, accusing me of the worst rationalism and of being practically a Kuenenite. This disturbed Mr. R. very considerably; you will see, of course, the animus of the letter. I had a long conversation yesterday with Prof. Stevens of Rochester in which he told me the same matter. I have this morning a letter from Dr. Strong himself in which he asks me to assert my belief in the literal interpretations of all transactions, and in the literal interpretations of New Testament references to the Old. You will see that there is difficulty ahead. I feel this morning very much as if I were ready to pull out of the whole concern. I think that Mr. R. has not been influenced by this last letter. He will ask me to explain my position and this I am ready to do; and it is a position which I am sure the intelligent portion of the Baptist ministry would endorse. But I am not going to be drawn into a fight over

Dec. 28, 1888

Dr. Harper to Mr. Gates:

"Yours of December 24th from Chicago is at hand. I have also received the material from the 'Standard' but it reached New Haven too late for me to make any use of it. I am in a great hurry this morning but will write you a brief letter and will explain more at length later. I spent one hour and a half yesterday with Mr. Rockefeller. I had begun to be afraid that my personal relations with him had been disturbed because I had not seen him, but I concluded to see what the trouble was and went to his office and lunched with him. We went off to a private table by ourselves and discussed the situation. His position is just this: 'I have made very little progress since I saw you in New Haven. All kinds of influences have been brought to bear upon me and are still coming to me. You would be surprised at the volunteer opinions and representations which come to me almost daily. The reason why I have made no progress is because I have not had time to catch my breath. I have never known so many applications for help in a long time. The Montreal people are down and are pressing me; the Richmond people have been re-informed and are working at me. Everybody seems to be coming to me; I am tired. I would have seen you last Sunday but I was so tired I spent the day in bed; Christmas too I spent most of the time in bed. I am keeping my eyes open and am asking questions, and will see how things move. Meanwhile, I want you to come to me at any time and talk over matters, and whenever you are in the City take lunch with me.'

"This was the substance of what he said, let me add three points: Young Strong is at his house now and confidently asserts that Chicago is not the place for the University, only for the college. Schurmann of Cornell, in whom Mr. R. has great confidence, visited him and made the same statement. Dr. Strong has taken a new tack. The last point - and this is confidential - is a letter written to Mr. Rockefeller in which he takes me to task for my teachings at Vassar, accusing me of the worst rationalism and of being practically a Klu Kluxer. This disturbed Mr. R. very considerably; you will see, of course, the nature of the letter. I had a long conversation yesterday with Prof. Stevens of Rochester in which he told me the same matter. I have this morning a letter from Dr. Strong himself in which he asks me to assert my belief in the literal interpretation of all transactions, and in the literal interpretation of New Testament references to the Old. You will see that there is difficulty ahead. I feel this morning very much as if I were ready to pull out of the whole concern. I think that Mr. R. has not been influenced by this last letter. He will ask me to explain my position and this I am ready to do; and if is a position which I am sure the intelligent portion of the Baptist ministry would endorse. But I am not going to be drawn into a fight over

these matters even if I am to be deposed from the Vassar teaching by Dr. Strong's attitude because he is a member of the Board of Trustees,- a deposition ostensibly for heresy, but really to bring me into discredit so that I shall have no influence in the Chicago matter; you will see the position in which I stand. Dr. Strong understands, of course, that to hurt me in this matter is to hurt the Chicago University. The question is whether the brethren in the West will stand by me or not. I will write more fully again."

these matters even if I am to be deposed from the Vassar teaching by Dr. Strong's attitude because he is a member of the Board of Trustees, - a deposition ostensibly for heresy, but really to bring me into discredit so that I shall have no influence in the Chicago matter; you will see the position in which I stand. Dr. Strong understands, of course, that to hurt me in this matter is to hurt the Chicago University. The question is whether the brethren in the West will stand by me or not. I will write more fully again."

Dec. 28, 1888

Dr. Morehouse to Mr. Gates:

***** "You want to get The Forum for January. The Tribune of today has extended extracts from Pres. White's article on A Great Univ. for New York or Washington. He scores the Columbia College trustees in such a way that I think they will be aroused to see their opportunity in the establishment of a university in New York. He lays emphasis also upon Washington as the natural centre for a great university.

"Prof. Harper was in town yesterday but I did not see him. His pastor, Rev. Mr. Butrick, was here. In conversation with him I got a pretty distinct impression that Mr. Rockefeller's gift to Chicago may hinge somewhat upon the man who is to be at the head of the institution. It is pretty clear that his mind is upon Prof. Harper as the man; while Harper is strongly disinclined to consider the matter. Mr. Rockefeller takes a great stock in men; and knowing him as I do I am a little apprehensive that his gift will not be forthcoming until he is satisfied as to the man who is to be at the head of the institution. If my conjecture is correct I fear we shall not see Mr. Rockefeller's gift before May next. I wish Harper would at once say that he would take the presidency of the institution if Mr. Rockefeller will give a million and a half. I shall write to Harper on this point and try to impress upon him the tremendous responsibility of the position he occupies at this critical period.

