

207<sup>x</sup>  
Im7

CORRESPONDENCE  
CONCERNING THE  
PRESBYTERIAN  
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Of the North-West,

BETWEEN

REV. WILLIS LORD, D. D.,  
Professor of Theology,

MR. JESSE L. WILLIAMS,  
Director,

TWO COMMITTEES OF THE DIRECTORY,  
And Others;

AND

M. CYRUS H. McCORMICK,  
Founder and Trustee,

REV. N. L. RICE, D. D.,  
Former Professor of Theology, and others.

LIBRARY OF THE  
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS  
AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

207  
Im7



I. H. S.



“IMPORTANT CORRESPONDENCE,”

CONCERNING THE

PRESBYTERIAN

# THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Of the North-West,

BETWEEN

REV. WILLIS LORD, D. D.,  
Professor of Theology,

JESSE L. WILLIAMS, Esq.,  
Director,

TWO COMMITTEES OF THE DIRECTORY,  
AND OTHERS,

AND

MR. CYRUS H. McCORMICK,  
Founder and Trustee,

REV. N. L. RICE, D. D.,  
Former Professor of Theology, and others.

---

NEW YORK:

A. C. ROGERS, STEAM, BOOK AND JOB PRINTER, 142 Fulton St.  
1869.

LIBRARY  
OF THE  
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

209  
Im 9

I.A.S.

"IMPORTANT CORRESPONDENCE,"  
 CONCERNING THE  
 PRESBYTERIAN  
 THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY  
 Of the North-West.

*From the North-Western Presbyterian, November 28, 1868.*

MESSRS. EDITORS:—Inclosed, I send you a copy of a letter from a Committee of the Board of Directors of the Theological Seminary of the North-West, notifying me of the election of Rev. Mr. Blackburn, to a Professorship in the Seminary, with an intimation that the fourth instalment of my endowment fund would be acceptable,—and my reply to the Committee.

k  
j  
i

11/15/4

I ask the favor of the publication of these letters in the *North Western Presbyterian*. I had hoped that it might not become necessary for me to appear before the public in connection with this matter. I preferred to remain quiet, thus letting the experiment undertaken be made by those who had by superior numbers and proffered means, wrested from its original friends the direction and management of the Seminary.

Howard Memorial Lib  
7E3  
9

At different times heretofore criticisms on my course, and misrepresentations of my position, have come to my knowledge, while I have remained silent, and still when called son by my friends have responded, as now shown. Having reached the point where, in my judgment, further silence would be improper, and a vindication of myself becomes a duty, I offer this correspondence to the public, that the facts in the case may be understood.

Truly yours,  
 CYRUS H. McCORMICK.

*Chicago, Nov. 17th, 1868.*

CHICAGO, Illinois,

October 16, 1868.

*Cyrus H. McCormick, Esq., New York City :*

DEAR SIR:—The undersigned, a committee appointed by the Board of Directors of the Theological Seminary of the North-West, for that purpose, have the pleasure to inform you that the General Assembly at its sessions in Albany in May last, appointed the Rev. William M. Blackburn to the Professorship of Biblical and Ecclesiastical History in the Seminary. He was inaugurated and entered upon its duties at the beginning of this term. He promises to be an able and efficient Professor. All the four Professorships in the Seminary are now filled.

This information is due, in view of the arrangement heretofore made, in regard to the last instalment of your noble and beneficent gift to endow the Seminary.

The Institution is now in a prosperous condition, and its fields of usefulness rapidly enlarging.

Uniting our prayers with yours, that the blessing of God may rest upon it, we have the honor to remain,

Yours, very fraternally,

R. G. THOMPSON, Kintyre, Ill.

C. A. SPRING.

---

CHICAGO, Nov. 17, 1868.

*Rev. R. G. Thompson and C. A. Spring, Sr., Esq., Committee :*

GENTLEMEN:—Your letter of October 16, 1868, was duly received. Circumstances have prevented me from answering it sooner; and, although very busily occupied since my arrival here from New York, on business, and as I have been approached on the same subject by the present collecting agent of the Seminary (Mr. Traux,) I will not longer delay an answer.

In view of statements which, as I have been informed, have been made to your Board of Directors, I had not supposed that such a notice to me would be considered necessary.

Learning, previous to the meeting of the General Assembly at St. Louis, in 1866, that, in a meeting of the Board of Directors of the Theological Seminary of the North-West, a proposition had been made to transfer Dr. Lord from the chair of History in this Seminary to the chair of Theology, I decided to attend the meeting of the Assembly for the purpose of satisfying myself of the course to be taken by that body, and if possible, of preventing the proposed transfer, by making the Assembly acquainted with the state of things existing at Chicago, as between Dr. Lord and myself and friends, bearing upon that question. I accordingly, when there, sought an interview with Mr. Jesse L. Williams, whom I knew personally, and who I was informed was the most active and leading member of the Assembly in connection with the action sought in relation to the affairs of the Seminary at Chicago. A large minority of the Board of Directors had protested against the transfer of Dr. Lord, at the previous meeting of the Board, on the ground that such transfer would be far from satisfactory to the friends of the Seminary who had contributed to its endowment, and sustained and carried forward the Institution successfully to that time, as well as to myself, no friendly intercourse having existed between Dr. Lord and me for some years. I informed Mr. Williams of this fact, explaining to him somewhat the character of the differences which had existed between Dr. Lord and myself and friends, who had co-operated with me in the establishment of the Seminary, adding that I hoped the General Assembly would not place Dr. Lord in that chair; that I felt that the interests of the Institution would not be thereby promoted; and, as that chair bore my name, and was the only recognition of the sort of my connection with the Seminary, I trusted that circumstance, as well as others, would be entitled to consideration in placing a professor in that chair.

I may here state that, among other things, on one occasion, in the meeting of the Board of Directors, Dr. Lord denounced the manner in which my donation had been made to the Assembly, saying that if the Assembly had understood its terms, it would not have been accepted. This denunciation referred to the application of \$25,000 to each professorship, a point which could not possibly have been misunderstood by the Assembly, and to which no objection was taken. It had some bearing upon his interest at the time in the distribution of the proceeds of the endowment fund.

On another occasion when Dr. Lord was a candidate for the pastorate of the North Church, at a meeting of the congregation for the consideration of that question, he made a gross attack upon me without cause, in my absence, as I was informed, when he stated that if he were to expose all that he knew in reference to some parties in that church, it would tear that church to pieces. This threat was heard by a large majority of the audience then present with astonishment and disapprobation, and his course led ultimately to the division of the North Church, and to a number of his friends going off and organizing themselves into a rival congregation.

I am induced to state these matters, in order that the existing relations between Dr. Lord and myself may be the better understood, supposing, as I have, that there are few men who would be willing to occupy the chair in question as he has done, under such circumstances.

I further stated to Mr. Williams that Henry Day, Esq., one of Dr. Rice's elders, from his church in New York, felt authorized to nominate him in the Assembly for that chair, to which he had been elected at Indianapolis, when the Seminary was first constituted, and which he had resigned on receiving a call to the Fifth Avenue church in New York, (his health not being equal to his labor of teaching, preaching and editing the *Expositor*,) and that I hoped the Assembly would be disposed to restore him to that chair, as I supposed no more suitable and advantageous selection could be made for it; and more especially as Mr.

Day was prepared, in the event of his election, to give a pledge for a large addition to the endowment fund for that chair, from his congregation.

Mr. Williams replied that, in his opinion, the Assembly would not be disposed to elect Dr. Rice to that chair, and that it was not decided to transfer Dr. Lord to it. He said that Dr. McMaster was spoken of in the Assembly for the chair, and asked whether he would be more acceptable than Dr. Lord. I replied that I thought Dr. McMaster would be more acceptable, in part for the reasons stated; but that Dr. McMaster had been nominated in opposition to Dr. Rice at Indianapolis, when Dr. Rice was elected over him on the ground, I believe, that Dr. Rice better represented the views of those undertaking the support of the Seminary, in that they were opposed to agitating the church by the introduction of political questions;—that I supposed Dr. McMaster to be a consistent, able and honest man, but still differing, as before stated, from the views of those sustaining the Seminary, and who had so well, under Providence, brought it to its then prosperous and promising condition.

In this connection, I urged, to some extent, the propriety of the election of Dr. Rice, but Mr. Williams, conceding all that was claimed for what had been done up to that time by “our side,” as he said, and remarking that full credit was due to us for all that had been done, still insisted that they, not having co-operated with us before, considered it due to them that they should have an opportunity to come forward and do their part, our part having been so well done. They considered, he said, that there was as much remaining to be done to complete the work of the Seminary as had already been done by us; and that, to do so, they felt they “*should have the Chair of Theology, and a good working majority in the Board of Directors.*”

I then remarked to him that if they persisted in carrying out their plans as proposed, and in thus setting us aside in disregard of our wishes, and *preventing us from continuing our work*, especially when we had always been desirous that they should co-operate with us in support of the seminary, they would of course not expect me to pay over the



remaining fourth instalment of the endowment, then unpaid. To which he replied that there would be no difficulty upon that point, as they had on their side men of wealth and ample means, by whose contributions they proposed to endow the Chair of Theology for Dr. McMaster, if elected, with the sum of \$50,000, and that Dr. McMaster would not accept the chair otherwise than with the understanding that it would be endowed by his friends. Mr. Williams said he would communicate my suggestions to the Committee on Seminaries, but that he had little expectation they would be adopted by the Assembly. And he afterwards informed me that no change could be made, and that Dr. McMaster would receive the nomination.

This is the substance of the conversation between Mr. Williams and myself, and, as near as I can give it, the language that was used; and after the election of Dr. McMaster, I prepared a statement of the conference between Mr. Williams and myself, together with the action of the Assembly on the subject, for publication, but, with the advice of friends, finally concluded to make no publication of the matter.

Feeling, as stated, that no further call would be made on me for this (fourth) instalment of my endowment (\$25,000), I soon after donated to the Union Theological Seminary of Virginia, for the endowment of one of its Professorships, \$30,000, not desiring to withdraw for my personal use any portion of what I had donated for the benefit of the church.

It appears, however, that certain of the Faculty and Directory of the Seminary have been in ignorance of the foregoing facts, or are disposed to look no higher than the *law* in the case, expressing the opinion that I am "bound to pay this instalment." Inquiries have also been made of the Trustees upon this point. But, in view of what has been said, I now submit whether this proscription of the Directors, as well as of myself and friends, wholly upon political grounds, does not *justly* work a forfeiture of the whole endowment fund—instead of my being subjected to a call from you, under the circumstances, for further funds.

When my endowment was accepted by the General As-

sembly, it is well known that a large majority of the *Old School* Presbyterian church were opposed, as I have before said, to the agitation in the church of political questions. My own humble views on that subject were known to agree with those opposed to such agitation, as represented by Dr. Rice. The General Assembly—as I believe is universally the case when not inconsistent with duty—in accepting such donation, elected Professors and Directors to carry forward the Institution, agreeing essentially in these views. At that time Dr. Lord was understood to be in perfect accord with them. I have always accorded to others the same liberty of opinion claimed for myself, and have had nothing whatever to say in the selection of Directors or agents of the Seminary, at any time, not even knowing the men, and I challenge the production of testimony to show proscription in any case while the Seminary was in the hands of its founders. The General Assembly acted *then* upon the principle that justice and equity, to say nothing of Christian courtesy, require that due regard should be had to the wishes and sentiments of members of the church who have placed in her hands the means of founding and sustaining important institutions in her gift. The correctness of this principal was fully recognized by Dr. McMaster at the time of his election, his conduct appearing in marked contrast with that of the present incumbent, for, while Dr. Lord advocated before the Seminary committees of the Assemblies of 1866 and 1867 his transfer to the chair of theology, Dr. McMaster had the manliness to refuse it unless endowed by his friends!

And as my *political* opinions were thought of sufficient consequence to be referred to in an address by the Moderator (Dr. Stanton) of the Assembly at St. Louis, though not quite accurately, I may add that they have always been the same as when the endowment fund offered by me was accepted by the General Assembly; and as they were at that time Democratic, they have at no time since been more than Democratic, while throughout the troubles of parties during the war, they were uniformly for the union, as was well known during the political canvas in '64, when I was

the candidate for the Democratic party for Congress in this district. And as there was no reason for proscription on political grounds when my donation was accepted, there can have been no good reason for proscription on that ground at any time since.

After the death of Mr. McMaster, and the failure to raise the sum anticipated for the endowment of that chair, Dr. Lord was transferred to it at the meeting of the next Assembly, at Cincinnati, leaving the chair of Biblical and Ecclesiastical history unoccupied during the past year.

Prior to the meeting of the General Assembly at Albany, residing in New York, I was written to by friends in Chicago, inquiring whether, in the event of being able at the meeting of that Assembly to elect a Professor to the chair acceptable to the old friends of the Seminary, and to restore the Directors displaced to their former positions upon the Board, and to procure some satisfactory guarantees against similar unjust interferences in the future, I would be disposed to return to my original position in connection with the Seminary, and, of course, to pay over the fourth instalment of the endowment fund. To which I replied, if a satisfactory arrangement of that sort could be effected, I would not only willingly, but cheerfully do so; that Dr. Rice was, as I was informed, in the enjoyment of better health than for some time previous, and I had no doubt could be induced to accept the professorship of theology if re-elected to it. He was accordingly nominated for the vacant chair in the Assembly at Albany, when Dr. Thomas was nominated in opposition to him. And when it was thought at a later day by some of his friends that he (Dr. Rice) would not be elected, they consented to withdraw his name and substitute for it that of Dr. Skinner, a man of acknowledged ability and learning. But Rev. Mr. Blackburn was elected in opposition to him.

Your letter, in effect, calling upon me for the payment of the fourth instalment of my endowment fund has seemed to me to make it proper to refer, as I have done, to so much of the past history of these transactions.

The Board of Directors were long since apprized by the

Trustees of the Seminary of what occurred at St. Louis, as above related—of the statement made to me by Mr. Williams, that I would be exonerated from the payment of this instalment, and of my unwillingness to pay it, accordingly. And I understand that Mr. Williams has himself confirmed the foregoing statement at one of the meetings of the Directors. It only remains for me to add that, as the matters in controversy remain unchanged, I cannot understand, as intimated above, why this application is made to me.

I need not say that my interest in the success of so great an enterprise, labored for with so much interest and anxiety, remains unabated. And if, as stated to me by Mr. Truax, the Seminary is now embarrassed for funds, and with no reasonable prospect of obtaining them—some of the few subscribers to the McMaster endowment refusing to pay because of the failure to raise the \$50,000 proposed—in this condition of things I would reaffirm my willingness to co-operate in the support of the Seminary, and my desire to assist in placing it on a solid financial basis, if the General Assembly will provide for such a corps of Professors as the original one, and the corresponding “working majority” of Directors demanded and taken from us “by the other side,” and with proper assurances of noninterference in the future. In this case I should be disposed not only to pay the \$25,000, but to add besides \$5,000 to the endowment of each Professorship—considered by the Board also important.

Finally, I submit whether—this issue having been made by “the new friends of the Seminary”—first, in their refusal to co-operate with its old friends and founders; and, second, in their turning them out and taking possession themselves—it is not *just* that they meet them in a spirit of Christian equality and fairness, and either accept this proposition or refund (without interest) the \$75,000 paid by me.

Respectfully yours, &c.,

CYRUS H. McCORMICK.

*Editorial from the Presbyter,*

CINCINNATI, *December 2, 1868.*

MR. M'CORMICK'S LETTER.

The letter of Mr. Cyrus M'Cormick, on our first page, will attract earnest attention. Several years ago the Board of Directors agreed that as there were but three professors in the institution, Mr. M'Cormick might be released from paying interest on the \$25,000 of his endowment until a fourth professor was elected. October 16, 1868, the Committee of the Directors, appointed for the purpose, notified Mr. M'Cormick of the election of Mr. Blackburn to the vacant chair, in order that Mr. M'Cormick might pay his last \$25,000, or the interest on it, for the support of the new incumbent. The letter we publish to-day is Mr. M'Cormick's reply. He claims that he had an understanding with Jesse L. Williams, when Dr. McMaster was elected at St. Louis in 1866, that no more was to be expected of him. We heard Mr. Williams' statement before the Board in regard to his conversation with Mr. M'Cormick at St. Louis, and if we understood Mr. W., then Mr. M'C. misunderstood him. Mr. M'Cormick claims that there was an understanding that his and Dr. Rice's views were opposed to political action in the church when his donation was accepted; that he has not changed; that Dr. Lord was understood to be "in perfect accord with them," and regard should be paid to the wishes of donors in placing persons on foundations made by them. He is willing to pay the unpaid part of his pledge and add twenty thousand dollars, if he can have such men as were elected at Indianapolis in 1858, Dr. Lord excepted. Mr M'Cormick's letter will produce a sensation. We have nothing to say.

*From North Western Presbyterian,*

*December, 19, 1868.*

MESSRS. EDITORS: The letter of Cyrus H. McCormick, Esq., published in your issue of the 28th Nov., calls for correction in some particulars.

Let me say, first, that Mr. M. gives me far more credit than is due for influence in the affairs of the seminary, and attaches quite too much importance to our brief interview during the session of the General Assembly of 1866. Soon after being informed by one of his friends that he desired to see me, I met him in the public hall of the Southern Hotel, where both of us lodged, not in any sense as a negotiator, or representative of the Directors, nor of any special policy, but in the spirit, I trust, of that Christian courtesy due to a gentleman who had contributed so liberally to the endowment of the seminary. That any remarks made by either of us at that interview should have been afterwards written down, and considered of so grave import as to enter into the question of payment or non-payment of an obligation entered into for the endowment, surprises me. It must be manifest that I was clothed with no authority to speak for the Assembly, the Directors, or Trustees, and I certainly assumed none.

My recollection differs from his in several particulars:

1st. Mr. McCormick, as he states, remarked, in view of an apprehended result of the Assembly's deliberations, that "they would not, of course, expect me to pay any more." To this remark I am very confident I made no response whatever. What reply could I have made? Assent to his conclusion, by a Director in an institution yet greatly needing his contribution for the support of the professors, would have been indiscreet, to use the mildest term. Dissent, leading certainly to an argument, might have been considered under the circumstances, uncivil, as it certainly would

have been unavailing at that particular juncture. In relating this remark of Mr. M. to the friends of the seminary, the next day, I distinctly stated the fact that I made no response.

2nd In another part of his letter he speaks of "the statement made to me by Mr. Williams that I would be exonerated from the payment of this installment." Here his recollection is certainly at fault. No such statement was made by me. He must have confounded my conversation with that of some other person whose views on the seminary question corresponded with his own. Having myself no authority to release any party from any moneyed obligation to the seminary, and desiring rather to increase than diminish its funds, it is not supposable that I would inform any donor that he would be released or exonerated from payment.

