

A

0  
0  
0  
9  
1  
1  
2  
6  
8  
1



DOUGLASS  
Further Statement of Facts  
and Circumstances.

California  
Regional  
Library Facility

LD  
2791  
K4 D7

Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2007 with funding from  
Microsoft Corporation

#350/2  
FURTHER STATEMENT

OF

FACTS AND CIRCUMSTANCES

CONNECTED WITH THE

REMOVAL OF THE AUTHOR

FROM

THE PRESIDENCY OF KENYON COLLEGE,

IN ANSWER TO

"THE REPLY OF TRUSTEES," ETC.

BY D. B. DOUGLASS, LL. D.

ALBANY:

ERASTUS H. PEASE.

1845.

9711

MUNSELL AND TANNER,  
PRINTERS.

## ADVERTISEMENT.

---

The following statement drawn up, and originally designed, as a letter to a friend, is now respectfully communicated to the patrons and friends of Kenyon College, and of education generally, as well as to the friends of the writer, and to ALL, in every situation and relation, who may have read the pamphlet to which it is an answer.

The position of the writer is a very painful one, but, so far as he can see, unavoidable. Thrown before the public, by the injustice and cruelty of a corporate body, acting with the countenance and co-operation of a high public functionary, *in direct violation of pledged faith*, he was compelled to vindicate himself in a temperate but firm appeal; and he has been met in reply, with scarcely any regard for the real *merits* of the case, by a virulent and needless personal attack upon his name and character. To that attack he now replies, and should it be repeated, he sees no alternative but to pursue the course he has laid down for himself until it is decided beyond appeal, whether there is, or can be, under the constitutional forms of this enlightened age and country, a vested right to *do wrong*, or an immunity superior to *moral obligation*.

But it is not merely as a matter of private and personal grievance, that this subject is now presented. Questions of much higher import are involved in it. The essential nature of the endowment at Gambier; the due and proper conservation of that endowment, as a means of *liberal education*, and as a property of *the Church*, without endangering *both*, by the union of unlimited *temporal* power, with that which is, in its nature, *jure divino*; these, and to some extent the constitution and adminis-

tration of educational trusts generally, in our country, are topics of deep interest, which cannot fail to engage the attention of the intelligent reader.

The writer regrets the necessity of drawing out his statement to so great a length, but he trusts it will be considered, that in defence of *charater* as in that of *religion*, *pages* of elaborate reply are sometimes necessary to neutralize *lines* of unfounded aspersion. He hopes however that no one, who thinks it worth while to have an opinion on the subject at all, will be deterred from reading the whole.

*Albany, 30th June, 1845.*



## LETTER &C.

---

Dear Sir:

Your kind letter of the 16th ult., and the interest you were pleased to express in my behalf on account of the very severe and vituperative character of the Bishop's "Reply," demand my heartfelt thanks. They should have had, as well as the pamphlet itself, an earlier acknowledgement from me, had that been possible; but the nature of my engagements with the Cemetery Association at Albany, (in consequence of the lateness of the season when I commenced that work) precluded the possibility of my attending to any other thing, until that was; in some measure, complete; and the delay has been further prolonged by *other* imperative engagements since. I regret it the more, as I find that a notice of my intention to answer the "Reply," which I sent down to be inserted in one of the New York papers, in November last, was not attended to by the person to whom I sent it, and I have been, thus long, exposed therefore, to the implication of having plead guilty to, or at least tacitly admitted the slanderous insinuations, which constitute so large a part of the publication referred to. I am now, however, once more in the vicinity of my papers, and not a little thankful in looking over them, to find how provident I have been, in securing documents and references, to sustain me, in this otherwise unequal contest. And now, before I answer you at large, let us look for a moment, at the state of the controversy, and the relations of the parties engaged in it.

My adversaries would have you believe, that in the publication of my former statement, I was guilty of a wanton and unprovoked attack upon the "powers" at Gambier—the Bishop, or the Trustees, as the case may be; and upon this circumstance they found not only the ordinary presumption in favor of the defensive party, but the most unlimited license in regard to the means of defence. Let us see with what propriety.

I was at Gambier, under a solemn compact, to which I had pledged myself, for life. I was engaged in the peaceful discharge of my duties under that compact; and perfectly unsuspecting of any evil. No crime, or offence, or neglect of any kind, had been laid to my charge. The proceedings of the Trustees show, that I enjoyed the approbation and "high regard" of that body, as "a gentleman of integrity and moral worth"—"a most excellent man, entitled to universal respect and affection." Bishop McIlvaine, the official head and representative of the Board, (writing about me after my dismissal,) expressed his "entire confidence" in my "strict integrity, and gentlemanly character," and his "high respect for my eminent attainments in science," "which," said he, "do honor to you and to your country;" adding his testimony at the same time to my "diligence and zeal" in promoting "the interests of the institution,"

and to my "kindness and hospitality, in endeavoring to enhance the comfort and happiness of the students, and secure their affections."\*

Finally, the whole body of students, concurring in all these particulars—my "gentlemanly character," my "eminent attainments," my "moral and religious worth," my "zeal and diligence in behalf of the institution," and my "sincere kindness and hospitality" to themselves, added over and above all, many gratifying assurances of their "personal esteem and respect." Yet, in the midst of all these golden opinions, freely expressed, **WITHOUT ANY CONVERSE ALLEGATION**, or the slightest *pretence* of an *accusation* of any kind against me, the Board, in a secret, inquisitorial process, and without a moment's warning, put an end, or *affected* to put an end to my engagement, as President, and immediately published abroad my name as having been stricken from the rolls of the Institution.

We have heard of such a thing as "guilt without criminality," and I suppose there may be also, *vice versa*, criminality without guilt; but in what code of jurisprudence or morals was it ever heard of before, that a man was visited with the severest possible punishment, in consideration of his "eminent attainments," his "gentlemanly character," his "moral and religious worth," or his "zeal and diligence" in discharge of his duty?

There is no explaining away or evading this absurdity. Bishop McIlvaine says, "it was the desire of the Board to do all things in the kindest manner towards Mr. D." and "so to injure as little as possible, his future standing, hence the complimentary language," &c. This would be very intelligible, if Mr. D. had been put upon his plea, and *convicted* of *anything* worthy of punishment; but what does it mean when applied to a person *legally innocent*—against whom *no charge of any kind had been exhibited*—"a most excellent man, entitled to universal respect and affection?" Is outrage any the less outrage, because committed in a kind manner?

The *consequences* of this proceeding, **TO ME**, were the sacrifice of my property, the taking away of my proper and legitimate means of support, the scattering of my family like sheep without a shepherd, and the frustration of all my cherished schemes for the education of my children; the entire uprooting, in short, of all my plans and prospects in life. Yet these benevolent and kind gentlemen would have it believed, that all this was no aggression; and that *I*, in presuming to set forth the wrongs done me, in a calm, temperate, and Christian spirit,—no one can deny that such is the character of my statement—have, wantonly, disturbed the peace of the community, and almost forfeited my claim to be treated as a human being!

"O judgment, thou art fled to brutish beasts,  
And men have lost their reason!"

To this hour, notwithstanding all the abuse they have endeavored to heap upon me in their "Reply," I stand uncharged, as you justly remark, with any thing that would be admitted as of the least weight under a legal *rule to show cause*. There is no lack of *inuendo*,—vague insinuations implying **SOMETHING**,—rhetorical tricks and subtleties in abundance, conveying to the mind of the careless or prejudiced reader, the idea of *some* unnamed fault or failure on my part, which the writer *seems too humane* to specify. The whole strength of the pamphlet lies in *this*. Full from beginning to end of the gall of defamation; and barren

\* This language is quoted from the letter of the students, but as the draft of that letter is claimed to have been written by Bp. M., I am entitled to consider it *his* language also.



every where of authentic facts and sober arguments. Examine for yourself and tell me if it is not so.

I was dismissed, you will please to recollect, for unpopularity with the students, and the authors of the reply took their position vauntingly, (see their published card in October last,) in the *first* place to justify that act; and *secondly*, to exonerate Bishop McIlvaine from having had any part in it. Now I have read the reply, as you may suppose, with some little attention, and I have not yet been so fortunate as to discover a single passage, in the way of argument, that bears (logically) upon either of these questions. They have reiterated, with a great many changes and variations, the charge of unpopularity, (a charge which I shall show to be utterly without foundation,) but beyond that there is *nothing—absolutely nothing*. They have not proved the fact; they have not said a word to show that the alleged unpopularity, if true, was not a natural and necessary consequence of my responsibilities. It might have been, as I have elsewhere said, an evidence of faithfulness. They have not said a word to show that it was any cause for their unceremonious violation of a contract; not a word to justify the insidiousness and secrecy of the process of my removal; nor, finally, a word to prove (logically) that Bishop McIlvaine was not a full participator, positively as well as negatively, in that process. Their whole collective energy has been concentrated in the effort to defame and villify my character, and to impair, if possible, my claim to confidence. And of this let me now give you a few examples:

Passing with a mere notice the round and plenary *denials* which appear (p. 5, and elsewhere,) and which are to be expected perhaps in proportion as *proof* is scanty, you will observe occasional reflections, in the way of *petitio principii*, upon my “rashness in refusing to resign,” and in publishing my “statement.” “His only wise plan,” say they, (p. 4) “was to let his case be forgotten as soon as possible. He does not know what is good for him,” (Col. Bond, p. 12,) *i. e.* in refusing to resign. “D. has brought all these things upon himself. He would have consulted his dignity and peace by receiving the advice to resign in the spirit in which it was given,” (Col. Cummings, p. 47,) &c. Whether I was *rash* in refusing to resign depends upon whether I was *wrong*; and that is not shown.