"I note what you say about Dr. Strong. I was told yesterday that he is suffering from melancholy because of the probable miscarriage of his cherished plan for the establishment of a great university. But I fancy this is a rumor, although his disappointment must be great. He must feel very sore also because of the attitude which Mr. R. has taken concerning him.

"You will doubtless receive a copy of The Christian Inquirer containing the Addresses of MacArthur and Crandall. The subject is to be up at the Ministers' Conference next Monday. It is understood, however, that neither of these brethren will take any prominent part in the discussion as they have had their say. It will be a free field. I shall probably be a looker-on and say a few well-chosen and guarded words."

Dec. 28, 1888

Dr. Morehouse to Mr. Gates:

"You want to get The Forum for January. The Tribune of today has extended extracts from Free White's article on A Great Univ. for New York or Washington. He scores the Columbia College trustees in such a way that I think they will be aroused to see their opportunity in the establishment of a university in New York. He lays emphasis also upon Washington as the natural center for a great university."

"Prof. Harper was in town yesterday but I did not see him. His pastor, Rev. Mr. Butrick, was here. In conversation with him I got a pretty distinct impression that Mr. Rockefeller's gift to Chicago may hinge somewhat upon the man who is to be at the head of the institution. It is pretty clear that his mind is upon Prof. Harper as the man; while Harper is strongly disinclined to consider the matter. Mr. Rockefeller takes a great stock in men; and knowing him as I do I am a little apprehensive that his gift will not be forthcoming until he is satisfied as to the man who is to be at the head of the institution. If my conjecture is correct I fear we shall not see Mr. Rockefeller's gift before May next. I wish Harper would at once say that he would take the presidency of the institution if Mr. Rockefeller will give a million and a half. I shall write to Harper on this point and try to impress upon him the tremendous responsibility of the position he occupies at this critical period."

"I note what you say about Dr. Strong. I was told yesterday that he is suffering from melancholy because of the probable miscarriage of his cherished plan for the establishment of a great university. But I fancy this is a rumor, although his disappointment must be great. He must feel very sore also because of the attitude which Mr. R. has taken concerning him."

"You will doubtless receive a copy of The Christian Industrial containing the addresses of MacArthur and Grandall. The subject is to be up at the Ministers' Conference next Monday. It is understood, however, that neither of these brethren will take any prominent part in the discussion as they have had their say. It will be a free field. I shall probably be a looker-on and say a few well-chosen and guarded words."

Dec. 28, 1888

Dr. Harper to Dr. Morehouse:

"I received word from you through Buttrick at a late date, too late to permit me to change my plans. I have thought several times of visiting you. I had an interview with Mr. R. yesterday; the facts stand about as follows: he has not made any progress these three weeks because of (1) sickness in his family; (2) the great number of petitions which have come to him from various sources, - from Montreal, Richmond, etc.; (3) extra business cares; (4) the volunteer opinions of a great many busy-bodies who are anxious to say a word for or against the proposed plan, and I would infer that it has been mostly against.

"Dr. Strong is using every possible effort to break up the thing. The last move is a very strange one. He supposes, as I understand many do, that if the organization is made I am to be President. He does not know that I have peremptorily refused to consider the matter. He feels that it would be a blow to the organization to injure me and so he has taken steps in that direction. He has taken the notes made by his daughter on my lectures at Vassar - a school-girl's notes - and on the basis of them has written to Mr. R. (This is confidential), showing my rationalistic tendencies, etc., and so on. This was in some respects an unfortunate thing, and still it will have little or no weight unless reinforced from outside quarters. The fact is, I am entirely straight on all these matters, - not holding certainly the ultra-rigid views of Dr. Strong, but views which accord well with those of the average intelligent Baptist minister of today. I have said nothing at Vassar which was not endorsed by Taylor. This is the situation. Be kind enough to keep this last point to yourself and let me urge upon you the necessity of seeing him (Mr. R.) at an early date and showing him the urgency of the matter. I am sure that he would like to see you for he has indicated as much indirectly. Will you not make it a point, therefore, to visit him at as early a date as possible and encourage him in what is being done. You will find him a little less ready now than before, but I think if proper measures are taken everything will come out right."