3rd. Mr. McCormick seems also to have been informed that I confirmed his statement, as above quoted, at one of the meetings of Directors. His informant misapprehended me in this case also. At a meeting of the Directors, not long after the vacant chair was filled by the election of Dr. MacMaster, a member proposed that a letter be written to Mr. McCormick, informing him of the filling of the chair, with a view, of course, to the payment of the endowment. To this I made some objection, on the ground that it would be better to defer this call on Mr. M. until our new agent had made further progress in the collection of funds from others, or words of this purport. From this remark the inference may have been drawn by some one that I considered Mr. M. would be released from the payment of the endowment. I certainly did not intend to be so understood. On another occasion in the Board, I think when the Trustees' Report of April 1st, 1867, was read, I recollect having expressed the belief that Mr. M. would, in his own time, pay the endowment.

4th. Mr. McCormick seems to have understood me as responding to his remark that "of course they will not expect me to pay any more," by saying, "there would be no difficulty on that point, as they had on their side men of wealth and ample means, by whose contributions they proposed to endow the chair of Dr. MacMaster, if elected, with the sum

of \$50,000." Although this is not very important, yet I certainly believe that I gave no such flattering view, for I expected the agent would find very great difficulty amid the divided sentiment of that period in raising the fifty thousand dollars proposed, to say nothing of the funds needed for securing buildings. There was also misapprehension as to the endowment of \$50,000 for Dr. MacMaster's chair. That sum had been named as an immediate effort in view, but twenty thousand dollars of it was, in my own mind, to supplement the other chairs. Dr. MacMaster's frugal habits required no such support as indicated. While his friends supposed he would not accept without bringing with him, as *their* contribution, the basis of his own support, they presumed also that he would not expect more than his co-professors. He was at the time 600 miles distant, probably knowing nothing of the movement for his restoration to the chair of Theology, which for ten years he had occupied in the same Seminary when under the control of the western synods.

One purpose in my remarks was, if possible, to reconcile Mr. McCormick to the choice about to be made by the Assembly, I assured him that when he came to know Dr. McMaster he would admire him as a model Christian gentleman, of many noble characteristics as a man, and an instructor in Theology of very eminent attainments.

The delay in making this statement has been caused by absence from home in the discharge of public duties.

J. L. WILLIAMS.

*Fort Wayne, Dec. 9, 1868.*



*Editorial from the Presbyter.*

CINCINNATI, Dec. 23, 1868.

## MR. McCORMICK AND MR. WILLIAMS.

We ask attention to the letter of Jesse L. Williams, in another column, in response to Mr. McCormick's letter, which we published in the PRESBYTER of December 2:

Mr. McCormick represents himself as saying at St. Louis to Mr. Williams, in view of the apprehended result of the action of the Assembly in electing Dr. McMaster: "They would not, of course, expect me (Mr. McCormick) to pay any more," and Mr. Williams *quotes this language* without taking any exception to it. We venture to remind Mr. Williams of what took place when at St. Louis he reported his conversation with Mr. McCormick to us and several other brethren. Mr. Williams reported Mr. McCormick not as saying, "They will not expect me to pay any more," but as saying, "They will not expect any more of me." We at once said, "He may mean by this remark that we must not expect any more than his bond, or that we must not expect of him any more than he has paid." Mr. Williams replied, "Yes; I made no response, however, to the remark." We are confident, moreover, that when *Mr. Williams referred on two occasions*, in meetings of the Directors, to his conversation with Mr. McCormick, he gave the same report. The matter came up on one occasion in the Board of Directors in April, 1867, when considering the report of the Trustees to the Directors, in which is the following clause: "Mr. McCormick, as we are credibly informed, intends to contest the demand for any further payment from him on his endowment fund, in view of the action and treatment he received at St. Louis during the session of the General Assembly." After hearing Mr. Williams the Directors say in their report to the Assembly: "Nor

can the Board believe that Mr. McCormick intends, as suggested in the report of the Trustees, to contest the demand for any further payment from him on his endowment fund, in view of the action and treatment he received at St. Louis during the session of the Assembly last year." If the Directors had understood that Mr. McCormick meant by his remark to Mr. Williams that he must not be expected "to pay any more," they would not have adopted the language above employed in their report to the General Assembly. They regarded his language as susceptible of the interpretation—"Expect no more of me than my bond"—and they felt bound to so understand him until they heard directly and definitely from him; inasmuch as the payment of his last instalment was deferred, by arrangement with himself, until the fourth chair was filled.

---

*From the Cincinnati Presbyter, Jan. 9th, 1869.*

DR. LORD TO MR. McCORMICK.

CHICAGO, *December 19, 1868.*

*Mr. Cyrus H. McCormick:*

SIR:—You have just given to the public a letter concerning your obligations to the Theological Seminary of the North-West. It consists so largely of views and statements which relate to me personally, and which at the same time so deeply effect, not only individual honor, but also public truth and virtue, that I feel constrained to set forth such counter views and statements as herein follow:

In the month of May, 1859, you appeared in the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, then holding its annual sessions in the city of Indianapolis, Ind. In that presence, and upon your own motion, you offered to donate to the Presbyterian Theological Seminary of the North-west the sum of one hundred thousand dollars, on these conditions, viz.:

That the General Assembly (1) accept and take charge of said Seminary; (2) locate in the city of Chicago, or within one and a half miles of its limits; and (3) hold your donation as a perpetual endowment to be used exclusively for the support of four professorships.

These were the sole conditions. In your bond, executed subsequently to this offer, it is further, and properly, provided, that if at any time the Seminary shall cease, or shall cease to be an institution for the training of students for the Christian ministry, this endowment of one hundred thousand dollars shall revert to you or your heirs.

This offer was felt to be generous. It seemed to indicate not only large means, but also large ideas. Men were conscious of an impulse to place you among public benefactors. The General Assembly accepted the offer; expressed to you its cordial thanks, and took immediate measures to carry your propositions into effect. What followed, in the progress of the matter, and so far as is important to my present purpose, I will present in the following extracts from a paper which bears your name and seal, viz.:

“Whereas, the said General Assembly did accept the said offer of the said Cyrus H. McCormick, and in consideration thereof, and other considerations thereunto moving, did provide for the location of the said seminary within the said limits and city of Chicago; and

“Whereas the said Board of Directors of said seminary did locate said seminary as aforesaid, in consideration of said donation by said McCormick, and accept the same as an endowment fund for the professorships established in said seminary by the said General Assembly.

“Now, therefore, in consideration of the acceptance and taking charge of said Theological Seminary, by the said General Assembly and the location of the same by the said General Assembly and Board of Directors of said seminary, at the place aforesaid; and

“In further consideration of the acceptance by the General Assembly of the Old School Presbyterian Church of the United States of America, of said sum of one hundred

thousand dollars, as an endowment fund exclusively of the professorships in said seminary, as aforesaid :

“I, the said Cyrus H. McCormick, of the city of Chicago, county of Cook, and state of Illinois, do hereby donate the same accordingly; and am therefore held and firmly bound unto the trustees of the said Presbyterian Theological Seminary of the North-west and their successors for the same as aforesaid; and by these presents promise, agree and bind myself, my heirs, executors, administrators and assigns, to pay to the said trustees and their successors in office, for said seminary, as aforesaid, the sum of one hundred thousand dollars, in four equal annual instalments, the first of which is payable on the 14th day of September, 1860; and on the 14th day of September annually thereafter, with the privilege of paying said instalments or either of them, before said days herein named, at the option of said McCormick, his heirs, executors, administrators or assigns, with interest, payable annually at the rate of six per cent. per annum on each instalment.”

All this was done in the year 1859. On its part the General Assembly, from that day to this, has performed its engagements in letter and spirit. On your part there has been, for some reason, a failure. At the end of nine years your bond is not paid; and not only so, but now, at length, through the public press, and over your own signature, you propose to repudiate so much of your obligation as remains unfulfilled.

So grave an act as respects law and morals, ought to have clear and invincible reasons. They should, at least, be such as will palliate, if they cannot justify it. What then must be the surprise of all thoughtful and candid men when they read your letter. You plead, and you can plead, no violation or even neglect of compact on the part of the General Assembly. That venerable body has done its whole duty. Your only avowed reasons for dishonoring your bond are your personal feelings toward myself, and an alleged private conversation with the Hon. J. L. Williams; neither of which things you must know can effect in the slightest degree your legal or your moral responsibility.

“Mr. Williams” and “Dr. Lord” were not among your conditions. They are not in your bond.

It is not my office to consider the legal quality and force of your act. This duty belongs to the responsible guardians of the seminary. You have seen fit, however, in devising pretexts for such a crime, to arraign me before the public as if I were the criminal. The plain tenor of your letter is, that had I but thought, felt, spoken and acted as you supposed I would, or as you willed I should, the bond would have been paid. And you go into a careful detail of my offenses against you as a justification of your course. I thus am compelled to self-vindication. After years of patient and silent endurance of opposition and wrong from you and your sympathisers, and though it is painful to me beyond expression to be dragged into the public arena, I am compelled to assert and defend the truth and right.

The same General Assembly, sir, which accepted your offered endowment, appointed me to one of the four professorships. This was done without my knowledge. The faintest thought of such a thing was never in my mind, until in a daily paper I read the telegram announcing my election. You will perceive, therefore, that the place sought me, not I the place. You will perceive, too, that whatever may be true as to others, on my part, there were no pledges. Neither the General Assembly nor you had a particle of right to assume that my views and conduct would be different from what they have been.

Urged by the special friends of the Seminary, and notwithstanding it subjected me to much pecuniary sacrifice, I, at length, accepted the appointment. My reception in Chicago was kind and cordial, and for many months my presence and labors merited certainly no higher appreciation than they had. From the first, however, I was conscious, in my immediate surroundings, of an atmosphere different from that to which I had been accustomed. It seemed to be, not so much that of Lake Michigan as of Chesapeake Bay; of the prosperous and free North, as of the South. There were an air, color, tone and general drift of things which made slowly but at length quite definitely

this impression, that the professors were expected to be the exponents of Southern ideas, and defenders, if necessary, of Southern institutions. I may note it too, as a fact, that simultaneously with this, and equally definite, was another impression, to wit, that if the former should prove really true, then, in the inevitable course of events, some one must be disappointed. The course of events was inevitable, and I come now to what you, in your arraignment of me before the public, leave undone; *i. e.*, to state what were my real offenses.

1. Some few months before the war began, but when the danger of it was becoming imminent, you proposed to the professors to issue, in connection with yourself, a sort of manifesto or address to the South. The object was to save the Union and slavery. To give it more weight, you wished it to go forth over our signatures. One of the professors was requested to prepare it and submit it for our consideration. It was an able paper, but conceived and written from the Southern stand-point. In the existing conflict, it assumed that slavery was all right, and freedom all wrong. I declined to sign it. Materially modified and toned down, it was published in the *Expositor*, without a name. This was my first conscious offense. I did not intend to offend you; but neither did I intend to compromise my Christianity or my manhood.

2. The Chair of Theology in the Seminary, and the Pulpit of the North Church, were about to become vacant. Dr. Rice had decided to accept a call to New York. You came to me and said, that in your view the Chair and the Pulpit ought to be filled, as they had been, by one and the same man, and you proposed the Rev. Dr. Moore, of Richmond, Va. "If the people wish such union of the two offices," I answered, "let it be so. As for Dr. Moore, he is a ripe scholar and an admirable preacher. So far as these qualities are concerned, we could not, perhaps, have a better man. But in the present state of things it would be most unwise to even try to get him. He has identified himself with the disunionists, and uttered expressions of contempt for the people of the North, at which they are indignant. Dr.

Gurley will meet our want equally well, without subjecting us to such peril." You replied slightly to this suggestion, and insisted on Dr. Moore. With entire respect, but with perfect frankness, I said: "So strong are my convictions that an attempt to get Dr. Moore would be ruinous, I shall feel it my duty to oppose it in every proper way." This was my second conscious offense. I did not intend to offend you, but neither did I intend such damage should come, with my consent, upon the Seminary and the Church.

3 A few weeks only rolled on, and the war was indeed upon us. Fort Sumter had fallen. The President had issued his first call for seventy-five thousand men. The streets of Baltimore were wet with the blood of our brave soldiers. Every loyal heart in the land was on fire. I suggested to the temporary editor of your *Expositor* the preparation of an article proper to the exigency. He desired me to write it. It was on the duty of Christian citizens in such a crisis. It simply said, in Christian words, that putting away all mere partisan animosities and strifes, they should rally as one man around our imperiled government. The editor cordially approved it, and it was to appear in the next issue as an editorial. It got safely through the types, it reached the condition of proof-sheet. At that point, you saw it and forbade its publication. This was my third conscious offense. I did not intend to offend you. I only intended to plead for our country in its struggle for life.

4. Another and brief interval brought the climax of my offenses. I was sent by my brethren to the General Assembly of 1861. The venerable Dr. Spring, of New York, offered in that body his now historic resolutions. They were alike patriotic and Christian. It is marvelous to think what excitement they produced, and how vehemently they were opposed by great and good men. I dared to speak for them, and vote for them. This was my fourth conscious offense. From that day to this you have seemed to feel that the gulf between you and myself was impassable. I did not intend to offend you; I only intended to do my duty as a man and a Christian on that great occasion. I give thanks to God who enabled me to do it.

These, then, are my offenses; my real offenses, according to my best knowledge and belief. You will see, and the public will see, how intimate is the connection between them and the spirit that pervades your letter. They all occurred before the time at which you begin your definite accusations. Let me now examine these. They have no sufficient ground in truth; and were they true they would avail nothing to your main purpose.

1 You first affirm that in a meeting of the Board of Directors, I "denounced the manner in which my (*i. e.*, your) donation had been made to the General Assembly, saying, that if the Assembly had understood its terms, it would not have been accepted." That meeting of the Board was in April, 1862. I do not wish to uncover all its history, unless I am compelled. But there began what at the time I felt to be practical repudiation. Dr. Rice had gone to New York. Dr. Scott had gone, we trust, to heaven. I had committed the above serious offenses. The General Assembly also had incurred your displeasure by its patriotic action. The purpose of making the Seminary an outpost or bulwark of slavery, if any one entertained it, had plainly become like a forlorn hope. Your first instalment only had been paid. The second had been due since the 14th of the preceding September. The third would mature in the September approaching. By the declinature of Dr. Krebs, and the death of Dr. Scott—both occurring in the interval of the Assembly—two of the Chairs in the Seminary had been nominally vacant through the term. Really they had been filled by the exhaustive labors of Dr. Halsey and myself. Because of these vacancies then existing, you intimated that the endowment was forfeited. This, however, was more than your most partial friends could admit. The matter was at length arranged by your obtaining a release from the payment of your third and fourth instalments, both principal and interest, until the vacancies should be filled. On that occasion you assumed the right, virtually, to control the endowment, just as you do in your recent letter. With reference especially to this assumption, I expressed it as my opinion that had the Assembly so under-



stood your meaning, it would not have accepted the endowment. I think so still. But I denounced no one. I simply and with courtesy gave an opinion. My then only colleague assured me of his concurrence in my view. But suppose, sir, I had done what you thus allege. What has this to do with your dishonored bond?

2. You charge me next with a "gross attack" upon you, without cause, and in your absence at a meeting of the North Church. If this were indeed so, I ought to be blamed. But it was not so. The meeting to which you refer was in September, 1861. It was held for the election of a pastor. At a previous meeting, and in accordance with your wishes, as was generally understood, the Rev. Dr. Gurley had been nominated; the very man whom I had suggested to you months before. By some too partial friend, my name also had been presented. It was without my knowledge, and to my very deep regret. I took occasion from it, however, to be present at the meeting you specify; and there not only peremptorily withdrew my name, but also, with whatever power I had, urged the parties in the church to unite upon Dr. Gurley. I knew that good man, and firmly believed that his coming to us would be a blessing. He was called, there and then, by a unanimous vote. Intelligent men present at the meeting told me this result was owing to my earnest efforts. And when Dr. Gurley was thus called, I wrote to him, urging his acceptance by every consideration that seemed to me proper. Instead of an attack upon you, according to my best recollection and my firm belief, I neither uttered your name, nor even had you in my thoughts, on that occasion. But suppose again, I had done what you thus allege, what has this to do with your dishonored bond?

3. You allege further that I was the main cause of a division of the church, which resulted in another organization. This division occurred after the interval of a pastorate, that of the Rev. J. B. Stewart, from the time last noted. You assign me a place in connection with it, which truth does not permit me to accept. All my conscious and intentional influence was uniformly and strongly the other way. There

are indeed some men who insist that our great and good government was the cause of the rebellion. Possibly this is your view. On such a principle of reasoning, no one can know for what he may be held responsible. But in no truer sense can this allegation apply to me. On the contrary, I prayed and labored for the unity of the people. And when the signs of division became imminent, I went to individuals and besought them, for the love of Christ, to forbear crimination and recrimination, and to study those things which would make for peace. I persisted to the last in my efforts to prevent a schism in the church I loved. When, however, those true Christian men and women had made their firm decision, despite my earnest counsels against it, I could not be blind to the weighty reasons which had moved them; nor could I make their judgment the measure of their rights. But suppose again, I had done what you thus allege, what has this to do with your dishonored bond?

4. You venture another charge. "Dr. Lord," you affirm, "advocated before the Seminary Committees of the Assemblies of 1866 and 1867 his transfer to the Chair of Theology." And you press this point, as showing my want of manly honor.

You, sir, were present at the Assembly of 1866. You, therefore, had personal knowledge that I was not present. At no time during its sessions was I nearer to it than Chicago is to St. Louis, nor do I know who the committee were, before whom you represent me as thus pleading.

Of the Assembly of 1867 I was a member. At the special request of its committee on Seminaries, I appeared before it, in company with many others, to answer such questions and make such statements as the committee thought necessary, to acquaint them with our affairs in the Northwest. And suppose that in their presence I had made the alleged plea? Having for five years and a half performed all the duties pertaining to the Chair of Theology, besides those in connection with my own, suppose I had said, it seemed to me just that I should bear its name, as well as do its work? What then? It is not commonly thought unmanly to reach right and honorable ends. Nor is such a

thing without precedent, in either Church or State. But I did not do so. I made no plea in advocacy of my transfer. The Committee, however, thought it manly and right to recommend it. The General Assembly, by a unanimous decision, thought it manly and right to make it. I thought it manly and right to accept it. But again: Suppose I had done what you thus allege? What has this to do with your dishonored bond?

These, then, are my offenses, and these your accusations. The church and the public will see that I have committed no sin against peace, truth, honor, right, or you, except only that which is common to all those who felt and acted with the church and the nation, as against slavery and the rebellion. My crimes are simply and only those of our General Assembly during the stupendous conflict of right with wrong. And if that venerable body can think it just, at your will, and because of my cordial agreement and cooperation with it, to make me a sacrifice, let the sacrifice be made. My consistency and honor will remain unstained.