Look also at the reflections, (p. 9 and elsewhere,) equally gratuitous, that I was indifferent as to the financial condition of the institution. “The question whether we were running in debt to sustain the College, was one which never troubled Mr. D,” &c. If it were even true, (and it can be shown to be most maliciously otherwise,) what possible relevancy has it?

Look, then, at the representation of my private affairs at Brooklyn prior to my removal to Gambier; what has it really to do with the proper subject matter of this controversy? I speak not now of its *falseness*—that will come up in due time—but of its logical correctness and *relevancy*, supposing, for argument’s sake, it were all true. Were my embarrassments (at a period of universal stagnation) likely to render my removal less difficult? Was my mere going to Gambier to relieve me from them at all? Did the circumstances alleged, supposing them to have been as represented by Bishop McIlvaine, absolve him or the trustees from any part of their obligation as parties to the compact under which I went?—What was it that made it the best—if it *was* best—for myself and my family to go to Gambier at all? Was it not especially the *permanency* of the situation? And would it not have been madness in me to have removed myself and them thither at great expense and great *sacrifice*, (I insist upon the propriety of this word,) without a full and unquestioning reliance upon the Bishop’s propositions in this respect? These questions

are answered from the surface of the "Reply," without any arguments, and the answers will show how perfectly sophistical and irrelevant to the real matters in controversy this whole discussion is.\* But it was not inserted without motive, and if you will turn to the 25th and following pages of the Reply, you will see by the spirit in which its details are enlarged upon, what *that* motive *unquestionably* was; it will be still more apparent when I come to the facts.

Another example in the same spirit is found on page 29th, where Bishop McIlvaine speaks of my not being his "first choice for the Presidency." I shall show presently that I *was* his first choice; but suppose I was *not*; what bearing has this fact upon the real merits of the case?—Not the slightest. If I had been his *hundredth* choice, his obligation, in the compact finally made between us, would not have been a whit the less. The subject is wholly irrelevant therefore, and could only have been pressed into the controversy like the preceding, for the purpose of defamation.

Look then at the insinuation (p. 31,) in regard to the truth of my statement of my affairs, before going to Gambier. "We know all about his relations to the Greenwood Cemetery" say they, "from which that annual receipt proceeded, and *could*, if we chose, give a statement of particulars that would convince Mr. D. that we *do know*." What a parade of magnanimous charity is here exhibited in keeping back what never was pretended to be concealed! My relations with the Greenwood Cemetery were no secret; but does it follow that a knowledge of *these* is a knowledge of *all* my relations and interests in life? The Bishop knew, unless he had forgotten, that while I was in the Greenwood, I was also a professional Civil Engineer, in extensive correspondence; insomuch that when I was elected President of Kenyon College in 1840, he was in breathless haste to communicate the fact to me lest I should "commit myself to any other engagement." I could have added, moreover, with evidence of the fact, that within a little more than a year before that election, salaries and fees were tendered to me to an aggregate amount of \$6,000. In one instance a permanent salary of \$2,500 which was refused; and in another a fee of \$500 for only three weeks service, repeatedly urged upon me by the intermediation of third parties, and refused; and many other like examples.

Closely connected with these charitable insinuations, and a step beyond them in the *moral* quality, are the suggestions (p. 33, and elsewhere,) as to the *CAUSE* of my embarrassments; not expressed in distinct terms, and still less attempted to be proved, but shadowed forth, as better suited the purpose of the writer, in significant hints and allusions. "Had Mr.

\* The authors of the "Reply" introduced this discussion *as if* to *repel* a charge of "base ingratitude and injustice" brought by me against Bishop McIlvaine; which, they say, "is the main string upon which all the harping of (my) pamphlet is struck." I deny that I have charged either ingratitude or injustice against the Bishop. Bad faith and injustice are doubtless to be inferred from some parts of my statement, though they are by no means the "*main string*." But what relevancy has the discussion here alluded to, to either of these? The question of bad faith turns upon the consistency of the Bishop's *professions* with his *practice*; that of *injustice* upon the conformity of his *acts* with his written or implied obligations as head of the Trust; and with either of these my embarrassments at Brooklyn in 1839—40 had about as much to do as the annexation of Texas. The charge of "base ingratitude" is a goblin of their own raising; evidently invoked for effect, and to show or *seem to show* "that I have attempted too much for my own integrity." ("Reply," p. 32.)

1). been in the receipt even of \$4000 per annum while residing in New York or Brooklyn, it would have been a kindness and favor to himself and family, considering peculiarities of character which his friends will readily advert to without our being more particular, to take him to a salary of \$1000 in such a place as Gambier. We do not mean that he can understand this." Pause a moment, I pray you, over the deep malignity of this thrust. What has *the cause* here hinted at to do with the *action* of the Board of Trustees, on the 27th Feb. 1844; or with *the part* which Bishop McIlvaine may or may not have taken in that act? Has it the slightest relation to any legitimate object of this controversy? Clearly none whatever. I am before you, if you please, demanding *justice*—the reparation of gross wrong; and my adversary meets the demand by going far out of his way, even abusing the sacredness of *spiritual* confidence, to defame and vilify my *private character*. Look at the *sort* of insinuation by which this is attempted to be done. How perfectly gratuitous! Is there any where a reputation so spotless, a character so pure,—the most beautiful example, male or female, that adorns and dignifies humanity—that may not be defamed at any time, if it should suit the purposes of malevolence to defame it in the same way? There is no protection for any character against such malevolent assaults, and the more pure the object the greater the outrage.

But for the sake of variety, I will give you now an example of a less serious character. The Bishop while in New York was impressed with the fear, "that things were *not going right at the College, and that he should find some fresh burden to be born on his return to Gambier.*"—(Reply p. 7.) What was the ground of this apprehension? Simply that his correspondents *said nothing at all on the subject!!* A most pregnant premiss truly. The Bishop would do well to keep it for future uses. It will prove any thing. I presume the suggestion, (p. 16) as to the number of students that did *not* come to the College, belongs to the same category. And I know not where else to class his proof (in the same place,) that the *numbers had diminished*, under my Presidency, viz. *because they had increased only two.*"

But again. "The earnest desire of the Board, while finching from no duty, however painful, to do all things in the kindest manner towards Mr. D, &c." (Reply, p. 12), has already been noticed in another relation. I recur to it again, for the purpose of pointing out more particularly the disingenuousness of the *logic*. The question under discussion is the *essential justice* or injustice of my removal from office: Some show of argument had been attempted to make it out *expedient*, but not a word to prove it *just*, and the moment this point is fairly reached, it is evaded by the dexterous interposition of a *circumstance*, viz. the *manner* of my removal; while, by a specious talk about "duty however painful, &c." the mind of the reader is betrayed unconsciously into an impression that the right and wrong of *the thing* has already been settled by some previous argument.\* But the fallacy does not end here. The paragraph goes on to state, that it was in the overflow of their *kind feelings* towards me (!) that the Board "placed my removal *only* on the ground

\* The committee of the Board who originated the action in that body against me, expressly disclaim having made any "inquiry as to the justice of the difficulty." Their preamble and report is as follows: "The committee which has had in charge the inquiry into the causes that have produced the existing diminution in the number of the students belonging to the classes of Kenyon College and Preparatory Schools, has had the subject in anxious consideration and made all the investigations in their power, and REPORT, that in their view two facts have mainly led to the present state of things: One is, the high charges in the senior grammar school, whereby that



of want of acceptableness with the students," without "giving other reasons." What other reasons? The whole proceeding, the Bishop and the Board tell us, was an inquiry into the *financial condition* of the Institution—the causes of the diminished revenue, &c.—an inquiry perfectly impersonal. My connection with it arose only from my (alleged) *unacceptableness*, and must have been limited specifically to that circumstance. (*if the Bishop and the Board speak truth.*) Yet here they allude to "other reasons," as if the enquiry was *personal* to myself, embracing the circumstances of my conduct and character at large!! How is this? If the enquiry was, as they pretend, purely financial, what do they mean by *other reasons* for my dismissal? If *personal*, what is to be thought of all their former disclaimers on this point? Nor is this jumble of contradictions confined to the page quoted. It runs through the "Reply." Every attempt to set forth "*other reasons*," (which is in short the gist of the whole publication,) involves the same dilemma, and shows at once the temper of the publication, and the liability of extreme subtlety to over-reach and betray itself.