Dr. Harper to Dr. Morehouse:

"I received word from you through Buttrick at a late date, too late to permit me to change my plans. I have thought several times of visiting you. I had an interview with Mr. R. yesterday; the facts stand about as follows: he has not made any progress these three weeks because of (1) sickness in his family; (2) the great number of petitions which have come to him from various sources, - from Montreal, Richmond, etc.; (3) extra business cases; (4) the volunteer opinions of a great many busy-bodies who are anxious to say a word for or against the proposed plan, and I would infer that it has been mostly against."

"Dr. Strong is using every possible effort to break up the thing. The last move is a very strange one. He supposes, as I understand many do, that if the organization is made I am to be President. He does not know that I have peremptorily refused to consider the matter. He feels that it would be a blow to the organization to injure me and so he has taken steps in that direction. He has taken the notes made by his daughter on my lectures at Vassar - a school-girl's notes - and on the basis of them has written to Mr. R. (This is confidential), showing my rationalistic tendencies, etc., and so on. This was in some respects an unfortunate thing, and still it will have little or no weight unless reinforced from outside quarters. The fact is, I am entirely straight on all these matters, not holding certainly the ultra-right views of Dr. Strong, but views which accord well with those of the average intelligent Baptist minister of today. I have said nothing at Vassar which was not endorsed by Taylor. This is the situation. He kind enough to keep this fact point to yourself and let me urge upon you the necessity of seeing him (Dr. R.) at an early date and showing him the urgency of the matter. I am sure that he would like to see you for he has indicated as much indirectly. Will you not make it a point, therefore, to visit him at an early date as possible and encourage him in what is being done. You will find him a little less ready now than before, but I think if proper measures are taken everything will come out right."

✓

December 28, 1888.

Dr. Harper to Dr. Goodspeed:

"I am ready to report progress. The contents of this letter must be regarded as confidential and to be talked of only with Dr. Smith and Dr. Northrup. Please keep this point distinctly in mind. You will see the occasion for the restriction before you finish. Two weeks ago I wrote Mr. R. thanking him for some money which he sent me for the Institute of Hebrew and indicated that I should be pleased to see him on the following Sunday when I should be in New York. He did not answer my letter and I felt quite sure that something had happened. I determined yesterday, being in New York, to sift the matter. I went to his office and found him; he was very glad to see me and gave me one hour and a half, - all that I could have asked and all that I needed. Naturally enough my first question was, "What progress in reference to the Chicago matter?" His words were briefly as follows: "I have made little progress in reference to the Chicago affair; my wife has been sick and I have been very anxious about her; my time has been taken up with the consideration of petitions which have come from every source, - I have never known them to be so frequent; Montreal has come down upon me and Richmond with a great re-inforcement has come to me. From every source the demands are growing more and more, greater and greater. Besides, you cannot imagine how many people have felt called upon to volunteer their opinions in reference to the Chicago matter. You would be amazed to know the peculiar statements of many who have called to see me; I keep my ears open and am hearing everything. The character of the material which comes to my knowledge is quite varied and is not all favorable. Young Strong who is stopping with me now thinks that nothing but a college is needed at Chicago. I find a good many who think thus, but I am so tired that I have not really strength to consider this matter. I did not ask you to come and see me Sunday because I spent the day in bed; Christmas, too, I spent in bed, - I was so tired. I have had some unusually worrying business matters within the last three weeks; still the thing is on my mind and I want to hear more about it. I want you to come to see me every time you come to the city and if anything occurs let me hear from you," etc. etc. This was in general the tenor of his talk. You will see exactly how the matter stands. During the whole interview I thought that there was something special on his mind which he did not seem ready to tell me, but finally the thing came out; and it is this part of the letter about which the greatest care must be taken. On Wednesday Mr. R. received a letter from Dr. Strong of a general character, - a sort of family Christmas letter; in it he took occasion in the most peculiar way to raise the question of my teaching at Vassar. Dr. Strong has examined the notes of his daughter taken from my "studies" and has concluded that I am a worse rationalist even than Kuenen or Wellhausen, and he took great pains to lay this matter before Mr. R. His purpose was, of course, to injure me, feeling sure that in injuring me he would

December 28, 1888.