But there are other matters in your letter which merit notice. You inform the public that having, for the reasons assigned, resolved to violate your plighted faith, and not feeling free to retain for private use the money thus sacredly devoted, you bestowed it on other institutions than that to which it legally and morally belonged; as if the spoiling of Peter could be sanctified by giving the gains of it to even the other apostles. The Institutions you selected for this benefaction were the Union Theological Seminary, and the College in Lexington, both in Virginia. The Faculty of the former were active participants in the war for slavery, and the President of the latter was the military Head of the rebellion. My offense you judged to be grievous, and not to be forgiven, because while faithfully performing all my sacred offices, I sympathized with our struggling country and with freedom; but one of the professors of the above seminary, who girded on his sword as an officer in the Confederate army, and the president of the college, who for years fiercely sought to destroy the nation, and both of whom to the extent of their power, sent sorrow and death through the

land, won your zealous admiration. Soon as the throes of the rebellion were sufficiently quieted to permit it, you sent your approval of their course in the form of money to their respective Institutions; money, too, as you yourself state, which had been solemnly and publicly donated to another. It is a signal proof of the inexorable impartiality with which you keep politics separate from religion.

There is also an error of principle and of fact pervading your letter, which calls for remark. Your assumption of the right to control our endowment is only another form of assuming that the endowment is still yours. Hence your repeated and emphatic imputations against my manliness and honor, because, though put in my office by the church, a part of my insufficient support comes from the endowment, *i. e.* as you choose to regard it, from your money. I repel the imputation and the assumption on which you make it. The unmanliness is elsewhere. The assumption is not true. My salary is paid me by the church, and from means which are its own. When one man bestows a gift upon another it is not, at least commonly, supposed that he still retains his ownership in it. And, certainly, among high-minded and honorable men it would not be tolerated that the donor should be constantly reminding the donee of the gift, and exacting his homage on peril of its revocation. When by your own deliberate act you publicly and solemnly donated that one hundred thousand dollars to the seminary, your ownership in it ceased. From that time it morally and legally rested elsewhere. Your right to it became extinct, except in the contingency that its conditions should be violated, which contingency has never occurred. Let a well-known precedent instruct us. A citizen of Jerusalem was thought to have made a certain donation to the Church. The sequel, however, showed that he had kept back a part. An apostolic solution and decision of the case established these points as permanent factors ever after in evangelic law and morals. In the first instance, it was wholly at the man's own option to make, or not to make the gift. In the second stage of the matter, though specific and important measures had been taken to consummate it, he was still at

perfect liberty to refrain or to go forward. But when in the third and final step he solemnly laid his money at the apostles' feet, the deed was done, and it was, without sin, irrevocable. The money was no longer his. It belonged to the Church, and, through the Church, to God.

There is another and more practical view of this particular. Many others besides you have made donations to the seminary, and for the purpose set forth in your bond, to wit: to aid and carry forward an institution for the training of young men for the Christian ministry. Many more, we trust, will make donations, and in large amounts. We need them now, and we shall need them in the future. The aggregate of those already made surpasses the amount we have as yet received from you; and indeed your whole endowment. Some have given valuable land. Some have given for the erection and furniture of buildings. Some have given to provide libraries. Some have given to endow scholarships. Some have given to meet current expenses and supplement the deficient endowment. A moderate estimate of these various gifts would reach at least one hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars. An additional amount, certainly equal to this, will be necessary to put the seminary on an adequate financial basis, and provide for those enlarged facilities of accommodation and instruction which the future will demand. Now, why should one alone of all these donors, past, present and to come, claim and be accorded the right of control? If the principle is valid and to be recognized in his case, why not also in theirs? Or if, while conceded to him, it is denied to them, would not the inevitable result be the severance of the seminary from the sympathy and benefactions of the church at large. On the contrary, if this right of control be conceded to all alike, what then must follow? Some might say: We are not pleased with this; give us back our land. Others might say: That does not meet our views; give us back our building. Others still might say: We take exception to something else; give us back our libraries, or our scholarships, or our notes for the endowment. Sir, a principle whose actual working:

would realize a Babel, cannot gain the suffrage of wise men, or belong to any true system of Bible ethics.

But, after all, you intimate that your avowed purpose can be changed. You are willing to remove your displeasure from the General Assembly, to take from off yourself the spot of repudiation, and to show the reality and strength of your interest in the Theological Seminary of the Northwest by giving an additional twenty thousand dollars, on two very definite and very remarkable conditions, viz. :

First—That the General Assembly shall eject such of the present professors as you desire, and put in their place men who will reflect your views; and,

Second—That the General Assembly shall give you “proper assurances of non-interference in the future.”

Here one cannot but pause. Certainly, whether this proposition proceeds from humility or audacity, it is astounding. The Church of God thus knows on what terms it may have your favor. You offer to buy sacred rites and powers. For the prerogative of permanent control in the appointment of theological professors to teach and propagate your ideas, you will give money. Before the breath of Mammon had tainted man's sense of honor and right, as it has in later times, such things were called Simony. It is incredible that you intended all that your words contain.

Before closing this letter allow me to inform you, and through you the public, that in many ways God has blessed and is blessing our young seminary. In respect to its internal affairs and its facilities for effecting the sacred ends for which it was founded, it is perhaps in a better condition now than ever before. We have a building not surpassed by any other in the church in its arrangements for the convenience and comfort of students. We have a library which, though not large, is yet, as to quality, exceeding choice, and for adaptation to the ordinary wants of a Theological Seminary is without a superior. We have a Financial Agent of eminent fitness and excellence, and whom the churches receive with great cordiality. We have a full Faculty, working together in entire harmony, and, I trust, with real efficiency. We have a company of noble young

men diligently pursuing the prescribed studies, and many of them give high promise of success as pastors and preachers in the Church of God. We have the confidence, sympathy, prayers and co-operation of the great mass of Christian ministers and people in our connection through the Northwestern States. And as our special sphere we have a field for action and influence literally immense. If only a few brethren here and there would rise up to the imitation of an apostolic example and forget those things which are behind; and if we all together would Christianly and resolutely reach forth unto those things which are before, our seminary would have not only peace, but a great and glorious future.

In all that is true and right, I am yours,

WILLIS LORD.

---

*From the North-Western Presbyterian, Jan. 9th, 1869.*

#### REPLY TO MR. JESSE L. WILLIAMS.

NEW YORK, Dec. 28, 1868.

MESSRS. EDITORS:—I find in your issue of the 19th inst., a letter from Jesse L. Williams, Esq., published as a “correction” of my letter of the 17th of Nov., “in some particulars.” As nothing further has appeared *in your columns* in answer to my letter, I might hardly have felt it necessary to occupy more space in your journal, had not my letter elicited so much comment in other papers, religious and political, as to make it proper, with your leave, to take some notice of them in the NORTH-WESTERN, as the medium of my communications upon this subject.

With due deference to Mr. Williams, however, he is at present over-modest of his influence with his Seminary friends, and underrates, let me say, the importance of “our brief interview during the session of the General Assembly

of 1866." We had certainly two interviews, and my impression is that we had three; and while conceding the *difference of recollection* between Mr. Williams and myself in the particulars mentioned—every *essential* point between us, however, being quite clear—I must claim some advantage over him on the score of recollection, having "written down" *for publication at the time* a statement of the case, not so much to preserve "any remarks made by either of us at that interview" as then to lay the whole matter before the public, as is now done.

Now I have not stated that Mr. Williams "was clothed with authority to speak for the Assembly, the Directors, or Trustees;" or that he "assumed" any. Nor have I meant to be understood as giving his precise words when not so *quoted*; but when he says he made "no response" to my remark—as he has it—that "they would not, *of course*, expect me to pay any more;" and that there was "*an immediate effort in view*" to endow his (MacMaster's) chair, by "*his friends*," who "*supposed he would not accept without bringing with him, as THEIR contribution, the basis of his own support*," while Dr. MacMaster himself says, in his *letter of acceptance*, published in the notice of this correspondence by the *Presbyter*, that "this difficulty is obviated by the spontaneous action of the brethren who have the matter in charge, and by whom I am assured that the endowment of the chair to which I have been appointed, is to be provided for by an additional fund, so as to preclude the necessity of drawing for its support on the present endowment;" and, further, as shown in my previous letter by the statement of the collecting agent, in connection with the present embarrassment of the Seminary, that "some of the few subscribers to the MacMaster endowment refused to pay because of the failure to raise the \$50,000"—I now submit, whether the correctness of my position is not made out, without reference to the particular words, "response" or not, of Mr. Williams, and irrespective of *what* he said of the matter afterwards in the Board of Directors. The question of difference is no longer restricted to the conversations between Mr. Williams and myself. It now appears that my position,



views and wishes in the matter, were promptly and fully made known to the Seminary Committee of the Assembly, and that the action of the Assembly, in the election of Dr. MacMaster, was taken accordingly, and with the further knowledge that the endowment by his friends was necessary to his acceptance—that he depended upon such endowment. And if endowed by the friends of Dr. MacMaster, how could the chair be also endowed by me! And *if*, again, as *now recollected by Mr. Williams*, \$20,000 of the \$50,000 to be provided by the friends was to be applied to the increase of the funds for *the other chairs*, no further funds for the endowment could possibly have been expected of me.

Add to the endowment of Dr. McMaster's chair the additional funds necessary to the completion of this enterprise by the "new friends"—as referred to in my previous letter, and *since admitted* by Mr. Williams—and the supposed aggregate amount of about \$150,000 appears, for which "the Chair of Theology and the good working majority in the Board of Directors" were required in 1866.

Since writing the foregoing, I have seen the comments of the *Presbyter* on Mr. Williams's letter, which are confined to his (Mr. Williams's) statement of my remark to him, that "they will not expect me to *pay any more*." The *Presbyter* treats this as a *quotation* by Mr. Williams from *my representation* of what *I had said*, without taking any exception to it. This is a mistake. *My* published statement of my remark to Mr. Williams was, that "they would of course not expect me to pay over the remaining fourth instalment," then unpaid. The words used by Mr. Williams agree with mine in substance. If by the slight change in the words used by Mr. Williams, suggested by the *Presbyter*, my meaning might have been considered *uncertain*—"on two occasions, in meetings of the Directors"—it is *not possible* that I could have *meant less* than is indicated by the words of Mr. Williams. When involuntarily, and against my protest, superseded by the action of the Assembly, with the proposition that not only the means for the endowment of Dr. McMaster's chair, but also what would become necessary for completing the Seminary endowment,

would be provided, it must have been superfluous in me to say, as rendered by the *Presbyter*, "Expect no more of me than my bond!" The clause in the "report of the Trustees to the Directors in 1867," (given in the *Presbyter*,) showing my *unwillingness* to "pay any more," is therefore quite consistent with what every friend at St. Louis to whom I spoke of the matter understood; and, how Mr. Williams could have any doubt on that point, I of course do not understand.

Respectfully, &c.,

C. H. McCORMICK.

---

*From the North-Western Presbyterian, February 6, 1869.*

REPLY OF MR. CYRUS H. McCORMICK  
TO DR. LORD,

New York Jan. 16th, 1869.

Rev. WILLIS LORD, D. D.

SIR : In answer to your letter to me, dated 19th ult, post-marked the 28th, in reply to my published letter of Nov. 17th, on Seminary matters, it is of some consequence first to ascertain the state of the case, and relations of the parties to it.

In my letter, I only referred to such *differences between you and myself* as were necessary to show the inconsistency and impropriety of your occupancy of the "Cyrus H. McCormick Professorship of Theology," and gave some reasons to substantiate my position. I said : "I am induced to state these matters in order that the *existing relations* between *Dr. Lord and myself* may be the better understood, supposing as I have, that there are few men who would be willing to occupy the *chair in question* as he has done, under such circumstances."

You have replied in a letter characterized by a *Presbyterian* paper as one of "*great length and severity.*" You

have not thought proper to stop with a defense of yourself, but have labored far more to arraign me on the question of my "dishonored bond," as you are pleased to term it, and the differences between the General Assembly and myself in relation thereto—not satisfied with the discussion of that question between "the Hon. Jesse L. Williams" and myself, between whom the only *differences* had appeared as to the action of the Assembly of 1866, on that question. If the sequel does not show that your "great severity" is more against yourself than me, "some one (as you say) must be disappointed" *again!* I shall use no more "severity" *towards you*, however, than *necessary to do justice to others*.

A committee of the Directors of the North Western Theological Seminary addressed a letter to me dated Oct. 16, 1868, informing me of the election of Rev. Mr. Blackburn, by the General Assembly, to the Chair of History, and signifying a wish that I should pay over the (unpaid) fourth instalment of my original endowment fund—and as you would have it, redeem my "plighted faith;" honor my "dishonored bond"; *restore* "the money thus sacredly devoted" to the "Institution to which it legally and morally belongs," which, as you say, had been diverted and "bestowed on the Union Theological Seminary and the College in Lexington, both in Virginia"!

In assigning in my letter some reasons why I felt called on to notice in a public manner *the demand made upon me by the committee for this payment*, I said that, "having reached the point where, in my judgment, further silence would be improper, and a vindication of myself becomes a duty, I offer this correspondence to the public, that the facts in the case may be understood." I am gratified that while some of the *political* papers at Chicago have caught *your spirit*, the *religious* press, in their treatment of the subject, have shown a different spirit.

In *refusing to pay* to the Board of Directors the fourth instalment of the endowment, which they had in 1867 been informed by the "Report of the Board of Trustees" would not be paid, I did so—not on the ground of *your course and conduct*, as stated, for at that time you had not succeeded

in getting yourself transferred to the chair of Theology, but —on the ground made known to the General Assembly at St. Louis, in 1866, through Mr. Jesse L. Williams, viz : the *taking from* the original friends of the Seminary, by the General Assembly, the chair of Theology, in the election of Dr. MacMaster ; and giving “ a working majority in the Board of Directors ” to the “ new friends,” by the displacement of the Directors who had co-operated with us in the work of the Seminary. And yet, *you say* my “ only avowed reasons for dishonoring ” my bond are my “ *personal feelings towards yourself, and an alleged conversation with the Hon. J. L. Williams* ” ! This is not true. As I have already shown, I “ avowed ” *nothing of “ personal feelings towards you ” in connection with my “ dishonored bond ” !*

In further noticing your communication, I will first consider the only “ offenses ” with which, in my letter, I charged you, and the manner in which these have been met.

1. I said, “ Dr. Lord denounced the manner in which my donation had been made to the General Assembly.” This, *you say*, occurred at the meeting of the Board of Directors in April, 1862 ; and add that “ then began what at that time you felt to be *practical repudiation* ; ” and you account for my disposition to repudiate by what you term your sundry “ real causes ” of offense to me—which will be noticed in their proper order.

Without recollecting all the particulars that occurred at this meeting, it is sufficient that *your* object was to have the several instalments of the endowment fund paid by me, that you might share the benefit of those applying to the vacant chairs, or, as if so provided in the terms of my endowment ; while it was shown by Judge Seates, on reading the bond to the meeting, only to be payable, \$25,000 to each *Professor* ; and whereupon, *as you say*, the matter was “ at length *arranged* ” by postponing payment of the “ third and fourth instalments, both principal and interest, until the vacancies should be filled.” After the reading of the bond by Judge Seates, came your *denunciation*—*not*, as *you say*, on the ground of my “ assumed right, virtually, to control the endowment, for the *arrangement* was made

simply in accordance with the *terms of the bond* ; and the fact that the second and third instalments were afterwards paid accordingly, and subsequent to the occurrence of your list of "real offenses" towards me, as you state them, does not seem much like "*practical repudiation!*" Your "then only colleague" has since stated that, on hearing the bond read at that meeting of the Board, which was the first time he had heard it, he became satisfied that I was right in my construction of it, and that I intended "that the income of the \$100,000 should be applied to the four Professors, and not to a less number." "But," as you say, "what has this to do with your dishonored bond?" Nothing: but it is one reason why you should not have sought your transfer to the "Cyrus H. McCormick Professorship of Theology."

2. I alluded to your "gross attack upon me, without cause, and in my absence, at a meeting of the North Church." "If this were indeed so," you say, "I ought to be blamed. But it was not so. I neither uttered your name, nor had you in my thoughts on that occasion." You admit this to be a cause of offense to me *if so*, but deny the fact. I shall make it clear that *it was so*.

You have not denied that you used the language alleged, nor have you stated to whom or what you did refer. I can not specify at what particular meeting your lengthy speech containing this threat was made, but that you did make it, and did refer to me, and could not well have referred to any one else, I am assured, was the distinct understanding of several of the most intelligent gentlemen then present, by whom, as I said, "it was heard with astonishment and disapprobation," and who have been equally astonished at your denial. That their understanding of the reference was correct, is further confirmed by the statement of a minister, whom you met upon the street in Chicago soon afterwards, and to whom, in a most excited manner, for you, you repeated the declaration, making it still stronger, saying, "if I were to make public what I knew of a certain party in that church, in three hours time it would raise a mob that would tear it to the ground." This statement led to a protracted conversation in which my name was repeatedly

mentioned, as the person to whom reference was had in the threat made.

In the same speech and in the same connection, you also said, you were "a proscribed man." And when asked the next day, "By whom?" your answer was, "By Mr. McCormick," though as you were then assured I had in no way interfered. Your fancied proscription, so far as is known, was the great matter, which if disclosed to the public, was to work such damage to that important church. From these disclosures it is evident that your threat was levelled against me, notwithstanding your denial. It is also evident that the only ground for such a threat was that you imagined yourself to have been proscribed. The names of the persons here referred to as witnesses will be given in full if required.

In this connection you deny having been a candidate for the pastorate of the North church, saying, "By some too partial friend my name also had been presented. It was without my knowledge and to my very deep regret." This is a most surprising statement, in view of the facts. You seem to have forgotten that, in the speech in which occurred your threat against me, and which was delivered immediately after your nomination, you did not once withdraw your name. You seem to have forgotten also your subsequent remark to one of the elders of that church that if the Rev. Mr. Stewart should leave you would like to take charge of the church, and also your statement to another elder afterward, that, if he and Mr. M——and Mr. R—— would support you, you would accept the call,—which call had been voted by your friends at a meeting when but a part of the congregation were present. You seem to have forgotten also that when this call, thus voted, was placed in your hands by the Presbytery, in the face of a protest numerously signed, you kept it in your possession until convinced that you could not be supported as pastor of the church. "But what has *this* to do with your dishonored bond?" Nothing; but in the opinion of many who were acquainted with these facts it is a good reason why you

should not occupy the "Cyrus H. McCormick Professorship of Theology."