But let us follow the logic of these gentlemen in another of its features. I wish you to notice how rapidly their wings expand after they have fairly shuffled off the restraints of the original controversy, and taken their ground against me *personally*. On page 13 of the "Reply," the writer remarks, that with "many eminent qualities, a man *may* be totally unfit for the Presidency of a college, and may utterly fail of exerting that influence over the minds of students, which commands obedience at the same time that it *warms and enlists*, instead of *chilling and repelling*, the affections of the heart." The drift of this language is not to be mistaken. Under the form of a mere abstract potentiality, speciously expressed, it is evidently intended to convey to the mind of the cursory reader the idea that there *was an actual personal unfitness* for the Presidency of a college, and an *actual failure* in exerting "that influence over the minds of the students which commands obedience, while it warms and enlists without chilling and repelling the affections of the heart." Yet all this, you will see, is a mere inuendo, unsustained by one iota of proof.

Again, (Reply, p. 13) the author continues, "after he declined, the necessity of his removal became still more imperious," as he could not be kept there "in the temper, towards the officers, and the trustees, and the Bishop, which it was manifest the process, thus far, had raised." This is a precious avowal, truly. Banditti take the lives of their captives

department is almost reduced to a nonentity. The other they mention with great reluctance, because it attaches to a most excellent man well worthy of universal respect and affection,—the point to which they refer, is the unpopularity of the President. In regard to the justice of this difficulty the committee do not pretend to speak; but it is believed by us to exist, and to operate prejudicially to the institution over which he presides. The committee therefore recommend the adoption of the following resolutions:

1. That the charge for tuition in the senior preparatory school be reduced, &c.
2. That while we seriously deprecate the necessity, we are constrained, in view of all the circumstances of the case, respectfully to ask President Douglass to resign his official relation to this Institution; assuring him at the same time, that the Board, as a body and individually, entertain for him the kindest feelings of regard.
3. That the salary of President Douglass be paid him to the first of September next.

on the very same principle ; the latter, after being rifled and robbed, are not likely to be in a very amiable temper with their spoilers, and the necessity for taking life becomes, under such circumstances, "still more imperious." The allegation, however, is not more *disingenuous* than it is *untrue*. The Rev. Dr. Fuller was my *spiritual* adviser during these persecutions, and will bear me witness that my temper was *not* unduly excited. "I am amazed to see you bear up so well," was his continual exclamation.

Finally, in this connection, (Reply, p. 14), the author still goes on as follows: "To have kept him there, would have only given him the greater opportunity of *injuring the college*, without the least reason to expect any change in his *constitutional and habitual unfitness* for his office." Here is another sweeping inuendo, equally unsupported and still more subtle than the preceding; and in the same ratio more slanderous. But what I wish you chiefly to observe is the summary process by which one of the "most excellent men, entitled to universal respect and affection, full of diligence, and zeal, and kindness, and hospitality," is converted into a cold and cruel despot,—“commanding obedience,” indeed, but “chilling, and repelling the affections of the heart,” and not only “constitutionally and habitually unfit for office,” but even seeking opportunity to injure the institution, which every consideration of duty and policy should have impelled him to promote. All this in the turn of a single leaf, *without a particle of evidence*, by mere *periphrasis*, and the *unlimited license of words*. “Eleven buckram men grown out of two.”

Such are a part, a *small* part of the fallacies and falsehoods of this precious production. Many others will be developed as we proceed. Do I call them by too harsh a *name*? Examine them attentively, and tell me whether they are not clearly *intended* to “darken council”—to mystify the mind of the reader, and lead him off as far as possible from the matter in hand, for the manifest purpose of defamation and slander? “And who is it?” I almost hear you enquire, that descends to such unfair and disingenuous artifices? Is it some low paragraphist in politics, who esteems nothing unfair? Some pettifogger, cunning in all the arts of chicanery, “to make the worse appear the better reason?” No! It is neither one nor the other. It is a body of men who, at this moment, are legally intrusted with the concerns of the Theological Seminary of the Diocese of Ohio—an institution founded by the benevolent donations of pious men and women, for the education of ministers of the Gospel,—under the presidency of a Bishop of the church,—who is at the same time the Professor of Ecclesiastical Polity and Pastoral Divinity in that school of the Prophets. “But the Bishop,” you will say, “must have been wholly unaware of these proceedings.” No! I am sorry to say he was not. The pamphlet was written in Philadelphia during the session of the General Convention, *ostensibly* by three of the trustees, assuming to speak in behalf of *their* fellows, and *unquestionably* with the aid and countenance of *the Bishop*. He is known to have overlooked and corrected the proofs. Four-fifths of all the matter must needs have been furnished by him; and the dialectics—*ex unguine leonem*—it would be a moral absurdity to look for the authorship of them, to any *other* person connected with the publication.\*

\* The Rev. Mr. Smallwood is an ungraduated clergyman, recently rewarded with the honorary degree of M.A., by the (President and?) Faculty of Kenyon College. Mr. Rogers is a store-keeper at Mount Vernon, and Mr. Reynolds, a forwarding merchant at Masillon. The last two had been members of the Board of Trustees only about five months, and never but once in session with them before the 23th February, 1844. They were, besides, almost strangers to me and to my administration; respectful and kind in their



You are now prepared to estimate the disparity of the parties in this contest. On the one hand you see the principalities and powers of Gambier, with all the accessories of high official station, character, and influence, and a skill and subtlety in the use of words, seldom, if ever surpassed. You see them, confederated (in this case) by a community of interest, zealously sustaining each other in the effort to crush an humble individual, whom, *having once grossly injured*, they cannot forgive. On the other, you behold that individual, standing alone, with no pretence or ground of confidence but in the righteousness of his cause, striving, as he may, against such odds, in defence of his name, his character, his means of support, and his capacity for usefulness. The disparity is fearful; and I am not surprised that some of my *kind friends* should have been alarmed for me, when my *enemies*, breathing out threatenings, and scarcely concealing their unscrupulousness as to means, seem already to exult in the certainty of my destruction. But there is no alternative. If the disparity was even a thousand fold greater than it is, I could not, without a moral dereliction, recede from the contest. The interests for which I am engaged, God has made it my duty, in a right spirit, to defend; and I humbly trust that he will enable me so to defend them while life lasts. I am no lover of controversy. No one, better than yourself, knows how repugnant it is to every instinct and feeling of my nature. I take it as I take medicine, only when I must, and then with loathing. But in the present instance it has been forced upon me by the intolerable aggression of these men; and so long as they go on, adding wrong to wrong, the option to continue or discontinue it is not with me. I am the defendant.

Some of the partisans of Bishop McIlvaine have endeavored to raise a presumption against me, on the ground that my statements are *ex parte*. But what is the meaning of that phrase in this connection? Every appeal against personal injustice or violence, is more or less *ex parte*. If you expose, as it may be your bounden duty to do, an attempt upon your life or property, your complaint has necessarily this character. The outcry of murder! or a call for help! from the victim of lawless power or unbridled passion, is *ex parte*,—but is it therefore to be unheeded, or is the complaint of any injured one to be ruled out of court, as unworthy of notice on that ground? This would be a precious immunity, indeed, on the side of aggression. But even this is not the whole of what seems to be claimed in the present case. The complaint of the single-handed victim is to be debarred a hearing, while the adverse statements of the confederated aggressors, no matter how vituperative and slanderous, are to be received on their own mutual endorsement, with full and unhesitating confidence, as if any principle in human character was more determined or more relentless than that which prompts an overbearing and high handed oppressor to justify his wrong doing.

Another, more imposing presumption has been urged, on the ground that my Statement involves an impeachment of the conduct and character of Bishop McIlvaine; and the authors of the "Reply," well aware of the advantage which this view of the case would be likely to give them in an appeal to the popular mind, have artfully contrived to shift the *whole controversy* to this ground. "The manifest object of the pamphlet," say they in their card, "is to lay all the responsibility of that act (my dismissal) upon the Rt. Rev. Bishop McIlvaine, to injure his character, &c." "So far as Bishop McIlvaine is concerned, (Reply p. 5) this effort to injure him must fall to the ground and recoil upon the author of it, if it can be shown," &c. "The base ingratitude and injustice of the

personal intercourse with me, (until the present action,) and the last named even made a point of *expressing, with tears*, his strong regard for me, after the adjournment of the Board.

Bishop is the main string on which all the harping of his pamphlet strikes." The *morale* of this double artifice is of a piece with the examples already given; I pass it in that aspect, without further notice, and proceed, at once, to examine its logical relations to the *real matter in hand*. And first, as a false issue.

If you turn to my Statement, you will see that more than half of it, (18 pages in the first edition, and 16 in the last,) is occupied with an account of the corporate proceedings of the Board of Trustees, in the matter of my removal, and an exhibition of the essential injustice of the act, in form and substance. This exhibit is fundamental to all the subsequent discussions, and is to be taken therefore as the primary aim and object of my publication. The remainder is taken up with statements explanatory of the circumstances, under which I became connected with, and "held office in the institution," having in view to illustrate the motives and agency, which, (there was some reason to believe,) had operated in effecting my removal. Bishop McIlvaine is certainly and of necessity implicated, in these statements,—he is almost as much so, in his own version of the matter, as in mine,—but what does it signify? The question whether HE did or did not take an influential part in the proceedings, is entirely incidental, and of no manner of consequence to the main allegation. It may be proved either way, without taking a feather's weight from the enormity of that injustice, which, I declared frankly beforehand, and still declare, I will never cease to denounce.