Dr. Harper to Dr. Goodspeed:

"I am ready to report progress. The contents of this letter must be regarded as confidential and to be talked of only with Dr. Smith and Dr. Northrup. Please keep this point distinctly in mind. You will see the occasion for the restriction before you finish. Two weeks ago I wrote Mr. R. thanking him for some money which he sent me for the Institute of Hebrew and indicated that I should be pleased to see him on the following Sunday when I should be in New York. He did not answer my letter and I felt quite sure that something had happened. I determined yesterday, being in New York, to call on him. I went to his office and found him; he was very glad to see me and gave me one hour and a half, - all that I could have asked and all that I needed. Naturally enough my first question was, 'What progress in reference to the Chicago matter?' His words were briefly as follows: 'I have made little progress in reference to the Chicago affair; my wife has been sick and I have been very anxious about her; my time has been taken up with the consideration of petitions which have come from every source. - I have never known them to be so frequent; Montreal has come down upon me and Richmond with a great re-inforcement has come to me. From every source the demands are growing more and more, greater and greater. Besides, you cannot imagine how many people have felt called upon to volunteer their opinions in reference to the Chicago matter. You would be amazed to know the peculiar statements of many who have called to see me; I keep my ears open and am hearing everything. The character of the material which comes to my knowledge is quite varied and is not all favorable. Young Strong who is stopping with me now thinks that nothing but a college is needed at Chicago. I find a good many who think thus, but I am so tired that I have not really strength to consider this matter. I did not ask you to come and see me Sunday because I spent the day in bed; Christmas, too, I spent in bed. I was so tired. I have had some unusually worrying business matters within the last three weeks; still the thing is on my mind and I want to hear more about it. I want you to come to see me every time you come to the city and if anything occurs let me hear from you, etc. etc. This was in general the tenor of his talk. You will see exactly how the matter stands. During the whole interview I thought that there was something special on his mind which he did not seem ready to tell me, but finally the thing came out; and it is this part of the letter about which the greatest care must be taken. On Wednesday Mr. R. received a letter from Dr. Strong of a general character, - a sort of family Christmas letter; in it he took occasion in the most peculiar way to raise the question of my teaching at Vassar. Dr. Strong has examined the notes of his daughter taken from my 'Studies' and has concluded that I am a worse rationalist even than Kamen or Williamson, and he took great pains to lay this matter before Mr. R. His purpose was, of course, to injure me, feeling sure that in telling me he would

Dec. 28, 1888.

injure the chances of this university at Chicago, - else why should he write to Mr. Rockefeller concerning this matter? On returning from New York I found a letter myself from Dr. Strong in which he presents the whole subject and the grounds for his grievance; in which he indicates that as a trustee of Vassar College he shall enter an objection to my continuing work there.

Now the facts in the case are these: (1) I have delivered a course of lectures on Old Testament Prophecy; appreciating the fact that the early periods were attended with difficulties, my first lecture was on the Book of Joel where everything was clear and definite, and my second on the book of Amos; then Pres. Taylor and the professors came to me and asked me if I would not go back to the beginning and take up the Messianic portions of the Pentateuch. I did this, and in doing it I did the work in accordance with that fundamental principle of all work: that the knowledge of any particular subject increases from generation to generation. My argument was that in the time of Isaiah there was a clearer knowledge of God and the future than in the time of David; in the time of Malachi it was clearer than in the time of Isaiah; in the time of David it was clearer than in the time of the Pentateuch. My point was to try to show how the idea of the Messiah, beginning in an indefinite way, had grown. I did not take up at all the question of the Pentateuchal Criticism and made no reference to the matter. Because I have tried to find a historical situation for all the prophets he claims that I am ruling out of this the supernatural element. This is the whole subject. One of the points made is that of the old question of the testimony of Christ and the apostles; they said that Moses wrote distinctly of Christ, therefore the Pentateuch is specifically Mosaic and the predictions in it refer to Christ individually. My position is exactly the same as that I held while in Morgan Park and taught to the class in Morgan Park. I have not changed in any respect from my position then. I talked the matter all over with Prof. Stevens of Rochester Thursday in New York, and I had also talked with Dr. Strong in reference to it and I satisfied him that my position was essentially correct; that I had not wandered away. As I said to you before and as I have said in my class, I have never in my life been so confident and felt so strongly in reference to the supernatural element of the Old Testament as I do today. I never felt so settled in my views as to the peculiarly unique and supernatural character of the Old Testament religion as I do today. I am at perfect rest in reference to all these questions, for I have spent ten years in their study and the whole result has been to convince me of the utter groundlessness of the Wellhausen hypothesis.

I make these statements to you; they will be substantiated by George. I suppose that my views in reference to the Hexateuch criticism are in advance of what you would accept, but these views do not in any way interfere with the sentiments which I have just expressed. Now the question arises: what is the next thing to do. Of course, if on the basis of Dr. Strong's charges my connection with Vassar ceases, I shall be injured and the Chicago enterprise so far as my connection with it is concerned - is hurt. As matters stand today Mr. Rockefeller still has confidence in me and he is waiting simply to see whether the brethren will stand by me or whether - accepting Dr. Strong's charges -

injure the chances of this university at Chicago, - else why should he write to Mr. Rockefeller concerning this matter? On returning from New York I found a letter myself from Dr. Strong in which he presents the whole subject and the grounds for his grievance; in which he indicates that as a trustee of Vassar College he shall enter an objection to my continuing work there.