3. In connection with the "astonishment and disapprobation" felt at your threat above mentioned, I said that your course led ultimately to the division of the North Church, and to a number of your friends going off and organizing themselves into a rival congregation—on which *you comment under this head*, saying, "All my *conscious and intentional* influence was uniformly and strongly the other way." You were then, perhaps, as in other cases, wholly *unconscious* of your "real" influence. From your remark in this connection—but with NO LEGITIMATE *connection*—that "there are indeed some men who insist that *our great and good government was the cause of the rebellion*, possibly this is your view," as well as from your failure to recollect so thrilling a scene *in your imagination* as the one so pathetically portrayed by you in the tearing down of the North Church in three hours' time by a mob, one is inclined to think your memory not quite reliable as to plain matters of fact, when under the "influence" of highly pitched *patriotic emotion*. You certainly had your share at least of the *credit* due "those true Christian men and women" who, moved by such "weighty reasons," did organize said "rival church" *under your* open advocacy in Presbytery. "But what has this to do with your dishonored bond?" *Nothing*: but it is a reason why *you* should not insist on payment of that bond for *your support* in the "Cyrus H. McCormick Professorship of Theology."

4. As to your advocacy of your transfer to the Chair of Theology, in 1866 and 1867: you virtually admit the fact as to the Assembly of 1867, and *defend your right to do so*. This you could not well deny, in view of the well known fact that you appeared in person before the Assembly's Committee on Seminaries, (which committee "had been placed in the hands of the Moderator,") and together with others replied to speeches made before the same committee in opposition to your proposed transfer. You say you were not at the Assembly of 1866. This is true; but the mail and telegraph supply the means of accomplishing

what would otherwise be lost for want of personal presence, and it was understood at St. Louis that you had recourse to one or both of these means, to effect your transfer to the Chair of Theology by that Assembly—having *threatened to resign* if not transferred, whereupon you were at once dropped! And it is said, and of course *known*, if so, that you exerted yourself to the utmost to secure Commissioners from Presbytery (of Chicago) in favor of your transfer, going into a caucus for that purpose, and refusing to vote for any one (as Commissioner) who would not vote for the transfer.

“But what had this to do with your dishonored bond?”  
*Nothing*: But the Assembly at St. Louis regarded it as the *best* reason why *you* should not then occupy the “Cyrus H. McCormick Professorship of Theology.”

I must now notice your own *pretended* “real offenses,” and add something to the list of your *actual* offenses. The letter of Dr. Rice, hereto subjoined, will assist in showing *how* “*real*” your “offenses” are.

1. You say, “Some months before the war began, but when the danger of it was becoming imminent, you proposed to the professors to issue, in connection with yourself, a sort of manifesto or address to the South. The object was to save the Union and Slavery. To give it more weight, you wished it to go forth over our signatures. One of the professors was requested to prepare it and submit it for our consideration. It was an able paper, but conceived and written from a Southern standpoint. In the existing conflict, it assumed that slavery was all right, and freedom all wrong. I declined to sign it. Materially modified and toned down, it was published in the *Expositor*, without a name. This was my first conscious offense.”

Immediately preceding this you had said: “From the first, however, I was conscious, in my immediate surroundings, of an atmosphere different from that to which I had been accustomed. It seemed to be not so much that of Lake Michigan as of Chesapeake Bay; of the prosperous and free North, as of the South. There were an air, color, tone and general drift of things which made slowly but at



length quite definitely this impression, that the professors were expected to be the exponents of Southern ideas, and defenders, if necessary of Southern institutions."

Elsewhere in your Christian and conciliatory letter you said: "The purpose of making the seminary an outpost or bulwark of slavery, if any one entertained it, had plainly become like a forlorn hope."

Should these statements, equally unfriendly to your colleagues, to the original Directors and students of the seminary, and damaging to the church at large, be found to be wholly untrue, what then? What would your position then be before the church and all candid and impartial men? Could any man, who truly loved the Old School Presbyterian Church and her institutions, and who was truly loyal to all her interests, permit himself to make such charges against an important Seminary, its professors and founders? That they are not only unsustained, as they are in your letter, but unfounded assertions, the letter of Dr. Rice, your senior professor for two years, herewith submitted to the public, abundantly shows. It disposes completely of your "first conscious offense." His testimony can be confirmed by that of the only other surviving Professor, and by most of the Directors then in office. "But what has this to do with your dishonored bond?" Nothing; but it goes to show your unfitness for the position you have used every means to secure, and the impropriety of your asking me to pay \$25,000 for your support in that Chair.

2. Your *second* conscious offense is equally groundless with the first. If you used the "strong" expressions you now state against the nomination of "the Rev. Dr. Moore" for "the Chair of Theology, in the Seminary, and the pulpit of the North church," I have no recollection of it. I do well recollect, however, that at a meeting of the Board of Directors, Dr. Boardman, Dr. Moore and Dr. Gurley, were named for the chair. As I recollect, neither of the three gentlemen would accept. Dr. Halsey spoke in the highest terms of Dr. Moore, and I was asked to write to him, which I did. Some doubts were expressed in the meeting as to his loyalty, and whether he had written certain things against the

North, as had been represented, but was not known. Satisfactory information was to be sought on that question, but his declinature superseded further investigation. There was no such issue made about him, however, as you represent. Dr. Gurley was *my friend*, personally, and his call afterwards to the pastorate of the North church, and visit to Chicago, were brought about by my instrumentality. He was unwilling to undertake both preaching and teaching.

3. Your "third conscious offense," the character of the article written by you as an editorial for the *Expositor*, I do not recollect. I have some recollection of the circumstance, since your reference to it, but only as disagreeing with you as to the expediency of publishing the article as an *editorial*. After Dr. Rice left Chicago, I was not only the proprietor but the *responsible* manager (or editor) of the paper; and as you have made good your claim to having been a Radical of the first water—often the case with converts from one doctrine to another—it cannot be considered very strange that an editorial written by you without any conference whatever with me, under all the excitement to which you refer, should not have been precisely what I chose to be responsible for—apart from the fact, well understood, that conservative Presbyterians generally are opposed to agitating the church with political questions. I understand, moreover, that *Dr. Halsey* has a distinct recollection that I only objected to the article as an editorial, in my name, saying explicitly that if you wished to publish such an article, you could do so over your own name. This you did not choose to do.

4. Your *fourth*, and "climax of offenses," as you represent it, consisted in advocating and voting for the "Spring Resolutions" in the General Assembly of 1861. Those Resolutions, you say, were "alike Patriotic and Christian;" but you also say: "It is marvelous to think what excitement they produced, and how vehemently they were opposed by great and good men." Well, if they were not only opposed "by great and good men," but opposed "*vehemently*," it is not surprising that I did not approve them. "Great and good men" are generally both patriots and Christians, and

were not very likely to oppose a popular paper that was "alike Patriotic and Christian." Those "great and good men," among whom stood prominently the venerable Dr. Hodge, of Princeton, believed then, and *believe still*, that in adopting the "Spring Resolutions," the Assembly traveled entirely beyond its Constitutional and Scriptural limits, and decided a great *civil question*; and that, by so doing, that body virtually *cut off nearly one-half of the church!* And as I gave the endowment to the *whole church*, of the *United States of America*, and as I agree with those "great and good men" in regard to the course of the Assembly; is it surprising that, in connection with the course since pursued towards myself and friends, I am not only unwilling to pay more money in the same direction, *as matters stand*, but believe that what I have paid has been forfeited?

You knew, and the entire church knew, as Dr. Rice has shown, that two different doctrines were agitating the church and country in reference to the subject of *slavery*, to which you refer, when this Seminary was founded: that one doctrine—the church doctrine—was represented by Dr. Rice, and the other by Dr. MacMaster. You knew that the position on this subject represented by Dr. Rice, which was the church position, and the position of all the Seminaries of the church, Princeton, Alleghany and Danville, was the one that prevailed at Indianapolis, after having been advocated at length by Dr. Rice, as against Dr. MacMaster. You knew that the endowment was proffered and accepted by the General Assembly on that basis. The Professors were elected on that basis, and on that basis they accepted. I further submit, therefore, that the *Church* and the *Professors*, so long as they retain their positions and draw from that endowment fund, are in all moral honesty bound to abide by that position—the former keeping the Professorships filled by men in harmony with the Seminary as originally founded. I have always believed that the Old School Church, as represented by the deliverances of the Assembly, and the other Seminaries, held the true Conservative Scriptural ground on this question—that the doctrine that slaveholding is *always* sinful, without regard to circumstances,

is unscriptural, and is, like all error, pernicious in its influence. Like Shylock of old, you harp on "the bond! the bond!" But the *written* conditions of that bond were not the *only* terms of the gift. There were *understood and implied* pledges that, as the Seminary was the outgrowth, so it should continue to be the *exponent* of sound Scriptural and Conservative views. These pledges have been openly and grossly violated. No one knows this better than yourself. It is for *me*, not you, therefore, to talk of "broken pledges"—"violated plighted faith," etc.

For the first two years your conservatism was as pronounced as that of any member of the Faculty. Your allegations in regard to the "atmosphere and surroundings of the Seminary," and its being an "outpost and bulwark of slavery," are all afterthoughts. In your proposed commentary on Peter, you discussed the subject of Slavery, and stated and defended at length the church doctrine on that subject, and opposed the abolition doctrine that slaveholding was sinful *per se*. You read it to Drs. Rice and Halsey, and received *their approval*. You were given to the recital of an anecdote, that: On being invited by a Congregationalist minister to attend a Congregationalist Convention in Chicago, you said no: If you were to attend, you might offer this resolution: "*Resolved*, That when we get to Heaven, we will *not* sit down with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, for they were slaveholders, and we have no evidenee they ever repented of their sin." You have spoken of your refusal to allow the Chicago *Tribune* to come into your house—"that vile, radical sheet, was unfit to be read in any family." You rejoiced with a *member* of the Assembly of 1859, after his return from the Assembly, in the defeat of Dr. MacMaster and the views he represented. In December, 1860, immediately after the Rev. Dr. VanDyke, of Brooklyn, had preached his well known sermon on "The Character and Influence of Abolitionism," you wrote to him a highly congratulatory letter, intimating your full approval of his views, and your disapprobation of those whose favor you are now so anxious to court.

But I am not so much *offended* at your having thrown off the mask you so long wore, as *disgusted* at your having, by wearing it, got yourself into a Professor's Chair.

So much for your alleged "conscious offenses." They have been shown to be without foundation. How then is your present hostility to the former management of the Seminary to be explained?

The *first actual* ground of disaffection, or *defection*, on your part so far as known, was the action of the Executive Committee in 1861, after the resignation of Dr. Rice, in appointing Dr. Scott instead of yourself to teach Theology. You took offense at this, and threatened to resign—so expressed yourself to an Elder in the church, and member of the Executive Committee. This it would seem dates the commencement of your aspirations to the Professorship of Theology.

The *second* (known) offense to you was the application, as shown, of only \$25,000 to each Professor's Chair;—and the *third* rock of offense, the declination of the North Church to accept you as their pastor.

Nor was your original *position* in the Seminary so entirely unsought by you as you would fain have the public believe. You say: "Urged by the special friends of the Seminary, and notwithstanding it subjected me to much pecuniary sacrifice, I, at length, accepted the appointment." You may have forgotten your letter to Dr. Rice previous to the Assembly of 1859, inquiring of him if there was any opening for you in the West—adding that you had to leave Brooklyn.

You attempt to excite odium against me because I made donations to two Institutions in Virginia—the *Union Theological Seminary*, in my native State; and Washington College, in my native county. You say: "Soon as the throes of the rebellion were sufficiently quieted to permit it, I sent my approval of their course in the form of money to 'the Union Theological Seminary, and the *College in Lexington*,'" which is simply false. The amount of "this benefaction" being \$25,000, I said in my letter: "I soon after donated to the *Union Theological Seminary* of Virginia, for the endowment of one of its Professorships, \$30,000,—not desiring to withdraw for my personal use any portion of

what I had donated for the benefit of the church"—*not* to the "College at Lexington!" My donation to Washington College was a separate matter entirely.

Whatever wrong may have been done in time past by persons connected with these institutions; in one respect they differ widely from you and your friends. Now that the war has ended, they do not still seek to keep up the strife, but have gone quietly to work to build up Institutions needed both by the church and the country. If you and your friends had pursued a similar course, this controversy would not have occurred. It is more than absurd for Christian men to *boast of their loyalty and their love of country* who continue to show a bitterness and vindictiveness of feeling which even men of the world rebuke.

But is it really true that those who now give money to assist Southern Institutions thereby express approval of the Rebellion? Did Henry Ward Beecher express his approval of the Rebellion, when he gave money to this same Washington College? Did any one think of charging Mr. Peabody with approval of the Rebellion when he made his princely donation for Educational purposes to the States recently in rebellion? Does it not argue a narrow mind and unchristian spirit in any man, much more in a minister of the Gospel, and still more in a teacher of ministers, thus to criticise such benefactions, the very design of which was to conciliate the two sections of the country, so sadly alienated, and to aid them in their *deep poverty*—the cries of which may never have reached *your ears*? Is this any part of the doctrine *taught in your Seminary*? Is this in accord with the command of Christ: "Love your enemies?" Has the Episcopal Church of the North expressed its approval of the Rebellion, by inviting the Southern branch of the church to return, and by sending men and money to build up churches and Institutions of learning in the South? Is the spirit manifested by you to be fostered in our Theological Seminaries? Are the young men who go from them to make it one object of their ministry to keep up this bitterness and strife? If so, well may any Christian man decline giving money to them. This proscriptive spirit is not content to

vent itself against the *South*. It is equally intolerant toward those "great and good men" at the *North* who opposed "the Spring resolutions;" and all who, like them, would keep the church out of the political strifes of the times.

But further, you say: "Why should one alone, of all the donors, past, present and to come, claim and be accorded the right of control? If the principle is valid and recognized in his case, why not also in theirs?" The right of control has never been assumed by me. The same answer must of course be given to all, as to one. It must be alike to all as to one a question of *justice* and right. Mismanagement by the Assembly and Directors may destroy, instead of building up, any such institution, while the *just rights* of no single contributor can be disregarded with impunity. Where the responsibility properly lies, there it must be met. You have *undershot* the mark entirely, when you say: "The plain tenor of your letter is, that had *I* but thought, felt, spoken and acted as you supposed I would, or as you willed I should, *the bond would have been paid*!" And you thereupon volunteer to fill one entire page of the *Presbyter*, professedly in "self-vindication," but really for the support of your Professorship, and in abuse of me; while, I repeat, the question of my "dishonored bond," as between the *General Assembly* and myself, had been fully discussed and disposed of between Mr. Williams and myself before you commenced writing.

It must be apparent, however, that while the issue between the General Assembly and myself was taken upon the action of that body anterior to your transfer to the Professorship of Theology, *when* that transfer was made, it might then properly have been, and should now be, *embraced as one of the reasons why*, if continued there, the \$75,000 should be returned to me and those acting with me. What fair-minded and impartial *minister of the Gospel* could justify keeping a man in the chair of Theology (bearing my name) who could be guilty of your demagogical conduct, in talking about my "grave act as it respects law and morals"—"pretexts for such a crime"—the "spoiling of Peter"—"offer to *buy* sacred rights and powers"—"such things

were called Simony," etc. And all this for what? After our having been set aside *by the Assembly*, and relieved by its action from *further responsibility* in connection with the Seminary; and after the other side having utterly failed to obtain the requisite means for sustaining the Institution—the "Financial Agent, of eminent fitness and excellence," as you say, having informed me, in connection with his application for help, that he had thoroughly canvassed Illinois, Ohio and Iowa, and nothing further could be depended upon from those States, and that the prospect was not good for collecting for the Seminary in Wisconsin or Minnesota—after these things, I say, and informed as I was also by the *Treasurer* that there would not be money enough to get through the session with; that I should, under such circumstances, have proposed to "assist in placing it on a solid financial basis, if the General Assembly will provide for *such a corps of professors as the original one*, and a corresponding working majority of Directors," *thus only making right the wrong done to us*—*this*, you say, "was called Simony!"

Not that I thought of "*ejecting*" you from office, or even that *you would make the issue with the Assembly* of being *sacrificed* by that body. Neither of these things occurred to me. I had supposed it even possible that you might be disposed to let the General Assembly consider and decide the case with a view to promoting in the best way the best interests of the church, without reference to yourself personally—ready yourself *even* to resign your professorship, should that *sacrifice* be necessary to *save* the institution, or, in the judgment of the Assembly, to do *justice* to all concerned.

I may not pass unnoticed the further demagogism of your reference to "human freedom"—"Fort Sumter had fallen"—"slavery and rebellion"—and such miserable clap-trap as furnishes the chief staple of certain depraved *political* sheets; but I say again, what *church unity* can be expected so long as such agitation is continued? When are we to look for the return of brotherly love and Christian fellowship so long as those aspiring to fill the high places of the church indulge in such wrath and bitterness? Such



demonstrations of passion and violence may have been pardonable during the exciting periods of the war, when great national interests were at stake and great sacrifices were required. But now that that great conflict is past, and its issues settled, religion and patriotism alike require the exercise of mutual forbearance, and the pursuit of those things which tend to peace.

Yours, respectfully

C. H. McCORMICK.

---

LETTER OF DR. N. L. RICE.

40, FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK,  
January 2, 1869.

REV. N. L. RICE, D. D.—*My Dear Sir*:—Having just received a remarkable letter from Dr. Lord, in which he accuses me, if I understand him, of being the instrument of producing an atmosphere around the Seminary at Chicago, “not so much that of Lake Michigan as of Chesapeake Bay;” and in which “the Professors were expected (by me of course) to be exponents of Southern ideas, and defenders, if necessary, of Southern institutions,” etc.; it has occurred to me that you can more appropriately than I reply to this portion of his letter, and accordingly I send you a copy of his letter for such correction as your knowledge and convenience may enable you to write, which will oblige,

Very truly yours,

C. H. McCORMICK.

---

NEW BRUNSWICK, Jan. 4, 1869.

Mr. C. H. McCORMICK—*My Dear Sir*:—I have just read your note of this date. It is due to you, and perhaps to myself, to give, as far as I am able, the information neces

sary to vindicate you from the charge which, I regret to learn, Dr. Lord has made against you. I will say, then—

1. I never had the slightest intimation that you desired the Professors in the Theological Seminary to take any other ground on the subject of *slavery* than that which the Presbyterian church had ever occupied. The last deliverance on that subject by the General Assembly, previous to the organization of the Seminary, was in 1845. Of that paper, it is well known, I was the author. It was fully endorsed by the *Princeton Review*, and has more than once, since that time, been declared by the Assembly to be in harmony with all preceding deliverances. And even since the war excitement began, our Board of Publication has published a pamphlet, written by Dr. McGill, of Princeton, in which the defense of that paper has a prominent place. I always understood you to be satisfied with the doctrine of our church on that subject.