But I may go further on this point, and I ask you to open my pamphlet and verify what I say. I have *not* been moved by any undue desire to make out a case against Bishop McIlvaine. What I might have done, had I been so minded, it is not now needful to say. It is sufficient that my course would have been a different one—a *very different one*. As it was, I confined myself to the exhibition of *facts* bearing directly upon the subject matter of my removal; and which, however roundly denied by my adversaries, I am prepared to substantiate in all their essential particulars by legal testimony. These facts I exhibited in a calm and temperate manner; far from endeavoring to enhance their weight or impressiveness by any rhetoric of mine, I even abstained from drawing formal conclusions, when I might easily have done so—leaving the mind of the reader, in this respect, perfectly free. Have my adversaries been equally dispassionate?

In the same spirit I made my quotations from the Bishop's letters. The correspondence on his part was no light matter; it extended in *time*, over a period of more than sixteen years, and in *volume* to near a hundred sheets, embracing a variety of topics, and written with the freedom and unreservedness of the most entire confidence. And what have I quoted? Nothing but his propositions and persuasions (*demi-official*) to induce my removal to Gambier, and a few—a very few, out of a vast number—of his professions of friendship and confidence, to show the nature of our personal relations. Neither one nor the other could be considered confidential; nor could either, *in itself*, have the slightest effect to injure his character. They were rather honorable; unless it should turn out in a comparison of those professions with his *subsequent* conduct, that his *pledges had been violated, and his faith broken*: But even that inference, like the others, I left to the unbiassed conclusions of the reader.

Secondly: as to the presumption against my "statement" on the ground that it impeaches the character and conduct of Bishop McIlvaine. This is a point of some importance. Almost every page of the "Reply" is drawn up in some dependence, more or less, upon this presumption; but of course it could not be stated as fully and explicitly under the *proof reading* of Bishop McIlvaine himself, as it has since been in certain re-

ligious newspapers. The amount of it, as there insisted upon, appears to be that so eminent and holy a Bishop, full of zeal and eloquence, more than ordinarily *spiritual* in his views, and, above all, the champion of doctrinal purity in opposition to the errors of a corrupt and schismatic church, is not to be held *capable of doing wrong*, or subject to a *charge* of wrong doing on any evidence; and such is the import of the etiquette assumed by the Bishop in the matter of my accounts. (Reply, p. 24.) Was it for the *order* of Bishops in general that this immunity was claimed, or for Bishop McIlvaine in particular? Recent events answer—beyond the possibility of being misunderstood—*the latter*; and we have then this curious anomaly: a man in this republican country—in the 19th century—ready to die in the last ditch of a dogmatic controversy with Papal Rome\*—broadly and boldly appropriating one of the most arrogant pretensions of the most corrupt period of that very Rome—pontifical infallibility.†

As to the fair and proper presumption in favor of character, God forbid that I should trespass upon it in the slightest particular. It is of all personal rights that which I hold most precious, and as I claim it for myself, I freely and fully concede it to all others. But how is it to be defined? Does it give impunity to wrong doing? Does it take away the accountability of men? By no means. It simply secures to *every man*, high and low, the most humble as well as the most dignified, the right to be held *blameless in reputation and character till fairly impeached on good and sufficient evidence*. I do not deny that great consideration is due to established reputation and tried worth. I yield to no one in my respect for the sacredness of ministerial and episcopal character, and I admit that more decisive (external) evidence (much more decisive) is requisite for an impeachment in many cases. But this is founded upon a rule of evidence, not upon the presumption anterior to evidence. And now let us apply these principles to the case in question.

Five days after my dismissal, while I was yet bleeding under the sense of that outrage, meditating in what terms I should answer Bishop McIlvaine's letter of condolence, several of the students waited upon me, (not one, as the Bishop has it, but *several*,) voluntarily, and with strong feelings of sympathy, to tell me that my character had been terribly assailed by the Bishop, in accounting for my dismissal *to the students*.‡—"How can that be," I said. "I have been dismissed for *unacceptableness with the students*: If it was 'a true bill' they (the students) must have been conscious of it without any argument from Bishop McIlvaine. But of course he confined himself to that subject." "No! not at all. He took up your character at large—disparaged you in every thing you have done for the college—remarked very freely upon your circumstances and conduct before you came to Gambier—and a great many things after-

\* See Bishop McIlvaine's address to the Convention of Ohio, in 1844, as reported in the papers at that time.

† This pretension is not confined to the publication referred to. It is in a much stronger sense the distinguishing feature of *the whole system at Gambier*. The idea is that the ecclesiastical power reaches and inter-penetrates EVERY THING—from the highest spirituality to the lowest secularity—on the Hill, and that its *rectitude*, in any application the Bishop chooses, is not to be even *mooted*. This was precisely the issue made in the famous interview in *his study*, Oct. 1842, of which I shall speak again. And the *real* ground upon which he put an end to our correspondence.

‡ Two of the classes—the *Sophmores* and *Seniors*—visited the Bishop on this occasion; the former at the instigation of some of the beneficiaries—the "Swiss" of "the Hill"—and the latter probably on the suggestion of Mr. Lang, who belonged to it. The *Freshmen* and *Juniors*, much the more numerous, were also tampered with, but refused to go.



wards that we never heard of before. He was *very* severe upon you, and seemed to do his utmost to injure your character in every respect."\* Such was the verbal communication at the time, and this has been corroborated in writing by several others since. Fifteen days after this information the return of mails brought me word from Brooklyn that the same attack upon my private character had been perpetrated by the same Right Rev. individual, in letters to my friends *there*, and that even a lady, greatly honored and respected by me, then as now, had been so far swayed as to become the medium of these communications.†

Such was, in general, the train of circumstances which led to the publication of my first "statement," and I think no impartial person who

\* A sort of excuse for this proceeding is pretended in the "Reply" on the ground that the subjects treated of *by the Bishop*, had been previously introduced *by me* in my interviews with the students; and it is affirmed that those interviews were sought by me for that purpose. Neither position is true; the interviews, as I can abundantly prove, *were not sought by me*; very few of the subjects spoken of by HIM were alluded to by ME at all; *nothing* that had not a direct bearing upon the theory of my dismissal; nor was a word uttered that was *personally* disrespectful to him (the Bishop.)

† I desire to refer to this letter with the utmost possible delicacy so far as *the lady* to whom it was addressed is concerned. I have never impugned the goodness and purity of her intentions in communicating it, as she did, to several persons, according to the request of the writer; nor has her doing so interrupted, in the slightest degree, the cordiality of our long established relations, so far as I am concerned. But I will not dissemble or disguise the profound contempt in which I hold the *taste* of any man who could deliberately and voluntarily place A LADY in such a position. The letter was quoted "*from hearsay*," as the Bishop truly remarks, simply because there was no other way of quoting it. My friends requested leave to make a copy, and were refused. I wrote to the Bishop for a copy, and my letter was return unopened. But, in the mean time, a memorandum of all, or nearly all the allegations contained in it, was carefully made by one of the persons who heard it, which has since been attested by several of the others; and this is now in my possession. The following is a copy of my (returned) letter to Bishop M. on this subject, dated Glenville, (Greenwich) Conn., 12th August, 1844:

Right Rev. Sir.—I respectfully ask of you the letter, or a copy of the letter addressed by you to ——— in March last, containing a number of allegations touching my character and conduct while at Gambier, and as President of Kenyon College; which letter I understand she was requested to communicate, and did communicate to sundry persons in Brooklyn.

Your motives for making A LADY the medium of this communication, I will not now attempt to penetrate. My reasoning upon the subject will depend somewhat upon your willingness or unwillingness to comply with the present request. If you *do* comply I shall be ready to admit that, whatever *other* motive you may have had, you were not actuated by fear to meet the responsibility of the allegations referred to in a proper manner; for I give you distinctly to understand that my object, in asking a copy, is to bring you to that responsibility.

(Another letter was demanded also, but the demand is omitted here from the desire not, at present, to introduce a third party. The letter then proceeds:)

Perhaps you may, in replying, lay claim to a reciprocal right, and to save time I answer on that point at once. As the assailed party in this business, and acting wholly on the defensive, I claim to have an unconditional moral right to the letters referred to; but I am willing, at the same time, and shall hold myself ready to give up, as I am ready to sustain any where and in any manner, whatever I have said or written on this subject. I shall expect an answer to both these requests at your earliest convenience. I am, &c.,

D. B. DOUGLASS.

Right Rev. C. P. McILVAINE.

reads that document carefully, will say that I have gone aught beyond what those circumstances required. Then comes the "Reply," *void* of any thing like argument on the real questions at issue, but *filled*, from beginning to end, with thrusts at my private and professional character, which—whoever may have been the penman—(I will not descend to any special pleading on that point,) *Bishop McIlvaine only could have conceived*. Will any one say that the presumption of which we have been speaking, or the proper etiquette of his official character, ought to save him from the responsibility of these things? Does not the assumption of that etiquette for protection, under such circumstances, dishonor and degrade the sacred function to which he appeals, as truly as it aggravates the *wrong* for which he thus seeks *impunity*?

But enough of these preliminaries. Let us come more particularly to the *statements and facts* set forth in the "Reply;" and first its assertions as to the time and manner of my publishing my first edition.