Now the facts in the case are these: (1) I have delivered a course of lectures on Old Testament Prophecy, appreciating the fact that the early periods were attended with difficulties, my first lecture was on the Book of Joel where everything was clear and definite, and my second on the book of Amos; then Pres. Taylor and the professors came to me and asked me if I would not go back to the beginning and take up the Messianic portions of the Pentateuch. I did this, and in doing it I did the work in accordance with that fundamental principle of all work: that the knowledge of any particular subject increases from generation to generation. My argument was that in the time of Isaiah there was a clearer knowledge of God and the future than in the time of David; in the time of Malachi it was clearer than in the time of Isaiah; in the time of David it was clearer than in the time of the Pentateuch. My point was to try to show how the idea of the Messiah, beginning in an indefinite way, had grown. I did not take up at all the question of the Pentateuchal Criticism and made no reference to the matter. Because I have tried to find a historical situation for all the prophets he claims that I am ruling out of this the supernatural element. This is the whole subject. One of the points made is that of the old question of the testimony of Christ and the apostles; they said that Moses wrote distinctly of Christ, therefore the Pentateuch is specifically Messianic and the predictions in it refer to Christ individually. My position is exactly the same as that I held while in Morgan Park and taught to the class in Morgan Park. I have not changed in any respect from my position then. I talked the matter all over with Prof. Stevens of Rochester Thursday in New York, and I had also talked with Dr. Strong in reference to it and I satisfied him that my position was essentially correct; that I had not wandered away. As I said to you before and as I have said in my class, I have never in my life been so confident and felt so strongly in reference to the supernatural element of the Old Testament as I do today. I never felt so settled in my views as to the peculiarly unique and supernatural character of the Old Testament religion as I do today. I am at perfect rest in reference to all these questions, for I have spent ten years in their study and the whole result has been to convince me of the utter groundlessness of the Wellhausen hypothesis.

I make these statements to you; they will be substantiated by George. I suppose that my views in reference to the Hexateuch criticism are in advance of what you would accept, but these views do not in any way interfere with the sentiment which I have just expressed. Now the question arises: what is the next thing to do. Of course, if on the basis of Dr. Strong's charges my connection with Vassar ceases, I shall be injured and the Chicago enterprise so far as my connection with it is concerned - is hurt. As matters stand today Mr. Rockefeller will have confidence in me and he is waiting simply to see whether the brethren will stand by me or whether - accepting Dr. Strong's charges -

Dec. 28, 1888

they will brand me as a heretic and throw me overboard. Should the latter be done, he will of course drop me and in dropping me, I suppose I may say truthfully, put aside in large measure his interest in the Chicago matter. I ought to add that I have made no statement in my lectures at Vassar to which Pres. Taylor has taken a single exception. In every case he has commended them strongly. That lecture with which Dr. Strong found the most fault was listened to by Dr. Robinson of Brown and on the basis of that he made me a proposition to deliver six or eight lectures before all the Brown students in connection with their chapel exercises Saturday mornings, - these lectures to be delivered next spring. You see that Taylor will be placed in an embarrassing position. It now remains for the brethren to settle the matter as they think best. If I am to be sacrificed without any just cause to Dr. Strong's desire to overthrow the Chicago University - very well. As you all know, I have acted in this university matter from the purest motives. I have never been able to persuade myself that it was my duty to leave New Haven. So far as my position here is concerned, the charge of rationalism which Dr. Strong makes, if it is published, will but strengthen me. The only question is whether is this is done I shall be in a position to help you in your Chicago work as I have done. I appreciate that I am placing you in an embarrassing position in asking you to decide the matter for yourself. I can only say that I see, as I have never before seen, the necessity of great caution in statement of views, and that I shall exercise this caution more carefully in the future than in the past, although I am not conscious of having said anything that ought in any way to compromise me. I have not yet replied to Dr. Strong's letter; I shall take a day or two to think the matter over."