2. Whilst my connection with the Seminary continued, I never knew you to inquire into the opinions of the Professors in relation to slavery; or to attempt, directly or indirectly, to control or to influence their opinions or teachings on this or any other subject. I certainly was not conscious of the peculiar "atmosphere" Dr. Lord describes, or of "the air, tone, color and general drift of things," which seem to have awakened his apprehensions. Indeed, although associated with him first in Cincinnati, and afterwards in Chicago, if he at all differed in his views of slavery from the other professors and myself, I was never made aware of such difference. Dr. Lord had been many years in the ministry, and had labored in the West, as well as in the East, during the period when both the church and the country were intensely agitated by this subject. It is not to be supposed that he concealed his opinions, much less that he designedly allowed them to be misunderstood. Nor is it to be supposed that he was ignorant of the controversy which immediately preceded the locating and organizing of the Seminary at Chicago, and which was terminated by the Assembly which elected him to a Professorship. I believe he was nominated through my influence; and I was

one of "the special friends of the Seminary," "who urged" his acceptance. I pursued this course, not only because I believed him qualified for the chair to which he was elected, but because, from long acquaintance, I thought I had abundant evidence that his views and mine were in harmony. And I felt quite certain that, before he accepted the Professorship, he understood the kind of "atmosphere" into which he was coming, "and the general drift of things" which he would meet in Chicago. He certainly knew *my* views of slavery; and he knew that you did not object to them.

3. It is due to you further to state, that during my editorial connection with the *Expositor*, you never attempted to control its columns; and it certainly was not the "exponent of Southern ideas." In the winter of 1860-61, I published in the *Expositor* a lengthy correspondence between Rev. Mr. Matthews, of Georgia, and myself; in which I wrote, in the strongest terms, against secession, and defended the paper on slavery, adopted by the General Assembly of 1818—universally regarded as strongly anti-slavery, and condemned by Mr. Mathews as an *abolitionist document*. I never heard from you any objection to the publication of such views in your paper.

4. I ought further to say that Dr. Lord's memory is very much at fault, in my opinion, in regard to the paper which, as he supposes, offended you. I feel confident that it did not originate with you. My recollection is that Rev. Dr. Scott prepared the paper of his own motion, and hoped that, either as he wrote it, or somewhat modified, it might be published avowedly by the Professors. He read it to me, I think, before he showed it to any one else. I do not think you requested either of the Professors to sign it; nor did I ever hear an intimation, that Dr. Lord had offended you by declining to sign it. I am confident, likewise, that Dr. Lord errs in saying that before being published it was "materially altered and toned down." I feel sure that I put it into the printer's hands without alteration. The paper was designed to be conciliatory, and to dissuade Southern ministers from favoring secession; but it never occurred to me that it was designed, as Dr. Lord represents it to *save slavery*.

5. In a word, so far as I am aware, you had nothing to do with the nomination of those who were elected to Professorships in the Seminary; and during my connection with the Seminary, I never heard an intimation from either of the Professors that you had, in any way, attempted to influence their course. On the contrary, I left the Seminary, not only myself entertaining the kindest feelings towards each of my associates, but believing that the most pleasant relations existed between you and them. Indeed Dr. Lord himself states, not only that his "reception" in Chicago was "kind and cordial," but that "for many months" his presence and his labors merited no higher appreciation than they received. During those "many months," and though the churches and the country were intensely agitated on the subject of slavery, yet no difference of sentiment was developed amongst us; and I left, after a connection of two years with the Seminary, hoping and believing that the relations between those with whom I had labored so pleasantly, would long continue undisturbed.

Under this impression, I had the happiness, after my removal to New York, of enabling the agent to secure the money for the erection of a Seminary building, and thus of recovering the valuable lands in Chicago, which had been forfeited. Why those who had done little or nothing for the Seminary, sought, in 1866, to get the control of it, and to secure, of their party, "a working majority," I do not profess to know. It has not been common, I am sure, thus to treat those who have given liberally of labor and money to the church. I cannot but express my deep regret that an institution so important to the church, and which entered upon its career with prospects so cheering, should have been crippled, apparently for no cause. Slavery had ceased to exist; the war was over. The time surely had come when the church should have aimed to unite her forces, and go forward in her great work. Having said so much, I owe it to myself to say—that I have had nothing to do, directly or indirectly, with having my name brought before the General Assembly in connection with a Professorship, since I resigned my place in the Institution.

Very truly,

N. L. RIC E

*Frm the Cincinnati Presbyter, Feb. 17, 1869.*

DR. LORD TO MR. McCORMICK..

CHICAGO, Feb. 9, 1869.

*Mr. Cyrus H. McCormick :*

SIR:—In view of its character, my thanks are due for your renewed attack upon me, through your accredited organ, the *North-Western Presbyterian*. It certainly puts me out of the number of those of whom Christ said: "Woe unto you, when all men shall speak well of you." At the same time I am not without hope; it leaves me in the goodly fellowship of others to whom he said: "Blessed are ye when men shall revile you, and say all manner of evil against you, falsely, for my sake." Whether I may assume this or not, I am sure your protracted effort requires only a brief answer. Virulent as it is, it is also, for the most part, its own best antidote.

1. To your profuse personal aspersions I make no reply. To do so would not become me. Of the mass of second-hand puerilities you adduce as their ground, every one is, either wholly untrue, or it is untrue in the relation and aspect in which you give it. Let the sermon on Slavery illustrate. In the confidence of private personal friendship I did read it to one of the two persons you name. I read it to him, simply and only, to learn how my view of the Bible teaching as to that vexed matter would impress a candid Southern man. The utterly perverse and ignoble use you make of this incident will be plain when I state that I preached the sermon before my removal to Chicago, as the expression of my then views on the subject of slavery. I have preached the same sermon since I came to Chicago, and since the war, without the change of a thought or word, as the expression of my present views on the same subject. It does not maintain what is called the *per se* doctrine; but it does earnestly maintain the doctrine of the Presbyterian Church,

as that is set forth in the full and fundamental exposition of the General Assembly of 1818; and its main purpose is to prove that slavery has no real ground in the word of God, and ought to have no being among men.

2. The principles and reasonings in my defense against your first assault you do not venture to question. You do attempt, however, to impugn its record of facts, though without success. I made no statement, sir, in that record, except on my personal knowledge of its truth, save only one, and that I made on your published testimony. The wave, therefore, has dashed against the rock, and the rock remains. The single instance in which Dr. Rice, whose aid you invoke, thinks my memory is at fault, must still stand as I gave it. I cannot concede to his want of recollection what I know to be true. If, in the other instance, resting on your own authority, any reader of my letter understood me to mean that your gifts to those Southern institutions, were both and all pledged to us, it was an error. What I meant was this, that in the whole amount you gave to them—the sum of \$25,000—for which we hold your legal bond, was included. This was your public confession. Not feeling at liberty to apply to your private use the money you had solemnly pledged to this seminary, you sent it elsewhere. Withholding it from us on account of our alleged political views, you yet transferred it to a seminary whose professor of Theology was a captain in the rebel army; and, still further, while persisting in this proscription of us, for our opinions, you sent an additional sum of thousands of dollars to another institution whose president was the military head of the rebellion. These, I suppose to be, the exact facts. Most people think they have a deep significance. This man, they say, purposely discriminates against freedom in favor of slavery, and to the extent of violating his word and bond The love of freedom he treats as a crime, while fighting for slavery he rewards as a virtue; and he does all this in the holy name of religion!

3. I am most happy, sir, to say that your second assault upon me has one merit. In the circumstances it is a great merit. Despite its quality, in every other respect, it has

the merit of being a demonstration. If after your first exhibit, there remained anywhere one single mind that did not see through the thousand pretexts and disguises thrown around the real root of all our woes in Chicago, it is impossible that even that mind should now not see. That root is laid bare. Our original sin is uncovered. The deep and hidden source of every actual transgression is opened to the light; and, consciously or unconsciously, your hand has done it. Here is the fatal grievance; not that the seminary has been turned aside from the sacred ends for which it was founded by holy men more than a quarter of a century ago; not that the senior professor has been remiss in diligence or fidelity with respect to any one duty devolved upon him by his office; not that the young men resorting here are not faithfully and thoroughly instructed in the whole sum of Christian truth and duty bearing on the office and work of the gospel ministry. These things, or any one of them, would be a just cause of complaint. But the immediate wound is this; Your offer of the endowment, you assert, was made on a certain, not expressed but implied basis as to slavery; it was accepted by the General Assembly on that basis; and all the original professors were elected to their office on that basis; and that basis, it is unmistakably implied, binds the Assembly and the professors, *in æternum*, to all the logical, ethical and historical sequences of the sacred system!

I will waste no time in comment on this plain self-exposition; this more than signal self-condemnation. The near future will show whether the Presbyterian Church in these United States is about to deny its ancient faith, revoke its noble testimonies, and sell its glory for ineffable shame.

In the meantime, permit me to recall a suggestive passage in history. I have reason to think it occurred in your presence. The venerable Dr. Robert J. Breckinridge was charged with precisely the same offenses, in kind, which you allege against the senior professor in Chicago. Because of these offenses he was no longer a fit person to teach theology, and ought to be displaced.

During the session of the General Assembly in Columbus,

in 1862, this grave matter was carefully considered. As the result, and by an immense vote, that venerable body

*Resolved*, That the Assembly does not concede, that in accepting a professor's chair in the seminary, Dr. Breckenridge did yield the right of expressing his views freely in relation to matters of great national concernment; and, in its judgment, his bold and patriotic stand in reference to the great conflict now in progress, entitles him to the gratitude of the church and the country.

With due consideration,

I am yours,

WILLIS LORD.

---

*For the North-Western Presbyterian.*

#### A CORRECTION.

In Mr. McCormick's letter published in your issue of Jan. 30th, there is an item respecting an interview between him and myself, in which he must have misunderstood me. It is due to our churches in the Northwest, to say that where the claims of our Seminary have been presented, they have almost invariably made liberal contributions. But a small proportion of them up to this time has been visited, and yet something more than fifty thousand dollars have been secured, in cash, notes, and other obligations, within the past fifteen months. My faith is strong enough to believe that when they are all visited within the Synods represented in the institution, we will obtain two hundred and fifty thousand dollars. We were never in a more prosperous condition than at present.

W. B. TRUAX,  
*General Agent.*



*Article from the Virginia Gazette, March 10th 1869, written by the Hon. John W. Brockenbrough, Rector of Washington College.*

CYRUS H. McCORMICK AND DR. LORD.

MESSRS. EDITORS:—The vigorous manner in which you are editing your paper is worthy of all commendation, but I apprehend you have made a grave mistake in indulging in those sharp strictures on the conduct of Dr. Lord, in your last week's issue. You are actually so inconsiderate as to complain that the Trustees of the Theological Seminary, at Chicago, have secured "*a good working majority*" of Radicals in their Board, and that the Rev. Dr. Lord has lent himself to the base purpose of perverting the munificent charity of Cyrus H. McCormick to the promotion of Radicalism, and in contravention of the declared wishes of the donor! Declared wishes of the donor, indeed! As my uncle Toby exclaimed to Corporal Trim, with an emphasis of rebuke which brought the Corporal up all standing—on one leg!—and instantly silenced his impertinent suggestion—*Fiddle-sticks!* Are you sure that you, rebel editors that you are, do not deserve an equally stunning rebuke? Have not the "*good working majority*" and Dr. Lord acted in this matter in most perfect harmony with the avowed teachings of Radical ethics? Who dare question the orthodoxy of that sublime code of morality which inculcates the maxim, so well done into verse by WORDSWORTH—

"The good old rule sufficeth them,  
That he should *take* who has the power,  
And he should *keep* who can."

And who is Cyrus H. McCormick that he dare refuse payment of his "*dishonored bond?*" Born on Virginia soil, of Virginia parents, and himself little better than a rebel sympathiser! What right has such as he to feel an emotion of pity when he casts a saddening eye over the beautiful land of his birth, and beholds her altars and hearths prostrate under the Vandal hoof of War? What right to yield to a

natural impulse to assist in restoring her waste places to something of their radiant beauty ere the blight of internecine war had fallen upon them? Was it not incumbent on him, as a true and *loyal* man, to forget the home of his birth and infancy, with all the clustering associations entwining themselves about his heart, and remember only her frightfully enormous crime? If nothing short of the sublime sternness of Roman virtue could accomplish this task, why, he should have proved himself a Roman, and, falling below that high standard, he has made himself an object for Radical scorn to point its slow, unmoving finger at! And is not Cyrus H. McCormick a rebel sympathiser? Behold the proof! He has lavished his bounty on two such notoriously rebel institutions as the Theological Seminary, of Virginia, and Washington College, the latter, led by the arch-traitor and rebel, R. E. Lee, and has *dishonored his bond* by refusing payment to the "*good working majority*," of the Chicago Trustees and the fit exponent of Radical Abolitionism, the Rev. Dr. Lord! Is he not doubly dishonored in bestowing his bounty on unrepentant rebels, and denying it to those pre-eminently worthy persons who know how to turn their loyalty to account, and make it a first-rate paying investment? Has he not, in fact, given away *their* money, and cannot the Trustees and Dr. Lord follow it into the hands of the rebel beneficiaries and recover it back, as so much money had and received to their use? Why not? I have known worse cases than this gained in a court of justice. Who knows but when the Bench, Bar, and Jury Box have been thoroughly expurgated of every trace of rebellion, and when loyalty rules supreme within our borders, such a suit might be brought with most encouraging prospects of success, in this District No. 1? Would it not be good policy in the Seminary and College to disgorge the ill-gotten fruits of violated plighted faith, and disarm resentment by laying these, *spolia opima*, in the lap of the peerless Institution which sits, in imperial beauty, in the Queen City of the Lakes? *Prenez garde!* I tremble to think, Messrs. Editors, how thoughtlessly you have imperilled the material interests of the College in our midst, by rousing the sleeping

lion of Fanaticism! Sleeping lion, indeed! Fanaticism never sleeps—while there is money in keeping awake! You may catch a *weasel* asleep, but Fanaticism has too well rewarded its carpet-bag devotees ever to be allowed to fall into the gentlest kind of slumber. No! eternal vigilance is the price of spoils! The tiger does sometimes sleep in his jungle and let his prey pass unscathed and harmless; but Fanaticism, more watchful than either, is ever ready to spring at the throats of this doomed people, and to tear and rend them with its claws and teeth of insatiable greed! Her's is,

“The immortal hate, and study of revenge  
And courage never to submit or yield.”

Satanic, but sublime!

Cyrus H. McCormick has done a very naughty thing, and offended the radical and dominant clique of the Presbyterian Church North, quite past forgiveness! Possessed of such old-fashioned notions as, “*peace on earth, good will towards men*”—for his was the evangel of love and not of hate—he munificently endowed three Chairs of the Theological Seminary of Chicago and promised a like endowment of a fourth, at a future time, on a like princely scale of \$25,000 each. He designed his bounty to promote the cause of genuine Christianity, as in his simplicity, he understood it, without any taint of radicalism, *political* or *religious*. All worked harmoniously for a season, and his bounty was applied according to his wishes. But lo! a change!—The restless, remorseless, fiend of Fanaticism, enters this Eden and turns it into Hell! The eleemosynary institutions of the Church fall into the hands of a “*good working majority*” of Radicals, and the pious Dr. Lord, after filling the “Cyrus H. McCormick” Chairs, and professing to inculcate conservative religious doctrines, wriggles himself into the fourth Chair, throws off the ugly mask of conservatism, dons the radiant one of radicalism and demands that he shall still be fed by the bounty of the donor! The donor demurs to a further misapplication of his bounty, the donee falls into a paroxysm of holy horror at the *dishonesty!* of

the donor, and gives utterance to his consuming wrath and withering indignation through many columns of a congenial radical paper! Now, pray, Messrs. Editors, what is there astonishing in all this? Do you really know so little of the code of radical morality as not to know that there is no inconsistency at all, in defending the act of obtaining a bond by false and fraudulent pretences, as *right* and *just*, and undertaking to prove, *uno flatu*, that the defrauded obligor is guilty of *dishonesty* in withholding payment? Now, 'pon my soul, I pity you if you cannot comprehend so elementary a principle of ethics *as that?* Neither, I suppose, can you be made to comprehend that peculiar system of ethics which justified the African slave-trade, the prosecution of it as lawful, pocketed the rich fruits, (and the richer the more legitimate!) These radicals are the cleverest and most practical school of moralists, never turning abolitionist till they had received the full price of their human freight! Now, in old times these were the ethics of the foot-pad and highwayman, and we have discovered that the system of the foot-pad and highwayman is really sound, but it was not accepted as satisfactory till a great politico-religious party made it respectable and obtained for it universal adoption throughout all the happy realms of radicalism. If you are such incorrigible old fogies as not to be able to elevate your minds to the sublime heights of this new philosophy, you should be objects of pity to all enlightened men and women! If you cannot comprehend such truths you may, at least, learn from the hints I have given that it is dangerous to attempt their refutation. Radicalism is now rampant and a power in the State. Let me entreat you, in an agony of fear, that if you cannot "see it," as I think I do, you will possess your souls with a little more of that negative virtue, which all men commend and few practice, called

PRUDENCE.

*From the North-Western Presbyterian, Chicago,  
March. 20th, 1869.*

REPLY TO DR. LORD'S REJOINER.

New York, March 3, 1869.

MESSRS. EDITORS: I had hoped it would not be necessary for me to ask any further use of your columns, or indulgence of your readers, in the prosecution of this Seminary controversy; but the appearance in the *Presbyter*, of the 17th inst., of Dr. Lord's letter in reply to mine of 16th January, and the note of Mr. Truax, as General Agent, in the NORTH WESTERN of the 27th inst., make it incumbent on me to write another letter. The responsibility is not mine for the continuance of the controversy, while the importance of the subject under discussion is understood and admitted.

In availing myself of the privilege you accord me, I find next to nothing in Dr. Lord's letter which I have not already refuted. He produces a repetition of his political clap-trap that may as well be eliminated from the case.

Dr. Lord takes no issue with me on the overwhelming evidence produced in my letter of the 16th of January in confirmation of the statements made in my reply to the Committee of Directors, (1) as to his offensive conduct towards me, and the consequent impropriety of his seeking to be transferred to the Chair of Theology bearing my name, and to be endowed by me; and (2) in refutation of his alleged offenses towards me. The proof adduced as to his strongly pronounced *conservatism*, and entire agreement with the other Professors in the Seminary, when, and for two years after he was elected—even to the date of his aspirations to the Professorship of Theology and the pastorate of the North church—was so conclusive that he is forced to concede it, and does so by introducing his "Sermon on Slavery," preached as he says, "before his removal to Chicago, since he came to Chicago, and since the war,"—not to prove

how he so soon found, on reaching Chicago, that some one was to be disappointed in expecting him to support the "bulwark of slavery;" nor yet to maintain "what is called the *per se* (abolition) doctrine," but to show his "earnest maintenance of the doctrine of the Presbyterian church as that is set forth in the full and fundamental exposition of the General Assembly of 1818."