Great significance is attached to the delay of seven months, but if Bishop McIlvaine should ever be the subject of such an infliction as he and his colleagues administered to me, I venture to say that he will find it a much more serious matter than he is now aware of. Many months would probably elapse before he could collect his faculties sufficiently to minister to any thing but the exigencies of himself and his family. \* \* \* I own I did not write in haste, as men do under the influence of passion, nor do I mean so to write or act on this subject at any time. I published as soon as I could with consistency; without any calculation of effect, but rather in the belief that the suggestions of *policy* were all against me in delaying so long; and the first perfect copy I could procure from the binder was mailed to Bishop McIlvaine, in time to have been received three days before he left home.

As to the manner of circulating: the pamphlet was published, as it purported, for private circulation, and given to churchmen only, except a few personal friends; to editors of secular papers only one or two, and those churchmen. It was left at no book store or publication office, except at the request of clergymen, who desired to receive it in that way. Finally, as to the imputation of having written or circulated my "statement" for party purposes, I utterly disclaim it. If I know myself I wrote and only wrote in the cause of truth and justice, and there are those who can bear me witness that I have kept studiously aloof from all party relations whatever.

The first attempt of the Reply, in the way of argument, is introduced (p. 5,) with a passage of personal history, illustrative of the *weakness* of Bishop McIlvaine's *memory*—a fact sufficiently well known, but of which the relevancy is not very apparent. It seems to have for its object to disparage a suggestion of mine, viz; that there was some *connection between my removal* and my action in the committee of the Ohio Convention, (on the Carey ordination,) *on the ground* that the Bishop, while in New-York, forgot the name of one of the members of that committee. The logic is rather foggy in any application of it, but perfectly *foreign* as to the matter really suggested by me. If you turn to my "statement" (p. 34,) you will see that my language had no reference to *Bishop McIlvaine* whatever. I expressed my conviction that my conduct, "on that occasion" *was noted by one at least of my constituency,*" &c. I repeat that conviction now; it is founded upon no vague surmise, but upon the *certainty* that within a very short time after the Convention, *one* of that constituency, who had previously been one of the loudest in his *professions of affection and regard to me*, was so loud in detraction, when speaking of me *to third parties*, that a humane friend thought it but just and proper I should be apprized of it. It was *not Bishop McIlvaine*



however, nor does my language imply that it was; yet it is so assumed in the "Reply," for the sake of a flourishing page of disproof, and this is offered as "the first specimen of the confidence to be placed in my solemn assertions."

Another like "specimen" follows on page 6, the occasion of which is thus stated. "But again it is distinctly asserted, (p. 32)" so they say, "that during the Bishop's absence in the east, in the fall, subsequent to the convention, the plot went on." "*The Bishop was actually, at this very [early] period, (so they quote me,) arranging with his confidential advisers the modus operandi of the impending and final proceeding.*" If now you turn to page 32 of my "statement" you will find that the thing which they here say is "*distinctly asserted*" is *not* asserted at all, distinctly or otherwise. It is assumed, *gratuitously, by my adversaries*. I spoke *specifically*, of the period *after the Bishop's return* from New York. *They falsify my language, making me to speak of the time of his absence.* The whole case is of their own making, and that it was so made deliberately and designedly is evident, from the fact that they had to interpolate the word "*early*" in their quotation from me, to make it suit. What can be done with men who have so little regard for truth and fairness? What can we think of the Theological Seminary, whose trust powers are thus *conscientiously* administered? What precious lessons in Ecclesiastical Polity must not the young Theologians of that Seminary be favored withal, under such teaching? But to proceed:

The Bishop "solemnly declares that the idea of Mr. D.'s removal by an act of Trustees, or of any proceeding with regard to him, such as afterwards occurred, had never to that time arisen in his mind, &c." There are several specialities in the language of this declaration, which, from such a dialectician, entirely destroys its efficacy as a general disclaimer. If the Bishop really *meant* that there was at the time referred to, no plot, no scheme, no design to effect my removal, which is the thing asserted by me, why does he not say so in distinct terms, and make the issue on that point in a tangible form? I affirmed in my statement (p. 33), not that "the Bishop" was at that "*early*" period "arranging the *modus operandi*," &c., but "that the design and purpose of [my] dismissal was distinctly shadowed forth, and *spoken of*, in terms, *long before* the date of the Bishop's return from New York." I repeat that declaration now; and I ask the Bishop, if he joins issue with me, to explain how it was that his family were taking so lively an interest, as they did take, in my private affairs and personal character, at that early period? How was it, that some of them were stationed near me, on particular occasions, to catch my words—*any words* uttered, or supposed to be uttered—that could be made available for the purpose of defamation? How was it that inmates of his house, at the same early period, (early in the fall,) were aware that my removal *was contemplated*? How was it, that some of his chief managers on the "Hill," enjoying his full confidence, and *notoriously* SUBORDINATE, were then engaged in tampering with the students, and endeavoring to create a party feeling against me? How was it, that his own son was constantly in the College, laboring with all the influence in his power to the same effect? And finally, when the notice for the meeting of the Board of Trustees appeared in the Gambier paper, how was it that the same person was enabled to say, *as he did say*, (five or six weeks before the time of their meeting,) that **IT WAS FOR THE PURPOSE OF DISMISSING PRESIDENT DOUGLASS?** These things *are susceptible*

\* A memorable instance of this was brought to the notice of Bishop McIlvaine, in September, before he left for New York, and then made the subject of a remonstrance.

of LEGAL PROOF, whenever the occasion shall be offered, and then what becomes of all the disclaimers of Bishop McIlvaine, and the swagger of TRUSTEES ?

Perhaps it may be as well to mention here at once, that though I have regarded Bishop McIlvaine as mainly accountable for my removal,—being not only President of the Board of Trustees, but co-ordinate with them,—and without whose sanction, (whatever *may be*,) in point of fact, nothing is done ; being, also, the person who negotiated my acceptance as President, (after having known me intimately for fifteen years,) and who should have known, therefore, all the obligations expressed or implied in that negotiation. While I have considered him, therefore, as mainly responsible in the matter of my removal, I have not for a moment supposed that he was the *sole worker*. On the contrary, I have constantly had in view the reality, known and felt elsewhere, as well as on the “ Hill,” that there is a clique, a cabal, a kitchen cabinet at Gambier, embracing also a part of the Board of Trustees, under some of the very leaders, who, in 1839-’40,\* were near driving the Bishop out of the Diocese, but who *now*, under a coalition of interests, of which I shall speak more fully by and by, kindly relieve him of all the *little work* necessary for the accomplishment of their common ends.†

We come now to the inception of the actual process of my removal, as set forth in the “ Reply.” “ After the Bishop had been at home about “ three weeks, a Professor of the College [he tells us] drew his attention to “ the declining state of that department with its two preparatory schools,” “ &c. \* \* \* “ Under [this] serious suggestion, the Bishop enquired “ into the financial state of the Institution, and found that while all the nett “ income from fees of students and from the land and every other source, “ with the exception of \$400 taken for a Theological Professor, was ex- “ pended upon the support of the officers of the College, those of the Senior “ Grammar School being officers of the College, and the other Grammar “ School sustaining its own expenses, there would be a deficit that year in “ the salaries of College officers to a large amount.” This financial discovery, you will please to remark by the way, was *the only ground* on which the Bishop professes to have acted, and the use of similar language, page 10, shows that *it was also the basis of ALL that was done by the Board of Trustees*. “ The object of the meeting was in no way com- “ municated to that body, [such is the language,] until the Treasurer sent “ in his *exhibit* of the state of the finances of the Institution. The Bishop “ read to them that document, from which it appeared that the receipts were “ expected to fall alarmingly short of expenses that year.”

The phraseology of these statements is deceptive and disingenuous. It conveys by a plausible implication, to the mind of the uninitiated, the idea that the College *was*, or *might be* a self-supporting Institution, competent to meet its own salaries, &c. The harping about an “ alarming deficit,” “ a new debt to be created,” “ no reserve to fall back upon,” and the “ solemn responsibility” of the Bishop and his Board in the premises, is just so much mere declamation, intended evidently as an appeal to the

\* Bishop Chase can probably give an earlier account of some of them. There seems to have been no period in the history of the Institution, when it has not been under the control of a *back stair* influence.

† “ You must not forget,” said a friend, writing to me on the subject of my dismissal, “ that there is a power behind the throne GREATER THAN THE THRONE.” “ I do *not* forget that there is such a power,” I replied, “ but I cannot believe that it is the greater. It is *there* because the Bishop wishes it there, for the accomplishment of his purposes, and need *not* have been there unless HE had willed it.

*business mind* of the community, to which, the writer well knew, such ideas were peculiarly odious; and all this, it is intimated, was the *peculiar circumstance* of "THAT YEAR," the regular *consequence* of MY ADMINISTRATION.