Dec. 28, 1888

-3-

they will brand me as a heretic and throw me overboard. Should the latter be done, he will of course drop me and in dropping me, I suppose I may say truthfully, but aside in large measure his interest in the Chicago matter. I ought to add that I have made no statement in my lectures at Vassar to which Free Taylor has taken a single exception. In every case he has commended them strongly. That lecture with which Dr. Strong found the most fault was listened to by Dr. Robinson of Brown and on the basis of that he made me a proposition to deliver six or eight lectures before all the Brown students in connection with their chapel exercises Saturday morning, - these lectures to be delivered next spring. You see that Taylor will be placed in an embarrassing position. It now remains for the brethren to settle the matter as they think best. If I am to be sacrificed without any just cause to Dr. Strong's desire to overthrow the Chicago University - very well. As you all know, I have acted in this university matter from the purest motives. I have never been able to persuade myself that it was my duty to leave New Haven. So far as my position here is concerned, the charge of rationalism which Dr. Strong makes, if it is published, will but strengthen me. The only question is whether or not this is done I shall be in a position to help you in your Chicago work as I have done. I appreciate that I am placing you in an embarrassing position in asking you to decide the matter for yourself. I can only say that I see, as I have never before seen, the necessity of great caution in statement of views, and that I shall exercise this caution more carefully in the future than in the past, although I am not conscious of having said anything that ought in any way to compromise me. I have not yet replied to Dr. Strong's letter; I shall take a day or two to think the matter over."

✓
Dec. 29, 1888

Dr. Harper to Mr. Rockefeller:

"On reaching home I found the letter of Dr. Strong. I want to thank you for your kind words day before yesterday. I think I have reason to feel somewhat hurt by what Dr. Strong has done; and yet, I think he entirely misunderstood the situation. I shall write to him at considerable length. Meanwhile, I trust that you will not feel that I have done anything or said anything which might bring the cause of biblical education into disrepute. I will also send you a statement of the matter when I shall have prepared it.

"I take the liberty of forwarding a clipping which I have just received from the coming number of the "Standard" in reference to the University at Chicago. Will you do me the favor to read the same? I am sure that this is a good presentation of the matter. It does seem that the opinion was very united in reference to this question."

Dec. 27, 1888

Dr. Harper to Mr. Rockefeller:

"On reaching home I found the letter of Dr. Strong. I want to thank you for your kind words day before yesterday. I think I have reason to feel somewhat hurt by what Dr. Strong has done; and yet I think he entirely misunderstood the situation. I shall write to him at considerable length. Meanwhile, I trust that you will not feel that I have done anything or said anything which might bring the cause of Bible education into dispute. I will also send you a statement of the matter when I shall have prepared it.

"I take the liberty of forwarding a clipping which I have just received from the coming number of the 'Standard' in reference to the University at Chicago. Will you do me the favor to read the same? I am sure that this is a good presentation of the matter. It does seem that the opinion was very wisely in reference to this question."

Dr. Morehouse to Mr. Harper:

Dec. 31st, 1888.

"I received yours of the 28th on Saturday. I had written you a very strong letter urging you to consider the question of taking the presidency of the new university at Chicago on the ground that I believe Mr. Rockefeller's gift to that institution will hinge very largely upon the man who is to be at the head of it. I have had an impression that he regarded you as the man for the place. And feeling that the whole scheme might collapse unless you should accept that position I have been anxious that you should do so. I will not send you the letter, for your present attitude, in view of the attack which has been made upon you, is doubtless the best for you to assume. But I am becoming very apprehensive that unless a speedy decision is reached Mr. Rockefeller's plans for Chicago will end somewhat as the plans for the great university of New York ended. I know how he is being besieged at present from Richmond. I think it is too bad.

"I have not seen him. I do not think I shall ask to see him on this subject unless a crisis comes. While our relations are pleasant and nothing has ever occurred to alienate us in any way so far as I know, yet I am thoroughly convinced that I have been misrepresented to him by certain parties who have, unfortunately, got into very close relations with him. As your letter is confidential to me so mine must be confidential to you. I understand that Dr. Boyd, of Newark, only this week lunched with Mr. Rockefeller, and they have lunched together several times this Fall and Winter. Boyd may be regarded as Dr. Strong's lieutenant to do everything in his power here to thwart the university scheme at Chicago; at least this is my conviction. To this end I will be put in false light if that will help defeat the scheme. I believe there are some who would be glad to have the Chicago scheme defeated as much for the purpose of giving a setback to the Education Society as for any other purpose. There are some men whose names I will not further mention, whom I cannot trust at all, however plausible may be their manner in my presence.

"The latest move of Dr. Strong, to which you refer, astounds me. If he has begun to operate on this line of attack he will undoubtedly get his lieutenant to co-operate to the best of his ability. At the same time I do not believe it is going to seriously affect the enterprise inasmuch as you declare yourself out of the field as a candidate for the presidency.

"You will of course see the Standard of this week which I hope Mr. Rockefeller may also see. How much weight these opinions will have with him I do not know, but they can do no harm.

"I have heard nothing from Goodspeed, who seemed to be in very close relations with Mr. Rockefeller when he was here, and who thought he had a definite proposition which Mr. Rockefeller would accept with some modifications perhaps. If Mr. Rockefeller can write others

Dec. 31st, 1888.