Dr. Monfort, also, in noticing his last letter, assumes and gives assurances that his (Dr. Lord's) present views are the same that they ever have been—*conservative*—and entirely in harmony with those of Dr. Rice on the question of slavery. He seems surprised that Dr. Lord's *conservatism* should have been questioned by me, remarking that "Mr. McCormick may not know it, but we are sure that Dr. Lord still holds with him," in holding that the true conservative Scriptural ground on this question of slaveholding is, that it is not "always sinful without regard to circumstances;" that "Drs. Rice and Lord agree perfectly here;" and going on to say that "this statement of Mr. McCormick may perhaps explain what he says elsewhere of Dr. Van Dyke's sermon, and of the *Chicago Tribune*, and of sitting down with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven."

Now I might leave this question here, as Dr. Lord has left it, to be settled between his *Radical friends* and himself, whether he is at *this time a Radical or Conservative!* His *former conservatism*, and agreement with the other Professors, are both *proved and conceded*. It is for him to reconcile this fact with his statements in regard to the atmosphere which he found on coming to Chicago; the Seminary a bulwark of slavery, and for the defense of Southern ideas, etc., and especially when he and Dr. Rice agree perfectly in their views on slavery!

But while startled for the moment by this most unlooked for turn in the case—the surprise of Dr. Monfort at the pains I had taken to *prove* what had been so clear to him, and is now claimed by Dr. Lord for himself—and finding myself *still lampooned* by him for doing for *Southern Institutions* what is recognized by such men as *Greely, Beecher, President Grant* and others, as *meritorious*, I am led to look

for a moment at the *quality* of his Conservatism ! “This man,” he says, “purposely discriminates against freedom in favor of slavery, and to the extent of violating his word and bond. The love of freedom he treats as a crime, while fighting for slavery he rewards as a virtue ; and he does all this in the holy name of religion !” Rather a cutting rebuke, to be sure, from a brother *Conservative*, after the labored effort in my *last letter* to justify myself on this point ! “His word and bond” On these the Dr. *again* rings his changes. I have heard of “out-Heroding Herod ;” but not before of out-Shylocking “Shylock !”

He says, “the single instance in which Dr. Rice, whose aid you invoke, thinks my memory is at fault must still stand as I gave it.” He *forgets* again that Dr. Rice, with his letter before him, wrote to me : “It is due to you (me), and perhaps to myself (himself), to give, as far as I am able, the information necessary to vindicate you from the charge which I regret to learn Dr. Lord has made against you.” He forgets also that Dr. Rice thought proper in his letter to vindicate me against *all Dr. Lord’s charges of interference on the question of “Slavery ;”* adding that, “I felt quite certain that before he accepted the Professorship he understood the kind of ‘atmosphere’ into which he was coming, and ‘the general drift of things’ which he would meet in Chicago. He certainly knew my views of slavery ; and he *knew* that *you did not object to them.*”

Referring Dr. Lord again to Dr. Rice’s letter for the position of “the Presbyterian church on the subject of *slavery*,” and the *evidence that I never “desired the Professors in the Theological Seminary to take any other ground on the subject of Slavery than that which the Presbyterian Church has ever occupied,*” I simply submit whether *this* position “binds the Assembly and the Professors, *in aeternum*, to all the logical, ethical and historical sequences of the sacred system”—*that was, is not, and never again can be ? If not,* “the near future *will* (in the eloquent language of Dr. Lord and *may*, I admit) show whether the Presbyterian Church in these United States is about to *deny* its *ancient faith*, revoke its noble testimonies, and sell its glory for ineffable shame !”

That “suggestive *passage*” in history referred to by Dr. Lord as having “occurred in your (my) presence (not recollected by me) during the session of the General Assembly in Columbus in 1862,” viz : the *resolution* of the Assembly on “*Dr. Robert J. Breckenridge’s*” patriotism, which he cites with such self-complacency ; modestly classing “the Senior Professor in Chicago” with that eminent divine, in being “charged with *precisely the same offenses*, in kind ;” and of course anticipating from “that venerable body, in the near future,” a corresponding *resolution* of “gratitude” for “*his bold and patriotic stand in reference to the great conflict*”—but *not* “*now in progress*,” as in the case of Dr. Breckinridge ! Let him have this resolution by all means, that his name may go down to posterity with that of “Dr. Robert J. Breckinridge,” as the *two great champions of freedom* and of the country’s glory. Certainly, let *justice* be done in this respect. But what has *this* to do with his occupancy of the “Cyrus H. McCormick Professorship of Theology ?” What parallel is there between the case of Dr. Lord and that of the distinguished divine of Danville ? Where have I arraigned him in regard to his patriotic services or stand for the country ? What peurile clap-trap is this to excite popular sympathy in his behalf ? I have only spoken of him as acting in connection with the party by which the founders and original supporters of the Seminary were proscribed and set aside, “solely on political grounds”—or on the ground of being opposed to the *agitation of the Church and Seminary* by the discussion of political questions ; and *arraigned* him in my first letter on the ground only of alleged personal offenses to myself and friends, that made it wholly inconsistent and improper for him to seek and occupy the Chair bearing my name.

*These “charges”* he *denied* ; and, after having been *proved*, instead of acknowledging his *errors*, as a Christian professor should do, (and as he had *promised*,) he says : “To your profuse personal aspersions I make no reply. To do so would not become me. Of the mass of second-hand puerilities you adduce as their ground, every one is either wholly untrue, or it is untrue in the relation and aspect in which you give it” !



Dr. Lord may hope to turn aside the force of the testimony adduced by me from gentlemen whose names I offered to give, if called for, and every one of whom, for intelligence and veracity, is his peer—by characterizing their statements as “personal aspersions,” “second hand peurilities,” &c. If, however, Dr. Lord can afford to rest under such disinterested and responsible testimony, in direct contradiction to his unsustained and personally interested assertions, both those who make them and myself can afford to bear his imputations.

A more manly and Christian course, in the judgment of impartial men, jealous of the veracity and purity of the ministry, would have been for him to have demanded an investigation. His veracity and Christian honor, if his statements were sustained, might then be vindicated. Such investigation he manifests no disposition to court.

In my first letter on this subject, I said that the General Assembly of 1866 was informed that “*a large minority of the Board of Directors had protested against the transfer of Dr. Lord to the Professorship of Theology, on the ground that such transfer would be far from satisfactory to the friends of the Seminary who had contributed to its endowment, sustained and carried forward the Institution successfully to that time, as well as to myself.*” In that letter I did not *desire to raise the question of Dr. Lord’s unfitness* for that Professorship, further than was stated.

But the opposition of the old members of the Board to his transfer *went further*, viz.: that he lacked the proper qualifications for the position; and that he was not a thorough Old School Presbyterian in Theology—more Congregational in his training and sympathies than Presbyterian. These points were urged in the Board of Directors against his transfer; and I thus refer to them in connection with his *repeated challenge*, as this: “Not that the *senior Professor* has been remiss in diligence or fidelity with respect to any one duty devolved upon him by his office; not that the young men resorting here are not faithfully and thoroughly instructed in the whole sum of Christian truth and duty bearing on the office and work of the Gospel ministry,”

etc.; while *I clearly showed*, in my letter of 16th January, that the *spirit* inculcated in his previous letter was *anything else* than such as is “becoming in the office and work of the Gospel ministry”!

But Dr. Lord’s “financial agent, of eminent fitness and excellence,” comes to the rescue!

In my letter of November 17th, immediately after being called on by this agent, I said: “And if, *as stated to me by Mr. Truax*, the Seminary is now embarrassed for funds, and with no reasonable prospect of obtaining them—some of the few subscribers to the McMaster endowment refusing to pay because of the failure to raise the \$50,000 proposed—in this condition of things, I would re-affirm my willingness to co-operate in the support of the Seminary, and my desire to assist in placing it on a solid financial basis,” etc. To this statement the agent did not at the time, and does not now object. What addition to this statement, then, is found in my last letter, to which he excepts? I therein say: “And after the other side having utterly failed to obtain the requisite means for sustaining the Institution—the ‘financial agent of eminent fitness and excellence’ having informed me in connection with his application for help, that he had thoroughly canvassed Illinois, Ohio, and Iowa, and nothing further could be depended upon from these States; and that the prospect was not good for collecting for the Seminary in Wisconsin or Minnesota—after these things, I say, and informed, as I was also by the *Treasurer* that there would not be money enough to get through the session with,” etc.

Here now are the two statements, and they are *substantially* the same, and corroborated by the statement of the *Treasurer* as to the actual state of the finances, so far as he could know. In my reference to the agent’s statement in the connection last used by me, I mentioned more particularly the different States, as referred to by him. And the only additional remark I have to make on his “*correction*,” is that, if his “*faith*,” being without works, is not “*dead*,” the occasion as understood for my proposed assistance is not only removed, but the \$75,000 may be *returned to us with-*

*out inconvenience* ; in which case both parties may work satisfactorily in the future, though *we* should have lost the fruit of our labors and means in the past.

Feeling as I did about the Seminary, I *may*, under the circumstances explained, have offered to "give" *more* "money" than was called for, and thus have excited Dr. Lord's suspicion that my object was not only to "*buy* sacred rights and powers," but also to "give money" for the "Cyrus H. McCormick Chair of Theology." If so, I can but assure him of his error. While his "dishonored bond" argument was one directly to save himself from the "*sacrifice*" to which he referred, I can conceive of no motive personal to myself either to "*buy*" him off, or "*buy*" up the Seminary ; and if, therefore, (in his language) "that venerable body can think it *just*, *because* of my (his) *cordial agreement and co-operation with it*"—to save him from this "*sacrifice*," I shall be content.

*Rights of property* involved are of course secondary questions ; but, under the operations of *wrong* done to one party, and demands both "legal and moral" made upon that party, it must not be supposed that in the contingency of such wrong being *perpetuated*, similar "*legal and moral*" claims on the other side cannot be alluded to. It is very *modest* to say : We have taken the Seminary as we proposed to do, with the Chair of Theology just where it stood in 1866, when we threw you "overboard." We did then propose that, whereas you had to that time done nobly, you should have *full credit* for all you had so well accomplished ; but, excuse us, we have now men and means and will relieve you of all further care and responsibility in the premises. You have done half the whole work of completing this noble Institution. We will take to ourselves "the Chair of Theology and a working majority of the Directors," (by displacing those who had so well till then discharged their duty,) and will complete the work, and will hold and run the Institution for you. You *protest* to be sure, but what of that ; we have just now a majority in the Assembly, and can do the work *better* than you, while you have done your part of it !

Soon, however, though with a new and approved collecting agent, we fail to get the "money" necessary for the work—the very *first* instalment towards *our* work—the Mac Master endowment, "*depended upon*" fails—and we send our Committee to you. Ah, if you please, the chairs are all filled now, and your fourth instalment would be acceptable. *Dr. Lord* thunders, "Your plighted faith," "Your disbonored bond," etc.—in effect: "I occupy the Cyrus H. McCormick Chair of Theology, and want the bond paid!" And of course the "old friends," superseded and superannuated, being just where the General Assembly placed them, should stay there most quietly! The idea that they should, under such circumstances, imagine themselves entitled to *any share of what they had themselves provided*, and so sacredly given to their "*new FRIENDS*," would be—"to say the least of it"—"*Simony !!*"

Respectfully,

C. H. McCORMICK,

---

LETTER FROM REV. T. V. MOORE, D. D.

NASHVILLE, March 5, 1869.

REV. DR. LORD—DEAR SIR: You will pardon me if I say that your reply of the 3d inst. is somewhat extraordinary. You have made in the *Presbyter* a statement about me which is untrue and injurious, in that, *prior to the fall of fort Sumter*, I was a disunionist, and had spoken contemptuously of the North. I solemnly aver that both these statements are untrue. When I call your attention to them, you say that they rested on statements made in the *New York Observer*, and perhaps, the *Presbyterian*; and, if their statements were incorrect, you have no doubt they would willingly make the due correction. To this I reply: 1st, That no such statements were published in those papers at any time; for I saw them regularly, and I challenge you or any one else to find

any such allegations in them at that time. You have confounded statements published during the war with that you allege to have been published previous to April, 1861.

Hence, the statement was not with these papers, but with you; and they might well decline to correct incorrect statements which they never made.

2. Were it possible for these papers to make any such correction, it would not reach the case; for your statement was made by the *Presbyter*, whose readers may never see these papers—and made, not as a contingent statement, based on the authority of others, but on your own authority, the responsibility being thus assumed by yourself.

You speak of Mr. McCormick's "unmanly attack" on you. Is your assault on me any more manly? You have dragged my name before the public, needlessly, as it seems to me; and, on a statement, the responsibility of which you formally assume, made a charge against me which is untrue, and incapable of proof by the witnesses you cite; and when I ask a manly reparation of the wrong you have done me, you invite me to ask the news-papers to correct misstatements which I know they never made, and were made by you alone. Is that manly? Is that bearing true witness against your neighbor? I know that a strong prejudice exists against me in the North; and it does so because there have been so many who, like you, have made false statements about me which they had not the manliness to correct when pointed out to them. Pardon me if I speak plainly, for I think you have acted in a very improper manner, and I feel bound to say so in plain words. I do not now expect any reparation of the injury you have done me; but I feel bound in Christian fidelity to say that you have done me this wrong; and I hope the time may come when God will lead you to see it, and to act justly and fairly to even a poor, hated rebel, as I suppose you regard me to be, whose good name is of no sort of consequence to you. I greatly regret the necessity of writing these things; but your own sensitiveness in regard to the statements of others about you, will, I hope, be my apology.

I am yours, etc.,

T. V. MOORE.

*Rev. Willis Lord, D. D., Chicago.*

*From the Presbyterian Banner, March 24, 1869.*

WRITTEN BY DR. JUNKIN,

*Late Pastor of the North Church, Chicago.*

DR. LORD AND MR McCORMICK.

MESSRS. EDITORS.—It is very important not only for the interests of the “Seminary of the North-West,” but for the welfare of all similar institutions in our Church and country, that the dispute about the Seminary in question be settled, not in a partisan spirit, but in a spirit of Christian fairness and equity. I deplore this dispute most profoundly. It is especially to be lamented, that sharp personalities should have entered into it; for they always complicate the real issues. Nor is it less deplorable that a disposition should appear in any quarter, to gather round the true issues the blinding mists of political passions.

In what I propose to say, I shall endeavor to deal candidly with the real issues; and that, not with a view to do injury to either of the gentlemen named at the head of this article, but simply to do justice to them and the cause. Permit then a few remarks, and, 1. I am sincerely of opinion that injustice is done to Mr. McCormick, by the allegation that he desires to control the Seminary, or dictate its management in the interest of anything beyond the legitimate objects of its foundation. I know that gentleman well; and know him to be unusually marked by a spirit of *tolerance* and exemption from a disposition to *dictate* or *control*. In this estimate I will be sustained by all candid men in Chicago, who know the man. I have had frequent conversations with him about the interests of the Seminary, and of the North Church; and can truly say, that his freedom from the domineering disposition that has been attributed to him, was more complete than I could conceive to be possible, in such a set of circumstances.

I know, too, that in the treatment of men in social life, or in business, sacred or secular, he was never influenced by their differing from him in political opinions. Many of his employees and confidential agents differed with him in political questions. In selecting attorneys and other professional agents, I happen to know that he often chose his decided political opponents. I never knew a man less disposed to yield to such prejudices.

2. If our brother Lord had been content to retain the chair to which he was elected, and for which Mr. McCormick deemed him qualified, no objection would ever have been raised by the founder of the Seminary. It was the proposal to transfer Dr. Lord to a chair bearing the founder's name, by a process that *violated the trust*—to a chair for which he was not deemed so competent as for the one to which he was elected—that awaked the founder's apprehensions.

3. It is a fact, which no man posted in the history of the Seminary can question, that there was a *very explicit understanding*, in the General Assembly, at the time the Seminary was located at Chicago, in regard to the type of theology that was to prevail in it, and in regard to the general policy that was to lie at its foundation. I was at the Assembly in Indianapolis—heard the debates—was cognizant of the issues decided by the vote in regard to location (Indianapolis or Chicago;) and *know*, as every other man there knew, that the friends of a distinctive Old School Theology and of the conservative basis of 1845 voted for Chicago, and the more *progressive* brethren voted for Indianapolis. Had the latter prevailed, Dr. MacMaster would have been the Professor of Theology; as it was, Dr. Rice was chosen as the exponent of the objects and platform of the Institution. The General Assembly perfectly understood this at the time. Mr. McCormick so understood it, and it was with this explicit understanding that he made his munificent gift.

4. The gift was also made upon the basis of the "plan for Theological Seminaries," adopted by the General Assembly, at the time the first one (Princeton) was established;

and which has been the law of the Church ever since. That “*plan*” prescribes very explicitly the mode of electing professors; and makes no provision for the *smuggling* process, by which a professor elected to one chair, is transferred to another by the manipulation of a committee, without prayer, and without a ballot. It was by this process Dr. Lord reached the chair of Theology; a chair to which in *ordinary times* it is hardly likely he would be *originally* chosen. And I do not wonder that the founder of the Seminary should feel reluctant to see the chair of Theology filled by an *indirection*; and that by a man who had assumed, without just cause, as Mr. McCormick thought, an attitude of personal hostility to himself. This reluctance was doubtless, increased by the fact that this transfer was effected, by its managers, not so much out of regard to the peculiar qualifications of the candidate, but on the score of his “loyalty” to a particular set of political opinions; which, too, the incumbent had but recently embraced, in obedience to the current of events.

5. I was personally observant at the time the manœuvering was in progress, for effecting this transfer, of the means resorted to; and if the painful necessity of a full *expose* should arise, can give it, backed by proof: but I hope such will never prove necessary. Human frailty can be proven by Scripture, without such a demonstration, as the secret history of this thing would furnish.