If the minutes of the Board of Trustees were *in Court*, (and the current books of the office forthcoming,) it would be seen that there never was a time, since 1832, the year of Bishop McIlvaine's consecration, when the Board were *not* embarrassed—"alarminingly" embarrassed—with deficits; and generally by a much larger amount, in the College alone, than could have been anticipated for the year 1843-4. By a Report of the Treasurer, entered on the minutes in Nov. 1835, (an abstract of which is now before me,) it appears that the *total receipts* of the College, including room rents, must have been from \$3,000 to \$3,500 *less than* the aggregate of salaries and other current expenses for THAT YEAR—the state of the College being about the same as in 1843;—and that after all the profits of the two Grammar Schools, (containing at that time 120 pupils,) were swallowed up in this deficit, there was *still a deficit* of some \$1,500, *against the Institution*. The truth is that the College not only *never did* bear its own expenses, but *never was expected* to bear them. Any one at all conversant with Colleges, would see at once that the idea of its doing so was absurd; and so Bishop McIlvaine evidently thought when he wrote his appeal in behalf of the Institution, in June 1843:—"No College (he says,) can hold its proper stand, and rely merely on the fees of students. Especially cannot this be done in a new country. Eastern Colleges have large endowments or annual grants from the States for the support of instructors.\* We have nothing but our land. You see then, that the sale of our land would be the death of the Institution." Such is his language, and the whole appeal is based upon the principle, that *without a land revenue, the College could not exist*.

But perhaps it will be said,—for this is also implied in the language of the "Reply,"—that the deficit of "that year" must have been unreasonably large, since it swallowed up, not only all the profits of the Grammar Schools, but the land revenue also. Whether it was unreasonably large or not, is a simple question to be determined by comparison with other years. That it absorbed all the profits of the Grammar Schools and the rents besides,—(if it did so,)—might arise from the *falling off of those profits*, or of the rents, either or both, and then the responsibility would be on the proper heads of those Seminaries, or on the "Prudent I Committee;" but in no case upon me. I shall take leave to examine all these questions in order.

*First*, as to whether the deficit of that year was unreasonably large?

There were in the College classes at the epoch of my removal, 40 students† The regular receipt from these would be \$1,800; and as the aggregate of salaries and current expenses, (see Journal of Convention for 1843, page 35,) was \$4,040, the *difference* to be provided for by other means, was for *that year*, \$2,240. Had the same calculation been made the year before, or three years before—about the time of my arrival on "the Hill"—the deficit in either case, would have been from \$100 to \$200

\* Instances are known of Colleges enjoying a much larger patronage than Kenyon College has ever enjoyed, which receive from grants and other extraneous resources, from \$5,000 to \$10,000 per annum, and could not be sustained otherwise; yet this circumstance is not deemed invidious, or in any way a reflection upon the judicious and prudent management of those Institutions.

† There were always some Clergymen's sons &c., who did not pay. But as these are not considered in the calculations of the "Reply," it is but just, in making comparisons, that they should not be considered here.



more; and in 1835, with about the same number of students, it was as heretofore stated, (from \$3,000 to \$3,500,) at least \$1,000 more. It appears then, from these comparisons, that the deficiency which excited such serious alarm in the mind of Bishop McIlvaine, and rendered it necessary to call together the Board of Trustees; which became the ground of such grave deliberation and action on their part, and which is charged so invidiously (page 15,) to my particular administration, *was in reality—as to the College—no DEFICIT at all.* It was rather a *surplussage*, being in fact from \$100 to \$1,000 less than the corresponding *deficiency* in other years. The real deficit then, must have been either in the Grammar Schools, or in the land revenue; and therefore

*Secondly, as to the Grammar Schools.*

On this subject you will find a statement in the "Reply," (p. 15,) to which I beg your particular attention. It is as follows:

"Milnor Hall, when Mr. D. took charge, (we take his own statement, p. 15, without vouching for its accuracy,) had *fifty-four* pupils. It therefore yielded by tuition, more than \$900 for the salary of Mr. D. and the other College officers. The other school he says had *forty-two* when he took charge. Thus it produced in fees for tuition \$1,260, all of which, as its instructors were College officers, was available for their salaries—so that when Mr. D. went to Gambier, these two schools yielded an income of at least \$2,160."

"Now what, according to *his statement*, was their reduced state when he was removed? By his own account the pupils in the Senior Grammar School had been reduced to *eleven*, diminishing the income from that source from \$1260 to \$330; and those in Milnor Hall had declined to *twenty-seven*; so that instead of yielding a nett income of \$900 to the college deficit, it only met its own expenses. Thus, according to Mr. D.'s statement, the falling off in the Grammar Schools at the time of his removal, had diminished the means of meeting expenses by at least \$1830."

These calculations, you will observe, are based with great emphasis upon my "statements." But if you will turn to the page (15) to which reference is made, you will see that I am not at all accountable for them. I made no statements, whatever, of the kind quoted. I never said that "Milnor Hall had *fifty-four* pupils when I took charge." I never said that I took charge of it at all; under any circumstances it would have been a falsehood. I never said that "the other school had *forty-two* when I took charge," or that I "took charge" of *that* any more than of Milnor Hall;—it would have been equally untrue.\* In all these particulars

\* My language in the passage referred to—(part of my address to the Trustees, pending their proceedings against me)—was as follows: "The falling off in numbers is not in the College classes, but in the Grammar Schools. The effective number in these classes when I came here, was *thirty seven*; it is now *thirty-nine* (40), and has not materially varied from that number in all the intermediate time. In the Senior Grammar School, however, there has been a diminution from *forty two*, year before last, to *twenty four* last year, and *eleven* now. So also in the Junior Grammar school, from *fifty-four* last year to *twenty-seven* or *eight* now. But what is that to me? I have nothing to do with the internal affairs of those schools; I took no credit for their increase, and I protest against being held in any way responsible for their decrease. The real causes I apprehend in both cases, were very easily ascertained, if *that* had been the object of your committee."

My object in this language was plainly to show the absurdity of the hypothesis, which made *me* responsible for the diminution in the Grammar schools with which I had only a very remote connection,—when in the college with which I was immediately and responsibly connected, there had been no material change. I was desirous, also, to excite the Trustees, if there was a

the quotation is *false*; and as the variation is palpable, and the numbers were so easily corrected, if *truth* had been the aim of the writer,—merely by opening the College catalogue for 1840–41,—and as the taking “charge” is evidently thrown in with an artful and insidious design to pervert truth in other respects,—it is difficult to avoid the conclusion, *that the falsehood was wilful and malicious*. Mark now how plain a tale shall put it all down.

As to the *falling off*: the Senior Grammar School had, *when I went to Gambier*, seventeen pupils. Sixteen months afterwards, in the summer of 1842, the number *had increased to forty-two*; but wanting the care and attention of a zealous and efficient Principal, its most important recitations (those of Professor Sandells) being sometimes omitted for nearly a week together, and no effort made to give it unity and character as a Seminary, it gradually lost interest and dwindled down, from sheer want of cultivation, to twelve, (I said eleven, but it should have been twelve,) at the date of my removal. There was in that Institution, therefore, a falling off of *five*, (from seventeen to twelve), during my official residence on “the Hill,” making a diminution of \$227 (instead of \$1260) in its receipts. In Milnor Hall, the number of pupils *when I went to Gambier*, was thirty. In two years it increased to fifty-four; but from that time to the date of my removal, it fell off again, (not from the neglect and inattention of its principals, as in the former case, but from essential defects in the modes of instruction), to its original number, about thirty. So that its receipts were not, from first to last, *materially altered*. And now let us sum up the whole of this matter. In the College there was an increment of *two*: in the Senior Grammar School, the falling off (from forty-two to eleven, as they have it) settles down to *five*: while in the Junior Grammar School (Milnor Hall) there was *no material variation*. The aggregate falling off, in ALL the Institution then, from the beginning to the end of my incumbency as President of the College, was *three*, as to the number of pupils! and *one hundred and thirty-five dollars*, (instead of *eighteen hundred and thirty*) as to the amount of receipts! Some-what of an error. Typographical, think you? Bishop McIlvaine read the proof!

But there is a climax of disingenuousness, even, if possible, beyond this, in the renewed attempt to make me responsible for the sins of the Grammar Schools. This is evidently a mortal effort with them, and page after page of the “Reply” is garnished with asseverations and arguments or verbiage intended for argument, to make it out. I am sick of ferreting out these dishonest fallacies, but this is a point of some importance, and must not be passed over. They say that I was responsible for these schools.

*First*. Because the profits arising from them went to pay the salaries of the College officers. *Ans*. So did the profits of the lands. Was I responsible for *them*? The Prudential committee, I apprehend, would have had something to say on that subject.

*Secondly*. Because the Principals were members of the College Faculty. *Ans*. They were also members of the Education Committee, and might have been members of a dozen organic bodies besides. Would that circumstance have transferred, from them, to the heads of those bodies, any part of their proper responsibility as Principals of their respective Schools?

*Thirdly*. Because in one of them (the Senior Grammar school,) a Professor was the Principal, and tutors gave instruction. *Ans*. The same

particle of truth or justice in them, to institute an inquiry into the real causes of the former. But it was of no avail.



Professor was also a Preacher, and an instructor in the Theological Seminary. Were these departments "as much connected with the President as any department of duty of the same professor?" And why not, if the principle is sound?

*Fourthly.* Because, in the same school the students live in the College edifice. *Ans.* Their living there is purely and professedly incidental. Circumstances might render it necessary for Theological students to live there in the same way. Would the President's responsibilities, in that case, extend to the Theological Seminary?