Dr. Morehouse to Mr. Harper:

"I received yours of the 28th on Saturday. I had written you a very strong letter urging you to consider the question of taking the presidency of the new university at Chicago on the ground that I believe Mr. Rockefeller's gift to that institution will make very largely upon the man who is to be at the head of it. I have had an impression that he regarded you as the man for the place. And feeling that the whole scheme might collapse unless you should accept that position I have been anxious that you should do so. I will not send you the letter, for your present attitude, in view of the attack which has been made upon you, is doubtless the best for you to assume. But I am becoming very apprehensive that unless a speedy decision is reached Mr. Rockefeller's plans for Chicago will end somewhat as the plans for the great university of New York ended. I know how he is being besieged at present from Richmond. I think it is too bad.

"I have not seen him. I do not think I shall ask to see him on this subject unless a crisis comes. While our relations are pleasant and nothing has ever occurred to alienate us in any way as far as I know, yet I am thoroughly convinced that I have been misrepresented to him by certain parties who have, unfortunately, got into very close relations with him. As your letter is confidential to me so mine must be confidential to you. I understand that Dr. Boyd, of Newark, only this week lunched with Mr. Rockefeller, and they have lunched together several times this Fall and Winter. Boyd may be regarded as Dr. Strong's lieutenant to do everything in his power here to thwart the university scheme at Chicago; at least this is my conviction. To this end I will be put in false light if that will help defeat the scheme. I believe there are some who would be glad to have the Chicago scheme defeated as much for the purpose of giving a setback to the Education Society as for any other purpose. There are some men whose names I will not further mention, whom I cannot trust at all, however plausible may be their manner in my presence.

"The latest move of Dr. Strong, so which you refer, astounds me. If he has begun to operate on this line of attack he will undoubtedly get his lieutenant to co-operate to the best of his ability. At the same time I do not believe it is going to seriously affect the enterprise inasmuch as you declare yourself out of the field as a candidate for the presidency.

"You will of course see the Standard of this week which I hope Mr. Rockefeller may also see. How much weight these opinions will have with him I do not know, but they can do no harm.

"I have heard nothing from Goodspeed, who seemed to be in very close relations with Mr. Rockefeller when he was here, and who thought he had a definite proposition which Mr. Rockefeller would accept with some modifications perhaps. If Mr. Rockefeller can write others

#2:

Dec. 31, 1888.

from a distance to visit him on this matter he certainly can write me when he wishes any suggestions from me. I have time and again opened the way for such an invitation and he has replied in general terms that he hoped to see me soon. Beyond this, I do not think I ought to go at present.

"I think the thing for you to do is to hold on to Mr. Rockefeller with as close and kindly a grip as you can, for I believe more depends upon you than upon anybody else in this important matter".

Dec. 31, 1888.

18:

from a distance to visit him on this matter he certainly can write me when he wishes any suggestions from me. I have time and again opened the way for such an invitation and he has replied in general terms that he hoped to see me soon. Beyond this, I do not think I ought to go at present.

"I think the thing for you to do is to hold on to Mr. Foster-
teller with as close and kindly a grip as you can, for I believe
more depends upon you than upon anybody else in this important matter."

Dr. Goodspeed to Dr. Harper, December 3/ 1888.

"Your letter is at hand. I have been over to see Dr. Northrup, but he is in the city and as I am engaged this evening I will write a word on my own account now. I have no idea that Dr. Strong can harm you by *assailing* you on the points named. It is generally conceded that on those points there must be some latitude allowed and if you are attacked a strong party will *at once* rally to your defense. Moreover, the animus will be too evident and the weapon will prove a boomerang and return to wound him.

You know well that I have from the first had but one desire that you should take the headship of the University. I have said this to you and to all others with whom I have had any conference on the subject. This is still my most earnest wish and if I can find an opportunity I shall lay my views on the subject very strongly before Mr. R. That opportunity may be given me in a letter I expect to receive from him tomorrow or within two or three days, as he is likely to send us some money this week. If it is not, the matter is sufficiently an open one between us to permit me to address him on the whole subject, and with your permission I will do so and in my letter refer at length to my hopes in regard to your relation to the institution. If he is holding his mind open to information and views I certainly am at liberty to write him.

I have had a fear that we discouraged him by asking too much and planning too large a thing. Would it not be wise to refer the whole question of the scale of the institution to him and let him understand that we will adjust our wishes to his views.

Suppose we propose to him to give \$2,000,000. or \$1,000,000. to endow the undertaking and leave us to find the site, buildings, etc. It ~~would~~ be wrong to defeat the whole thing by insisting on too much. I very much want an institution - a University if possible - if that is beyond us, then a well endowed college. I want something being certain that if we have it the thing will grow.