6. The writer of this article was made the unsuspecting and unconscious agent, by a gentleman whom I will not *now* name, of beginning the process of revolutionizing the Seminary of the North-West, as early as the Newark Assembly (1864), and has watched the progress of this unworthy effort ever since, with sorrow and humiliation. And I desire soberly to ask my brethren in this Church, whether they are prepared fully to inaugurate the custom of determining the theology and the directorate of our Seminaries by considerations, not pertaining to the kingdom and cause of Christ, but pertaining to questions of national and State politics? Is this patriotic dodge, this “loyalty” dodge, by which some men have managed to mount into notoriety, to



last for ever? Are we never to "have peace?" Are men to be proscribed, and the Church's benefactors denounced, because they, now that the war is ended, desire Christian magnanimity to be extended to our misguided enemies? I was very sorry to see my brother Lord, in his last letter, attempt to make a point against Mr. McCormick, for having carried out the Saviour's maxim—"love your enemies"—and aiming to prove him a Southern sympathiser—because he gave ten thousand dollars to the College that bears the name of Washington and located in Mr. McCormick's native county. If ever the Southern people are to be delivered from their political mistakes, and made a valuable portion of our population, it will be by education: and is it a crime in Mr. McCormick, to pity them in their poverty, and extend a helping hand? When one of our Generals tore down the statue of Washington, from that very College, and bore it off, a trophy of war, General Grant, our present worthy President, ordered it to be sent back and replaced. Is the President a Southern sympathiser?

7. The phraseology, "The friends of the Seminary," is a stereotype phrase, in the parliamentary and historical language of our Church. Very often have we heard it from the lips of directors, professors, and friends of Princeton, Alleghany, and other Seminaries; and its meaning is well understood, and it embodies an idea that is right, valuable, and important. It means that every institution of the kind is placed, by the Church, in the hands of persons who have taken and expect to take a special interest in founding, maintaining and managing it. And so long as it is managed, by these "friends," in accordance with the objects of its foundation and the wishes of the Church, it is wise to leave it in the hands of its "friends." Princeton, Alleghany, and Danville always expected and received from the Assembly "a working majority" of "the friends of the Seminary"—is the Seminary of the North-West to be blessed with "a working majority" of its foes? This policy was partially initiated in 1864—boldly attempted in 1865—and is now unblushingly avowed, by certain men, far from Chicago, who never have done anything towards its prosperity, except it

be to lead an unsuspecting Assembly to give to those who would kill it, "a working majority" in the Directorate. Let it be understood that this policy is fairly inaugurated, and that our Seminaries are to be made the stakes in ecclesiastical games of bluff; and who will contribute to endowments hereafter? Let it be understood that the munificence of a Christian gentleman can be not only perverted from the specific object for which he gave it, but even used for the sustenance of persons who become his enemies without cause—and farewell to such benefactions, so long as man is man. \* \* \* \* \*

#### NOUS VERRONS.

P. S.—Since writing the above, I have received a *Banner* of the 10th inst., in which, in noticing the catalogue of the Seminary, to which, it seems, is appended or prefixed a historical statement, you draw the inference that the "original friends of the Seminary" is a phrase which signifies something very different from what is intended by those who use it." This inference is one very natural for you to draw, with no information upon the subject, but what appears in the "history." Hereby hangs a tale. Dr. Lord, during the sessions of the Assembly of 1864, approached the Chairman of the Committee on Theological Seminaries, (who is a very unsuspecting man,) and made such representations as induced the Chairman, and through him the Committee, to adopt this little "history" into the report of the Committee anent the Seminary of the North-West; and it was adopted and reported, and, I think, adopted by the Assembly. Though brought to the Chairman by Dr. Lord, and though he requested that it should be incorporated in the Committee's report, it was not in his handwriting; but, (probably) in that of the then Moderator of the Assembly, Dr. Wood. That brother (Dr. W.) subsequently brought out this "history" in an address delivered before the Directors of the Seminary, in the North church, Chicago; somewhat curiously attributing the "history" to the pastor of that church, (Dr. D. X. Junkin,) who had been the Chairman of the Committee of the Assembly of 1864.

After the address was over, I heard a member of the Board of Directors speaking in terms of severe condemnation of the "history," denying its verity, and intimating that it was part of the process, then going forward, of revolutionizing the management of the Seminary. Dr. Junkin was present, and said on the spot, that he was not the author of the "history;" that Dr. Lord had requested him, as Chairman of the Committee, to incorporate it in the report to the Assembly—that he had no time to verify its statements, but took them upon Dr. Lord's representation. This is the history of this "history"—and fairness demands a remark or two.

1st. It proves that so early as 1864 a scheme was set on foot to get the Seminary, which the General Assembly had, by a vote of 251 to 82, taken out of the hands of certain "friends" and put into the hands of other persons, smuggled *back* into the hands of the same "original friends," with Dr. Joseph Monfort as their leader! It was a scheme to undo what the Assembly of 1859 had so emphatically done.

2d. This "history" was written when Mr. McCormick was in Europe, where he had been for some years, and at a time when he was taking no part in the affairs either of Church or State.

3d. If you will look at the Minutes of the Assembly of 1859, you will see evidence enough of this fact, viz.: that whilst, with a view to conciliate all our people in the West and North-West, and also for the purpose of preventing the existence of two rival Seminaries, the Assembly of 1859, did take the old New Albany Seminary under its control; the institution then established was, to all intents and purposes, a new one. The Assembly went so far as to vacate the seats of the old directors, and make all things new. In the resolutions on p. 225, the Seminary is spoken of as one "about to be established by this General Assembly," and the Assembly thanks Mr. McCormick for his liberal donation, and accepts it "upon the terms and conditions therein mentioned."

N. V.

MR. McCORMICK'S ORIGINAL PROPOSITION TO  
THE ASSEMBLY OF 1859.

NEW YORK, MARCH 27, 1869.

Messrs. Editors—I am induced to inclose herewith, for publication in the NORTHWESTERN PRESBYTERIAN, a copy of the paper presented by me to the General Assembly of 1859, at Indianapolis, containing the terms of my offer to that Assembly to endow the *Theological Seminary of the Northwest*, by the *postscript* to an article I find in the last number of the *Presbyterian Banner*, over the assumed name, "*Nous Verrons.*"

The "*history*" of this Seminary, as given by Dr. Lord to the chairman of the committee of the Assembly of 1864, for publication, had escaped my attention, and I send you this paper that the matter may be set right.

It will be observed from this paper that I say: "Whereas, \* \* *it is proposed* that the said General Assembly shall take the charge and control of a *Theological Seminary proposed to be established* for the use and benefit of the *Northwestern portion of the Presbyterian Church, &c.*"

"Regarding, as I do, this proposed enterprise as one of the greatest importance, not only to the religious, but *also to the general interests of the country*, and thus being desirous of securing for it," etc.

"*Provided*, that the said General Assembly shall take charge of said *Theological Seminary, as aforesaid*; and provided that the donation shall be applied to the *endowment of said Seminary—\$25,000 for each professor to said Seminary appointed or elected by said General Assembly*"—*not transferred* from one Chair to another.

The article in question, says: "The Assembly went so far as to vacate the seats of the old Directors, and make all things new. In the resolutions on page 225 the Seminary is spoken of as one 'about to be established by this General Assembly,' and the Assembly thanks Mr. McCormick for his liberal donation, and accepts it 'upon the terms and conditions therein mentioned.'"

COPY.

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 13, '59.

WHEREAS, At the approaching meeting of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, at Indianapolis, Ind., (on the 19th inst.,) it is proposed that the said General Assembly shall take the charge and control of a Theological Seminary, proposed to be established for the use and benefit of the Northwestern portion of the Presbyterian Church, select a site for the location of the same; and appoint a time for opening it:

Now, therefore, regarding, as I do, this proposed enterprise as of the greatest importance, not only to the religious, but also to the general interests of the country; and thus being desirous of securing for it such assistance as I now may have the means and privilege of doing, I hereby covenant and agree, as follows, viz:

*Provided*, That the said General Assembly shall at its next meeting (during this month) take charge of said Theological Seminary as aforesaid, and locate, or provide for the location of it, within the limits of the City of Chicago, in the State of Illinois, or at the most eligible locality that can be had within one and a half miles from said city limits; and *provided* that the donation hereinafter offered shall be applied exclusively to the *endowment* of professorships in said Seminary, I bind myself, my heirs, etc., to pay to the Directors or properly authorized agents of said Seminary, the sum of one hundred thousand dollars (\$100,000), to be paid on the following terms and conditions, viz.: Twenty-five thousand dollars (\$25,000,) for each Professor to said Seminary, appointed or elected by said General Assembly, and payable in four equal annual instalments, with six per cent. interest until paid—the first of which to be due and payable one year after the opening of said Seminary, with the privilege of paying the *principal* at any time in advance of being due, if so preferred by me, or my heirs. As witness my hand the date first above written.

(Signed,)

C. H. McCORMICK.

## LETTER FROM DR. MONFORT.

CINCINNATI, *April 14, 1869.**C. H. McCormick, Esq. :*

DEAR SIR—As you are now a reader of the *Presbyter*, you have seen my report of the doings of the Board of Directors of the Theological Seminary of the North-West, at its late meeting. You will have noticed that J. G. Monfort, S. T. Wilson, F. T. Brown, J. L. Williams, and J. C. Grier, were appointed a committee to report next year in regard to the matter of your endowment, with instructions to have a conference with you on the subject. This action was unanimous, and several brethren of the minority complimented me for my remarks in favor of this motion. I gave three reasons: 1. We must take some action, so as not to waive our claim for the \$25,000. 2. We ought to take a year, so as fully to find out what we ought to do. 3. I said that I had good hope that time would enable us to settle this matter in a way satisfactory to all; and I explained that reunion with the New School would be followed by an immediate change for the better between the North and the South. I stated a conversation between Dr. Nelson and myself, in which he expressed views the same as you will find in his remarks at a meeting in this city last week, of which he gives an abstract in the last *Presbyter*. I gave the views of other leading New School men, as agreeing with Dr. Nelson. I said that immediately after reunion with the New School, we would begin to drift towards reunion with the South. I said I believed that as soon as Mr. McCormick began to see this, his feelings would change, and he would help the movement, and, with it, the difficulties of the Seminary would be removed. These are the facts of the case, whatever you may hear to the contrary.

I greatly desire that things may, within a year, be put in such shape that you may feel well to all the authorities of the Seminary, and have that place in the esteem of all to

which you are entitled by your munificent donation. This cannot be attained by giving you the control of the Professorships or "a working majority" in the Board, for this perpetuates strife and distrust, and implies that parties are to be kept up. It may be done by a feeling on your part, that our alienations in the whole country are to end on terms equal and fraternal. My impression is that your objections to the management, which you think are, to some extent, personal, have all grown out of public questions, even those in which Dr. Lord is involved, and that hence, as soon as those public questions are in the way of adjustment, your feelings will change; and the same will be true in regard to the feelings of others toward yourself. This will take time. If Horace Greely and Henry Ward Beecher can conciliate, surely our church can. If our Government can pacify the South, our church may do the same.

I write for the purpose of bringing the work of the Committee before you, and asking if you are free to have a full and fraternal interview. At least Mr. Williams and myself will have an opportunity of seeing you during the meeting of the Assembly, if you are willing.

Yours truly,

J. G. MONFORT,

178 Elm Street, Cincinnati.

---

REPLY TO DR. MONFORT'S LETTER.

40, FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK,

April 29th, 1869.

REV. J. G. MONFORT, D. D.—*Dear Sir*:—I avail myself of the first opportunity I have had to reply to your letter of the 14th inst., in which you say, "J. G. Monfort, S. T. Wilson, F. T. Brown, J. L. Williams, and J. C. Grier, were appointed a Committee to report next year in regard

to the matter of our endowment, with instructions to have a conference with you on the subject."

In reply to your "purpose of bringing the work of the Committee before you and asking if you are free to have a full and fraternal interview;" and to your remark that "at least Mr. Williams and myself will have an opportunity of seeing you during the meeting of the Assembly if you are willing," I have not the least objection to such an interview.

But, as to the first of your three reasons given for the unanimous action of the Board of Directors appointing this Committee, permit me to say that you need have no apprehension of the loss of your "*claim, from delay*," "for the \$25,000;" and that, from the second, I regret to learn that you think it necessary "to take a year fully to find out what we ought to do." In relation to your third reason, after what I have written on this subject, I need hardly say that I also regret that you should think *any question* of "reunion with the New School," or of "change for the better between the North and the South," should delay, *a year, justice* to myself and the party with whom I have acted.

Up to the point of your having failed to publish in the *Presbyter* my reply to Dr. Lord's second communication, I have been gratified at the *fair* manner in which you treated this Seminary controversy, while I had hoped that you would be found ready *without delay* to meet this question on its merits; and while, perhaps, no one thing more than to do simple justice in this case would favor an early restoration of fraternal feeling between the North and South; and which, thus promptly done, could not fail to counteract the insults offered that people (South) by *Dr. Lord's* denunciations of them.

So far as my own "feelings" are concerned, the best possible *evidence* "that our alienations in the whole country are to end on terms equal and fraternal" might be furnished by those who *took from* the original founders and supporters of the Seminary "a working majority in the Board," and "the control of the Professorships," in first *restoring*



what had thus been taken from them. First restore to every one his *rights*, then do no more wrong. It seems to me more that "*parties* are to be *kept up*" when the *party having improperly usurped* control insists that to ask the return of it can only "perpetuate strife and distrust!"

Is it in the *golden rule*, much less in human nature, for *us* to "feel well towards all the authorities of the Seminary," while those authorities refuse to re-instate us in our rightful positions, from which they *ejected us* without a shadow of cause? Is it to be supposed that *I* can "*feel well* towards" a man who persists in the occupancy of the "Cyrus H. McCormick Professorship of Theology," after having triumphantly exposed the unwarranted means resorted to by him in getting himself placed there, when *no high-minded* man could have been induced, under such circumstances, to have accepted the position? And should I be supposed now to "*feel well*" towards a proposition that, in connection with the late action of the Board of Directors, and of *The Chicago Presbytery*, implies the *perpetuation of the wrong* done by the Assembly to my Conservative friends, and the *continuance* of a man in the said Professorship of Theology who, by his course as developed in his correspondence with me, has proved himself so unworthy of it? Never! And if, to "have that place in the esteem of all to which you (I) are entitled by your (my) munificent donation," *this is necessary*, I must remain without it, much as that may be desired.

The *wonder* with me is, when "Horace Greely and Henry Ward Beecher can conciliate" the *political* differences of the country, how such extreme *Church factions* could, in the year '69, be found to rule the action in the Seminary meeting of Directors, and in the Chicago Presbytery, as was done!

Duly appreciating your expressed disposition to *conciliate the South*, and trusting that *you*, sir, will in due time feel the propriety in this Seminary matter of being "*just* before being *generous*."

I am, yours truly,

C. H. McCORMICK.

*Editorial From The North Western Presbyterian,  
May 8th, 1869.*

THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY OF THE  
NORTH WEST.

A PLAIN STATEMENT.

The controversy in which this institution has been involved is universally deplored. A most important interest of the church has thereby been greatly embarrassed and retarded in its growth and usefulness. Its future existence is even believed to be seriously endangered. Brethren who before had harmoniously co-operated in its support, have been divided and alienated. Many who were its warm friends and liberal supporters have become estranged from it. The church and the cause of religion have been scandalized. In every aspect this controversy is sad and painful in the extreme. To no one has it been more embarrassing than to us who are called to conduct a church journal in the field of its existence. We have desired to give to this institution a most earnest and cordial support. Not to be able to do this from any cause has been to us embarrassing and painful beyond expression.

For prudential reasons we have declined to take part, editorially, in the controversy which has been pending between the liberal founder of the Seminary and one of its Professors, or to express any opinion editorially in reference to it. With the general controversy touching the management and control of the Seminary, we as journalists, and the church at large, have the deepest interest. What this Seminary is and continues to be, our church in the Northwest must soon become. Its injury or failure would be an untold calamity.

The questions which enter into the controversy in which this institution is now involved, lie deeper and run farther back than the differences which have arisen between Dr. Lord and Mr. McCormick. As was stated in a very calm and judicious article by one thoroughly posted in seminary matters in the West, in our issue of the 24th ult., over the signature of "Presbyter," "the origin of the present difficulty lies back twenty years and east of Chicago. It had a connection with New Albany soon after the death of the venerable Dr. Matthews. It may be traced as far back as the attempted removal of Hanover College about 1844."

As was before stated by us, for twenty years our church in the West has been torn and distracted by controversies with respect to the founding, management and control of Theological Seminaries. With these former controversies the present writer had no connection. Of them he has no particular knowledge. With respect to them he wishes to express no opinion. They occurred before he was called to the West. It is sufficient for our present purpose to know that they existed—that they have been evil and almost only evil, resulting in the death of the Seminary at New Albany, in greatly crippling the one at Danville, in the entire failure of the attempt to found the Theological Seminary of the Northwest under Synodical control, and now threatens this same institution under the control of the Assembly with similar embarrassments and disasters. Whether these controversies have been the result of serious differences as to important ecclesiastical or doctrinal questions, of personal ambition and conflicts, or of mere party strife, is not for us to determine. They existed. Their influence was most unhappy. If possible they should have been avoided. By no means should they be perpetuated.

The inquiry which we proposed, some time since, in connection with this subject, in due time to raise was—Is there no generally recognized principle, by which the Theological Seminaries of our church, under the control of the Assembly, may be or are managed in a manner alike fair and just to all, and by adherence to which, on the part of the Assem-

bly, these conflicts may be prevented, and those who embark in building up such institutions may be allowed to go on and do all the good they can unmolested by those who may be unwilling to co-operate with them.

We then said, in view of these long protracted controversies :

It is time to inquire earnestly whether there is not some true and just principle upon which our theological seminaries can be established and managed, so as to avoid such conflicts. One set of brethren band together with a sincere desire to advance the kingdom of God, by rearing an institution for the training of an able and godly ministry. Another set of brethren, distrusting the purity of their motives, and suspecting them of being actuated by an ambitious intent of lording it over God's heritage, think they will be doing God service by frustrating all their endeavors. A conflict ensues, and a great work, honestly begun, and with the ordinary amount of good intentions common to imperfectly sanctified men, is retarded or wholly thwarted. Now, the inquiry we propose to raise is, is there no way to prevent such collisions, and to allow each set of brethren to go forward and do all the good they can, without let or hindrance from their unconfiding brethren.

This is the inquiry we now propose to prosecute in the interests of peace. In order to secure this most desirable result, some principle, at once fair, equitable and just, must be adopted and enforced. Or if adopted and enforced in certain cases with the best results, it should be alike applied to all the seminaries of the church.

The whole church is interested alike in the settlement of the present controversy as to the seminary of the Northwest on true and just principles. For if wrong is allowed as to the management and control of one seminary, the party perpetrating it will thereby be only strengthened and emboldened, and soon the same wrong may be repeated in regard to the others.

What principle then is there, by the adoption and enforcement of which on the part of the Assembly, the management and control of the seminaries may be so arranged as

to secure these results? We answer, these results may be secured *by the Assembly leaving the management and control of these institutions in the hands of their friends.* Their friends are their supporters.

The limitations to this control are to be found in the constitution of the seminary and the government of the church. So long as they are conducted in accordance with their constitution, their management can safely be left in the hands of their friends or supporters.