*Fifthly.* Because the Schools are dependant upon the reputation of the College. *Ans.* So are the tailors, and shoemakers, and trades-people of "the Hill,"—and what of it?

*Sixthly.* Because "not only the existence, but much of the character and attainment of the College, depend on them" (the schools.) *Ans.* There were many things upon which the well-being, and even the existence of the College depends, over which I had no control, and for which I was not in the least responsible. Its resources might be wasted, its property alienated, or its standard of discipline or scholarship fatally debased, by the mismanagement of an ignorant Board of Trustees. What power had I to prevent it? There were always abuses and nuisances on "the Hill," which I had no power to reach authoritatively, however much I might use my personal influence to restrain or correct them; as I used that influence to correct evils in the two Grammar schools.

*Seventhly.* Because these schools were "important nurseries" for the College, and furnished a large proportion of its pupils; and "as pupils were sent to (them) expressly to be prepared for the college," parents would not so send them if the College was in bad repute. *Ans.* Was I responsible for all the nurseries in which pupils were, or might be reared for Kenyon College? That would be a large responsibility, truly. Every grammar school in the country, while open for students at large, is also, potentially, a nursery for Kenyon College; and this was precisely the case in regard to those at Gambier. The Senior Grammar School was "an Academy, or High School, [see Catalogue just published] designed for the accommodation of young men who may wish to obtain a thorough English education, pursue a partial classical course, or be prepared for admission into the Freshmen class of the College." It had in its best state, twice as many general pupils as candidates for College; and could have had, under good management, a much larger proportion. So far from pupils being placed there "expressly to prepare for College," parents much more frequently placed them there under a popular bias *against College education* altogether, and were only induced to allow them to prepare for College by great persuasion afterwards.\* Milnor Hall, in like manner, was "an Institute of Elementary and Classical Instruction," (see Catalogue) where "Reading, Orthography, and Penmanship" were taught to boys (from 10 to 15 years old), as well as "the studies required for admission to the Freshmen class of Kenyon College, and such others as are usually taught in common Academies." This Institution furnished, in 1841, seven candidates for the Freshmen class, not one of whom, however, was able to proceed with the class in which he entered. In 1842, having about forty pupils, it furnished not a single candidate; and only three out of fifty-four pupils in 1843; making an average of one qualified candidate, out of an average of forty-one boys, per annum. So much for the assertion that pupils were sent there expressly to be prepared for College.

\* I have a volume of correspondence on this subject, with parents who committed their sons to my care.

*Eighthly.* Because such was the "previous practice,"—these departments having "always been as much under the direction of that body, (the College Faculty) and consequently under its President, as the College, in every thing but very minute and subordinate details" *Answer*. There was not and could not have been any "previous practice" on the subject; I went to Gambier under "a new organization, provided for by changes in the constitution of the Theological Seminary," (see Bishop McIlvaine's address to the Convention of 1841), by which new offices, new duties, and new relations, were created in all parts of the Institution. Whatever subordination the Grammar schools may have had to the *present Faculty*, they were not the less organized institutions under their own proper and responsible heads, nor did the Faculty ever in a single instance overlook that circumstance, by the slightest attempt to exercise a control over the interior management of either. When they appointed examinations, it was as a conservative visitorial body, and at Milnor Hall in particular, they were, on such occasions, always regarded and treated as the guests for the time being, of that Institution. The assertion, therefore, that these schools were, in the same sense as the College, under the direction of the Faculty, is simply false. But even if it had been true, it by no means follows that the President was individually responsible for the acts of the body.

*Ninthly.* It is said that "the doctrine that the President of the College had nothing to do with the internal affairs of the Grammar schools, was as new to the Trustees as it was surprising," and that "no Officer of any department, no Trustee, no one but Mr. D. ever took any other view than that taken" by the author of the Reply. The profound ignorance of the Trustees on all matters (of fact and principle,) connected with the real interests of the Institution, renders the first clause of this allegation extremely probable.\* The second is simply *untrue*. I venture to affirm, without fear of contradiction, that no person on the "Hill" ever alluded to me or thought of me as the head of either Grammar school. I am perfectly certain that I never performed a single act, or gave a single direction in that character; and that if I *had* done so, it would have been indignantly resisted, and universally regarded as an act of arrogant and unjustifiable usurpation.

But it is stated by Bishop McIlvaine that "before (I) began (my) duties, (I) asked (him) to explain (my) relations to those schools, especially Milnor Hall.—Which he did; stating that according to all the previous practice and universal interpretation, (I) was President of these departments precisely as of the College; that (I) was never heard to demur to that construction, that (I) began and went on in the fulfilment of that trust, and conversed with the Bishop about those institutions, as having that relation to them." If I understand this language right, it is a reiteration in the Bishop's own name, of what I have just denied, viz. that I was constituted the organic head of the two Grammar schools, and endowed with administrative functions in and over them, exactly as in the College. But the Bishop is mistaken. With a full sense of the responsibility of what I am saying, and as I shall answer hereafter, I solemnly declare that the whole of the statement for which he here makes himself responsible is untrue. He gave no such "construction"; he conferred no such powers. I did not "begin to fulfil" any such "trust," nor did I ever "converse with the Bishop about these institutions as having such a relation to them." I would not have accepted the Presidency, under any circumstances, encumbered with such a condition. The powers of

\* One of the best informed of them was surprised, only a few months before, to learn that the President's salary was only \$1000.

the Presidential office were certainly defined as extending, in a certain sense, to these Grammar schools,—I was *in favor* at that time, and the Bishop exceedingly liberal,—but it was as to them, a *supervisory* power, over *organised* departments, each having its own proper head, responsible, not to me, but to him—the Bishop—and the Board of Trustees; supervisory, as his own oversight of a parish is supervisory, and not at all *administrative or interior*, like that of the President over the College. I again solemnly affirm, that no such construction was ever put upon my duties or my responsibilities by the Bishop or any one else, *till it became necessary to trump up a pretext for my removal*. And I appeal to the unvarying usage and custom of the “Hill”; to the constant language of Bishop McIlvaine, and to the repeated declarations of the Board of Trustees, in corroboration of this fact. What man, woman or child, ever looked *to me* for any single function or responsibility in the interior management of Milnor Hall? Was any body, but Mr. Blake and Mr. Badger, ever so much as thought of in connection with those responsibilities? I answer unhesitatingly, and without fear of contradiction from any quarter, no! And the same is equally predicable of the Senior Grammar school. Look at the catalogues. They give in due order the names of the **HEADS** and all the **MEMBERS** of those schools, but they give not the slightest reference to the President, as having any organic connection with them whatever. Hear also Bishop McIlvaine. As early as 1833, in his appeal to the public, he spoke of the Institution as consisting of “four distinct seminaries—the Theological Seminary, Kenyon College, the Senior Preparatory, and Junior Preparatory Grammar Schools.” In all the negotiation under which I became President of the College, the Preparatory Schools were not so much as named or alluded to by him. In his address to the convention of 1841, after speaking in great praise of the College under my Presidency, he thus proceeds: “The same may be said with emphasis, of the Junior Preparatory school, Milnor Hall. Under the great efforts and untiring zeal of the Principals, that department has been wholly renovated, &c.” Finally, observe the language and action of the Board of Trustees, to the same effect. In their Report to the Convention of 1839, they say: “The Institution, as the Convention are aware, comprises four departments—a Theological and Collegiate, and two Academical or Preparatory; each has its appropriate officers, its separate course of studies, and its peculiar regulations and discipline.” In the reports of committees entered upon their minutes—as for instance, at the meeting at Gambier in September 1842, when a committee reported the (then) prosperous condition of the Junior Grammar School,—to whom do they refer as the responsible head of that Institution? To me? Oh no! Such a reference would have been perfectly ridiculous. No! They refer justly and properly to Messrs. Blake and Badger—the joint Principals; and I venture to say, that the absurdity of a reference to me in that relation, is not to be found any where in the records of that astute body, however ready they may have been to “see things otherwise,” when **THE BISHOP** had a special end to be answered by their so seeing.

But though I had, as I have thus clearly shown, “*nothing to do with the internal affairs of these schools*,” I was not indifferent to their welfare, and did faithfully, perhaps *too faithfully*, all that was in my power to avert the state of things, which in my view incurred, as to them, the loss of public confidence and patronage. What that state of things was, in regard to the Senior Grammar School, I have already in part intimated. You will better understand it, however, as well as some other things connected with the whole subject, by the addition of a general remark, which I may insert here.