We must not underrate the Strong influence."
.....
....."If they beat us out of the

Dr. Goodspeed to Dr. Harper, December 31, 1888.

"Your letter is at hand. I have been over to see Dr. Hering, but he is in the city and as I am engaged this evening I will write a word on my own account now. I have no idea that Dr. Strong can harm you by coming on the points named. It is generally conceded that on those points there must be some latitude allowed and if you are attacked a strong party will be rallied to your defense. Moreover, the animals will be too evident and the weapon will prove a boomerang and return to wound him.

You know well that I have from the first had but one desire that you should take the leadership of the University. I have said this to you and to all others with whom I have had any conference on the subject. This is still my most earnest wish and if I can find an opportunity I shall lay my views on the subject very strongly before Mr. R. That opportunity may be given me in a letter I expect to receive from him tomorrow or within two or three days, as he is likely to send me some money this week. If it is not, the matter is sufficiently an open one between us to permit me to address him on the whole subject, and with your permission I will do so and in my letter refer at length to my hopes in regard to your relation to the Institution. If he is holding his mind open to information and views I certainly am at liberty to write him.

I have had a fear that we discouraged him by asking too much and planning too large a thing. Would it not be wise to refer the whole question of the state of the Institution to him and let him understand that we will adjust our wishes to his views.

Suppose we propose to him to give \$2,000,000. or \$1,000,000. so much the undertaking and leave us to find the site, buildings, etc. It would be wrong to defeat the whole thing by insisting on too much. I very much want an Institution - a University if possible - if that is beyond us, then a well endowed college. I want something being certain that if we have it the thing will grow.

We must not undertake the strong influence.
..... "If they beat us out of the

"University and will give us a college, why I am willing to take a college. I do not believe it will injure our prospects with Mr. R. to let him understand that we do not insist on having the earth or nothing, but that we are reasonable and will take what he decides upon."

.....

"University and will give us a college, why I am willing
to take a college. I do not believe it will injure
our progress with Mr. R. to let him understand that
we do not insist on having the earth or nothing, but
that we are reasonable and will take what he decides
upon."

.....

✓

Dr. Goodspeed to Dr. Harper, December 3, 1888.

"I have submitted your letter to Drs. Northrup and Smith and they wish me to assure you in the strongest terms that you may depend on them to stand by you with absolute fidelity. They are perfectly loyal to you, and will not see you assailed without coming to your defense.

The more I think of it the more I am disposed to write to Mr. R. laying before him strongly the plan for the University as we have proposed it, asking him to name it, or permit us to call it Rockefeller University and asking him to name the President, saying that we have thought it likely his mind might turn to Strong or you, that we suppose Strong is so wedded to his own University scheme that he would consider nothing else, and that if he should lay the work on you it would give us the greatest satisfaction, that we believe in and admire and love you and consider you the leading teacher, the best organizer and administrator of educational work in the denomination, the educator who will attract and gather students as no other man in any denomination can, and that he could not please us better than to name you to lead the movement. I will ask him to name the Board.

I will then say that we are very anxious for an institution on the scale proposed, but that if, with all the demands on him he cannot see his way to help us to that, we earnestly hope he will consider the next best thing. I will tell him we want an institution and if what we have in mind is wholly impossible we will receive with gratitude what he decides he can help us to secure.

If you do not approve of my writing in this line at length, telegraph me the moment you receive this, and I will wait till I hear further from you."

Dr. Goodspeed to Dr. Harper, December 31, 1888.

"I have submitted your letter to Mrs. Northrup and Smith and they wish me to assure you in the strongest terms that you may depend on them to stand by you with absolute fidelity. They are perfectly loyal to you, and will not see you expelled without coming to your defense.

The more I think of it the more I am disposed to write to Mr. H. laying before him strongly the plan for the University as we have proposed it, asking him to name if or permit us to call it Rochester University and asking him to name the President, saying that we have thought it likely his mind might turn to Strong or you, that we suggest Strong is no wedded to his own University scheme that he would consider nothing else, and that if he should lay the work on you it would give us the greatest satisfaction, that we believe in and admire and love you and consider you the leading teacher, the best organizer and administrator of educational work in the denomination, the educator who will attract and gather students as no other man in any denomination can, and that he could not please us better than to name you to lead the movement. I will ask him to name the board.

I will then say that we are very anxious for an institution on the scale proposed, but that if, with all the demands on him he cannot see his way to help us to that, we earnestly hope he will consider the next best thing. I will tell him we want an institution and if what we have in mind is wholly impossible we will receive with gratitude what he decides he can help us to secure.

If you do not approve of my writing in this line at length, telegraph me the moment you receive this, and I will wait till I hear further from you."