This principle is recognized and acted on by Presbyteries in the government of individual churches, and has been the principle upon which the General Assembly has always acted, in the management of the other seminaries.

For example, when any sufficient number of persons band together for the purpose of seeking a church organization and the support of the stated ministry, and apply to a Presbytery to be organized, all that the Presbytery requires upon the part of the private members in such cases, is a credible profession of their faith in Christ, and on the part of the pastor, ruling elders and deacons whom they elect, adoption of the Confession of Faith, Form of Government, Book of Discipline, and Directory for Worship contained in our Standards. The management of the church, within the prescribed limits of the constitution, the Presbytery leaves in the hands of its members and supporters. It never interferes except in case of irregularities of administration. So long as the church is conducted in a regular manner as to doctrine, government, discipline and worship, the Presbytery neither interferes itself, nor allows any other church or individual to interfere in its management. The result is peace, harmony and efficiency.

So also when any number of ministers, ruling elders, and members, are impelled for the glory of God, and the advancement of his kingdom, to associate together to build up a Theological Seminary, to train candidates for the gospel ministry in the knowledge of the Word of God, and in the doctrines, order, and worship summarily set forth in the standards of the Presbyterian church, and to cultivate in them, by all the means which God has appointed in his word, the

life of true godliness, and thus aim to raise up a succession of able, faithful and godly ministers of the divine word; they go to the General Assembly, and ask that venerable body to organize such an institution, and proffer to the Assembly the means for its support. The General Assembly at once accepts their offer and grants their request, and elects directors and professors, and directs them to organize under a specified constitution, the solemn adoption of which is required of each person accepting office in the same. The Seminary is constituted for certain specified ends. These ends are expressly stated in the constitution. Officers are chosen for the performance of certain well-defined duties. These ends being secured, the Assembly leaves the management of that institution in the hands of its friends. So long as the ends of its institution are faithfully secured, the Assembly neither interferes in its management, nor allows any one else to interfere, to distract or hinder the good work. This principle being adhered to, the institution has peace, stability, efficiency. There is encouragement under such circumstances to contribute to its support and establishment. Those who thus contribute will have a voice in its management. The funds thus set apart they have every assurance will be neither wasted nor perverted. To leave the management of the institution thus in the hands of its supporters is reasonable and just. The extent of their control is bounded by the government of the church and the constitution of the Seminary. Deny this principle and confidence is shaken, the benevolence of the church restrained; and all hands engaged in the church's work paralyzed. Now this is the principle upon which the General Assembly has acted in regard to the Seminaries at Princeton, Alleghany and Danville. On this principle the General Assembly at Indianapolis, in 1859, accepted the proffered endowment for the Seminary of the North-West, and elected its Directors and Faculty at that time. This very principle was distinctly announced, and universally accepted by all concerned at that time, and that too, by a representative man of the same party, who are now trampling it in the dust. In a letter published in the *Presbyterian Expositor*, in April, 1859,

by Dr. John M. Lowry, then pastor of the church at Fort Wayne, Ind., after stating, 1. That we are now agreed to the Assembly's control; 2. That it should not be sectional; 3. That the enterprise is important and action should be prompt and wise, he expressly says: "*It is now the policy of the church to place the control of these institutions virtually in the hands of their friends.*" (See *Expositor*, Vol. 2, p. 196.) The word *virtually* was italicised by him.

This was the principle upon which they then proposed that the seminary to be placed under the control of the Assembly should be managed. Its control was to be virtually in the hands of its friends. This announcement was made at the very time it was proposed to transfer it to the General Assembly. And on this principle the seminary was organized. On this principle it was conducted with peace and efficiency until the meeting of the Assembly at Pittsburgh, in 1865. Then it was, when Dr. J. G. Monfort was made Chairman of the Committee on Seminaries, that the first open and avowed attempt was made to wrest its management out of the hands of its founders and friends, and place it in the hands of those in whose hands the New Albany Seminary had died, and the Seminary for the Northwest, under Synodical control had utterly failed. In the hands of its founders and friends it had been wisely and successfully managed. No one ever heard any charge of maladministration brought against them. No one has pretended to allege that while the management was left in their hands, it was not the aim of the Directors to have the students faithfully trained in the doctrines, order and worship of the Presbyterian Church, and to have fostered in them a life of true godliness. It is equally well known that it was their constant endeavor to do all in their power to make the institution in all respects acceptable to the region of the church whose interests it was specially designed to promote. They invited the co-operation of all their brethren. They aimed to give each Synod in the Northwest a fair representation in the Directory. And while in their hands, at the annual meeting of the Board of Directors in the

spring of 1866, when the new friends first made their appearance in the Board, the Treasurer reported:

1. An endowment of	- - - - -	\$100,000.00
2. Twenty-five acres of land secured by them within the city limits, then valued at \$50,000, now valued at \$220,000	- - -	220,000.00
3. Seminary building erected and paid for by them	- - - - -	25,000.00
4. Furniture and improvements of grounds	-	10,000.00
5. Library	- - - - -	7,000.00
6. Scholarships	- - - - -	10,000.00
7. Lot and lands	- - - - -	3,600.00
8. Bequest	- - - - -	10,000.00
9. Notes in hands of agents	- - - - -	10,908.15
		<hr/>
		\$396,508.15

In addition to the above, during the same period, there had been disbursed in running the Seminary for salaries of professors, agents, and contingent fund, \$77,154.38.

The debts of Synodical Seminary had also been paid, and the institution was free of debt.

Now of what do the friends and founders of this institution complain? They complain that a party in the church in the West, in whose hands the Seminary at New Albany had died, in whose hands the proposed Synodical Seminary of the North-West had most signally failed; a party who expressly agreed to transfer the Seminary to the control of the Assembly, with the avowal of the principle, that it was the policy of the church to leave the control of these institutions in the hands of their friends, and who voted against its location at Chicago in the Assembly, and in favor of Indianapolis; and who, after the Seminary had been located and organized at Chicago by an overwhelming vote of the church at large, and by a large majority of the votes of the Northwest represented in the Assembly, refused to co-operate in building it up; not only so, but when the Synod of Cincinnati, in whose bounds this party has its head, had expressly declared that it sustained no other relation to this



*Seminary than to all the other Seminaries of the church ;* that such a party, at a time of great excitement in the church and country, without due information being given to the Assembly of their relations to the institution or their designs in regard to it, and by imputations upon the views of those in charge of it in relation to the great questions upon which the country was so deeply agitated, which were at once as false as they were offensive—should be allowed to displace from their positions of trust and responsibility those whom they themselves acknowledged had done nobly for the same, and usurp for themselves the control and management of the institution and its funds ; this is the matter of which they complain. It is a proceeding so unjust and so out of character, that it is to them a subject of amazement that any man or set of men could be found, professing the Christian name, who could persuade themselves to do it, much less obtain the high and sacred sanction of the General Assembly to so unjust a transaction.

Then what has this party accomplished for the Seminary since the spring of 1866, when they entered the Board ? To say nothing of the controversy in which the institution has been involved, the alienations produced, and the injury to the peace and harmony of the churches of the Northwest, which have been occasioned, what have they done for the institution, financially, since their advent to the Board ? The land, buildings, library, furniture, etc., are just the same as in 1866. In 1866, the Treasurer reported the cash assets of the Seminary to be \$91,350. In 1869, the Treasurer reported the cash assets to be \$92,718, which shows an actual increase in three years in cash assets of just \$1,368. The same reports, when carefully compared, also show an increase of unsecured notes of only \$29,517.77, against which an actual debt has been incurred in the same time of \$7,486.13. Thus it appears that the party in whose hands the New Albany Seminary went down, who utterly failed in the matter of a Synodical Seminary for the Northwest, who voted against the Seminary being located at Chicago, threw their influence against it in their Synods after its organization, who contributed nothing to it, and who usurped its control by the

suppression of its real designs, and by false imputations upon their brethren; have failed to fulfil their promises as to the aid they proffered, and have added in three years of unparalleled abundance of money and liberality toward other institutions, only the paltry sum of \$1,368 to the cash assets of the institution.

The controversy which has arisen between Dr. Lord and Mr. McCormick is a mere incident in the general conspiracy to usurp the control of the institution. Dr. Lord was elected to a subordinate position in the faculty of the Seminary in the outset, as one who was in harmony with the friends of the institution in whose hands it was placed by the Assembly. No note of discontent was ever heard from him until after Dr. Rice was called to New York. He then aspired to succeed him in the Cyrus H. McCormick chair of theology, and in the pastorate of the North Church. The North Church declined to call him, 1st, because they did not want a professor; 2d, because many of the most intelligent among them did not like his preaching. The executive committee of the Board of Directors regarded Dr. Scott as the better qualified to teach Theology, and requested him to take charge of that department of the institution. At these two things Dr. Lord took offense, and, turning against his old friends, joined hands with the party who were opposed to the Seminary, and with them has labored ever since to revolutionize its management, and to secure his own advancement. This is the plain English of this side issue between him and the old founders of the institution.

Mr. McCormick, on the other hand, has been remarkably reticent in regard to the Seminary from its organization. Notwithstanding his munificent gift, and his known disposition to do even more for it, yet he has never been known to dictate either as to the professors or directors. Under all the discourtesy which has been shown him, he has remained silent up to the time when the demand was made upon him for the payment of his last instalment of \$100,000. The treatment he has received is the most damaging blow to the cause of enlarged benevolence, which has ever been given in the history of our church.

Dr. Lord's connection with this Seminary is likely to prove a parallel to that of Dr. Beecher's with Lane Seminary at Cincinnati. Dr. Beecher came from the Congregational church and was received in the outset by the Presbyterians with the utmost confidence and cordiality. Gradually he formed a party and worked out of the Board Old School men, and worked in his New School friends. When the division came in '37, he had a majority in the Board, and carried the Seminary with him to the New School, though the funds for it had been given by the Old School. A similar course has been pursued in connection with the Seminary of the Northwest. What the ultimate result of the tactics here employed shall be, the future will disclose.

The two questions which now remain to be answered are, 1st, Will the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church when fully informed of this whole matter, sanction such a proceeding; or 2d, Will the Assembly adhere to the fair and just principle openly announced at the time this proposed Seminary for the Northwest was transferred to its control, and restore its management to the hands of its friends and chief supporters?

---

It gives me pleasure, at the request of Dr. Monfort, to print for this pamphlet the following (second) letter, just received from him. He says "they contain a fair expression" of *his views*, "and the *second* is as important to me (*him*) as the first."

C. H. McC.

CINCINNATI, *May* 5, 1869.

*C. H. McCormick, Esq.:*

DEAR SIR—I have not a copy of the letter I wrote you, to which I have to-day received your reply, but I may say that I had no intention of discussing the merits of the question between you and the Seminary. I only wished to apprise you of the appointment of the Committee, and to ask

an interview for as many of the Committee as may be in New York during the Assembly. To this you have assented, and I will only add: that in giving you the reasons which were presented to the Board in favor of the action taken, I desired you to know what was said, by way of disabusing your mind, from any misunderstanding that might arise from certain things which have been published, not fairly stating the case.

1. It was proper to take some action as the question was before the Board by the report of the Committee which called forth your letter.

2. We could not act at once, and delay of a year looked like acting with proper deliberation.

3. There was hope in delay, that the state of the Church, including relations to the Church South, might favor an adjustment of our difficulties.

As to the danger of losing your last installment, I am not concerned on that subject. I do not expect you to pay it until you feel that you ought to do so, and if you never pay it, I shall never charge you with dishonesty. I shall as heretofore treat the matter as a difference of opinion.

I am surprised that you are not quite satisfied with the course of the *Presbyter* in your last controversy. We published two letters from you and two from Dr. Lord, from you first and from Dr. Lord last; and we published one from Mr. Williams and one from you, from Mr. W. first and you last. Have you thought how other papers did in the case? And what they said as compared with the *Presbyter*? I have never impeached you or your motives. I have only stated your views as you have given them and then have stated mine. I feel that you ought to appreciate this, though we have differed widely and still differ. Your good opinion of my fairness, I should highly prize, while your approbation of my principles on certain questions I do not expect; and yet I hope that even our diverse views may yet be harmonized.

Yours, truly,

J. G. MONFORT.

## ADDRESS,

*Prepared by Mr. C. H. McCormick, at St. Louis, to be delivered to the General Assembly, then in session, in 1866, and placed in the hands of Henry Day, Esq., (of New York, Elder of Dr. Rice,) to be presented to the Assembly, but who failed to get a suitable opportunity to do so. It would have been introduced at the commencement of this correspondence, but was not then found:*

To the Moderator of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, St. Louis:

In view of the course proposed to be taken in this Assembly, in relation to the Theological Seminary of the North-West, I had intended to explain to your Committee on Seminaries, prior to its final action, the views of the friends and *supporters* of this Seminary as to the said proposed course of action, but was deprived of the opportunity to do so by the assurances of an active member of the Assembly that no immediate action on the subject would be taken by the Committee; that there would be ample time, and that, from the conversation between him and myself, which he seemed properly to appreciate, he thought it better not to send a paper to the Committee until something further could be ascertained, which he promised to do, and to report to me. Next day, however, the Committee made its report to the Assembly.

It is with much reluctance, Mr. Moderator, that I can consent to trespass upon the indulgence of the Assembly, in consuming a moment of its time. Nothing but a sense of duty impels me to it, with a desire that my own position and that of the *friends* of this Seminary may be known to the Assembly, and that whatever shall be done by the Assembly in the matter shall be with a knowledge of the facts in the case—that the responsibility may then rest where it properly belongs.

Now, sir, as it has been openly avowed (for a supposed good purpose) by the member of this body referred to, a Director in the Seminary, (Mr. Jesse L. Williams,) that the

changes proposed to be made in the Board of Directors of the Seminary, as well as the election of a Professor to the Cyrus H. McCormick Professorship of Didactic and Polemic Theology, are to be made on political or *party* grounds, and from party considerations; as you, sir, in the presence of this Assembly, have kindly and in flattering terms, though in a different connection, referred to my political position before the country, you will allow me one word for myself and friends in that connection. *My* political principles, while not in harmony with the majority on this floor, are now the same as when I proposed to endow the Professorships; the same as when, in 1864, I was in nomination for Congress—when, yielding to no one as a *Union man*, I was alike opposed to connecting politics with religion, as with the social or business relations of life;—but, while myself believing Democratic principles in the *government of the country* as essential as ever to its prosperity—and even, if you please, that the *old Democratic and Presbyterian* “hoops” that were *broken* must be reunited before we can have a *perfectly* restored and reunited country and church, I can see no justification whatever for the proscription now proposed in the management of the Seminary. Heretofore no such tests have been applied or thought of; while now, in the language of Mr. Jesse L. Williams, in the conversation referred to, with about three-fourths of the whole number of Directors *Republican*, further changes are to be made, for “a good working majority!”

I approached Mr. Williams as the *leading opposition* member who, at the last meeting of the Board of Directors of the Seminary, proposed and carried by a majority of 11 to 9 a motion to transfer Dr. Lord to the Chair of Theology, and to elect a fourth Professor. I desired to know of him the reason for desiring a man in the Chair of Theology of known hostility to myself and friends—the only Chair of the four endowed by me that bore my name—and while *we* had, to the present time, not only endowed the Professorships, but procured nearly all the property and funds in and for the Seminary? This he admitted, and added that the object of himself and friends was, by placing

their man in the Chair of Theology, to so interest their friends generally, *who had heretofore stood aloof and done next to nothing*, that they would now come forward and take the responsibility of providing the requisite funds for the *completion of the buildings undertaken*, supplementing the endowment of Professorships, &c., which would require in the aggregate at least \$300,000. While we had done our part well, they had, he said, ample means for accomplishing the work, and should now do their part; and to that end they thought it best to have "a good working majority of Directors." I replied that I supposed there must be some such money calculation, as they could hardly, by such a course, expect from me the unpaid instalment for that Chair. I also stated that I understood from one of Dr. Rice's friends that, if he (Rice) were wanted in that Chair again, further funds could be raised among his friends in New York to increase the endowment of it for him, which would be a permanent help to the Seminary. I further enquired of Mr. Williams if the possession of that particular Chair was necessary to interest his friends in the Seminary; and if, indeed, while admitting that we had done so well, they could not, now that "slavery was dead," come forward and *co-operate* with us in the great work of carrying forward this Institution. He remarked that he was glad I had introduced the conversation—regretted it had not taken place sooner—would see whether anything further could be done—there was still sufficient time to see, as nothing would be done by the Committee for some days—would let me know, but thought *Dr. Rice* need hardly be thought of further, while *Dr. McMaster*, who would probably be preferred to Dr. Lord, *would also be supported by endowment, if elected*. Next day he remarked, on meeting me, that Dr. McMaster would be elected; and the same day the Committee reported.

The nine Directors referred to opposed the election of a *fourth Professor* at this time. They were old Directors, representing the views of those who had sustained the Seminary. They opposed the election on the ground that there was still a material deficiency of funds for its support.

# INDEX.

---

	Page.
C. H. McCormick's letter to <i>N. W. Presbyterian</i> . . . . .	3
Committee's letter to C. H. McCormick . . . . .	4
C. H. McCormick's reply to Committee . . . . .	4
Editorial from the <i>Presbyter</i> . . . . .	12
J. L. Williams's letter to <i>N. W. Presbyterian</i> . . . . .	13
Editorial from the <i>Presbyter</i> . . . . .	16
Dr. Lord to Mr. McCormick' . . . . .	17
C. H. McCormick's reply to J. L. Williams . . . . .	30
Do. . . . . do. to Dr. Lord . . . . .	33
Do. . . . . letter to Dr. Rice . . . . .	48
Dr. Rice's letter to C. H. McCormick . . . . .	48
Dr. Lord to Mr. McCormick . . . . .	52
W. B. Truax's card to <i>N. W. Presbyterian</i> . . . . .	55
Hon. J. W. Brockenbrough's article from <i>Va. Gazette</i> . . . . .	56
C. H. McCormick's reply to Dr. Lord's rejoinder . . . . .	60
Rev. T. V. Moore to Dr. Lord from <i>N. W. Presbyter-</i> <i>ian</i> . . . . .	67
Dr. Junkin's article from the <i>Presbyterian Banner</i> . . . . .	69
C. H. McCormick's original proposition to the Assem- bly of 1859. . . . .	75
Dr. Monfort to C. H. McCormick . . . . .	77
C. H. McCormick's reply to Dr. Monfort . . . . .	78
Editorial from <i>N. W. Presbyterian</i> , May 8, 1869. . . . .	81
Dr. Monfort to C. H. McCormick . . . . .	90
C. H. McCormick's Address to the General Assembly, at St. Louis, in 1866 . . . . .	92



LIBRARY  
OF THE  
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS-URBANA

2071M7

C001

IMPORTANT CORRESPONDENCE, CONCERNING T



3 0112 025275394