The whole Institution,—College and Grammar schools, at the date of my first personal acquaintance with them,—was found, as to classic discipline, most unexpectedly and alarmingly low; greatly below that of any reputable eastern College: And the Grammar schools, far from furnishing a resource for the correction of this evil, stood precisely in the way of any substantial improvement. The desire of the Principals, young in office, to fulfil the expectations of parents, (often injudiciously excited,) in regard to the admission of their sons into the College, was paramount, whether the latter were prepared or not; and it was no unenviable task I assure you, for me, or any one else, to raise a question on the ground of *qualification*. In the Senior Grammar school, and in the *College*, by operating through the Tutors, I was enabled to accomplish something, notwithstanding the inertia and occasionally the undissembled opposition of Professor Sandels. But in the Junior Grammar school, having no such lever, my task was a much more difficult one. My first impressions of that Institution were highly in its favor. It was vacation, but the general arrangements for police and external management, seemed admirable, and I supposed every thing else must be upon the same footing. This impression was a little shaken during the summer of 1841, but completely overset at the first examination I attended, in July of that year; and I became painfully aware, that, with all the decorum and propriety of its external arrangements, there was no such thing as sound mental discipline in the school.\* The candidates for the Freshman class of the College, furnished no exception to this remark; they were totally unfitted for admission. A year's hard study would scarcely have qualified them for admission into any respectable college; and yet Mr. Badger, their instructor, thought them well prepared,†—Mr. Sandels did not object,—and I was too new to the whole system to be at liberty to take the stand which my judgment strongly suggested. Six of the seven were therefore admitted, to the entire satisfaction of *their parents*, and the great glory of the *Junior Grammar School*.

And now, what think you was my duty in these premises? Messrs. Blake and Badger were not appointed by me; they were not in any way accountable to me in the performance of their duties; but the well-being of the College, and a really friendly regard for them (Blake and Badger,) and for the institution over which they presided, forbade that I should pass over this state of things without some attempt to ameliorate it. Nor did I. I embraced an early opportunity of conversing on the subject with Mr. Badger,—expressed, with perfect frankness, and as much freedom as I felt myself at liberty to use, the results of my observation, and my views as to the proper mode of classic discipline,—tendered my services, at his pleasure, to visit the school, and, in any way, give all the influence in my power to stimulate the pupils in their classic recitations. So far as Mr. Badger was concerned, I have reason to believe these suggestions were received, as they were certainly given, in a kind and friendly spirit; but I am equally certain that they were coldly and unkindly regarded by Mr. Blake; that my personal efforts at the “Hall” were deemed obtrusive by him, and the impediment thrown in the way of the promotion of Milnor Hall boys, invidious and offensive. Certain I am, that his man-

\* There was scarcely a question asked on any subject, from the beginning to the end of the examination, that was not answered by the examiner, or so put in a leading form as to infallibly suggest the answer. In the Classics, there was scarcely a phrase construed or a word parsed, in which all that had any approximation to correctness, was not suggested *seriatim* by the examiner. These circumstances were particularly noted at the time.

† Mr. Blake did not pretend to teach even thus far, in *classics*.

ner towards me became more repulsive, and at times positively insulting; nor was I at all surprised to be informed\* that the boys, his pupils, went home to their parents with a strong impression "against the President."

That I should have relaxed the zeal of my *supervisory* efforts under these circumstances, seems to me a matter of course; and yet the author of the "Reply," page 16, adverts to it as if it was a dereliction of duty. He would have had me go on, it seems, in the course of action I had chosen to adopt, without any regard to the amount of ill-feeling or jealousy (unpopularity) I might incur from Mr. Blake, or any one else; and yet, mark me, *I have been tried and condemned in the secret councils of this man* (the writer of the Reply) *and his colleagues; and actually hurled from my office, without a moment's warning, ON A SECRET PRESENTMENT FOR UNPOPULARITY, RESTING UPON THE SECRET INFORMATION OF THIS VERY MR. BLAKE.*

But I must get back to my subject. I have been drawn aside, perhaps too far, in speaking of my relations to the two Grammar Schools, in consequence of the attempt of my adversaries to fix upon ME the responsibility of their decline. I do not forget, however, that I am *really* discussing a *financial* question, touching an alleged insufficiency of the *receipts* to meet the *expenses* of the institution, and that it still remains to be inquired.

*Thirdly. Whether the "deficit," spoken of by Bishop McIlvaine, may not have arisen from the falling off of the LAND REVENUE?* I have shown that there was no "deficit," in the proper sense of that term, in the College; that there was not a very considerable one from first to last, and leaving responsibility out of the question, in the Senior Grammar School; and in the Junior Grammar School, regarding it in the same aspect, none. The only other source of revenue, to be noticed, then, is the DOMAIN, the "COLLEGE TOWNSHIP," the lands, farms, buildings, &c., the administration of which, in *theory* and *practice*, was *exclusively* reserved to the Episcopate, as PRUDENTIAL COMMITTEE.

By the Treasurer's report in 1835, heretofore referred to, it appears that although the deficit of *the college* for that year, (after absorbing all the profits of the Grammar schools), was more than \$1700, the revenue, from land and other rents, was sufficient, not only to extinguish this arrearage, but to meet the interest of the debt, amounting to nearly as much more, and still leave an unexpended balance of \$450 in the Treasury. The nett income from this source, was, in short, at that time, \$3841. It would not be unreasonable, I think, to expect that this income had been somewhat increased in 1844, by the improvements from 1835 to that time; and especially as we find an addition of some \$6000 to the capital debt, on that account; a considerable portion of which must have been incurred within that period. But even if it had remained unaltered, as THE DEBT of the institution had been paid, and the interest account, therefore, extinguished, it was sufficient to have met the entire wants of the Collegiate department, (in 1844), including the "\$400 for a Theological Professor," and still to have left a surplus of from \$1700 to \$1800 in the Treasury. The declaration of Bishop McIlvaine, then, "*that there would be a deficit to a large amount,*" after all the "*income of the lands,*" &c., "*had been expended,*" implies that there must have been a falling off in the latter since 1835, of from \$2500 to \$3000; and this conclusion is verified by other evidences, bearing upon the subject. The Report of the Trustees of the Convention of 1843—for instance, under the head of "*Buildings,*

\* This fact was stated in terms by the Bishop, in his interview with the Senior and Sophomore classes, as I am prepared to prove.



*Farms,*” &c.,—gives the “total receipts, \$2992.20,” and the “total expenditures, \$1928.67,”—leaving an “excess of receipts, \$1063.53.” Finally it was stated by Mr. Dennison, in committee, on the memorable evening of the 28th of February, 1844, that the nett amount of the land revenue for the year, would not exceed \$900.

Here, then, is the rub—the real source of the alarming deficit so much talked of; not “in the salaries of the College officers,” nor in “the declining state of (the College) department”—as the Bishop has it—but in the prostration, the frittering away of the *means*, duly provided and always counted upon, for the payment of those salaries. Think of the revenue of this magnificent domain—4,000 acres of rich, productive Ohio land—estimated by the Trustees in 1842 (see Journal of Convention, page 74,) at \$90,000—besides mill property, and a whole village of tenements; the revenue from all these sources, amounting, in 1835, to almost \$4,000 per annum, now dwindled down, under the management of the *Prudential Committee*, to \$900! Can any one, contemplating this state of things, fail to perceive the deep policy of the whole proceeding against me? At a moment when the mismanagement of this noble property seems to have reached its climax, when the evidence of its abuse had become too palpable to remain much longer unobserved, when it was daily to be expected that the friends and patrons of the Institution would become alarmed and call for some inquiry on the subject, a hubbub is suddenly raised about “the unpopularity of the President,” an alarming “diminution in the College classes” is discovered all at once, the Institution is threatened with a “deficit to a large amount” in consequence, and “a new debt will have to be incurred (so they say) unless he (the President) is immediately removed from office.” All this is duly seasoned (in the Reply) with intimations of the wasteful expenditures of that officer—his recklessness in such matters—his utter indifference, in short, to all considerations of this kind; and, on the other hand, in strong contrast, the solemn responsibility of the Bishop—his vigilance in guarding against abuses—his “*bounden duty to a College, which, by so much labor, HE HAD JUST SUCCEEDED IN RELIEVING FROM ITS EMBARRASMENTS.*” Can it be a question, I say, in the mind of any one, after what has been said, that all this is but part and parcel of the most deep and subtle scheme to overwhelm me, and at the same time to divert inquiry from a real and palpable abuse of a great public trust? And see how perfectly it would have been consummated had I been weak enough, under the wheedling of Col. Bond, to tender my resignation.

We proceed, now, to examine the *mode* and the *means* and *appliances* by which, according to the “Reply,” the final result was brought about: “The Bishop was bound (he tells us) as President of the Corporation and *Prudential Committee*, to look into the causes of this deficiency, and ‘his he (accordingly) proceeded to do with all delicacy and caution.’” What were the Bishop’s ideas of “*delicacy and caution?*” Doubtless—you will say—he went immediately to the President, and spread the whole matter confidentially before him. The President was at the head of the Academic administration—no small responsibility—and more deeply interested, personally, in the prosperity of the College than any other individual. It is hardly supposable that he could have been called to that situation without some pretension, also, to experience and education, and professional standing; and a reference to the contemporaneous letters and publications of Bishop McIlvaine, show that he actually regarded him as holding a *very high rank* in all these respects\* Besides, he was the Bishop’s “dear”

\* The following article, from the Western E. Observer of March 27th, 1841, is instructive on this subject as coming from the pen of Bishop McIlvaine. Of course I am not responsible for its hyperbolisms:—

and "old friend;" having acknowledged claims upon him from "the long and intimate associations" subsisting between them, (nearly twenty years) "under such various and interesting circumstances."\* In every view of the case, under every suggestion of official propriety, frankness, faith and honor, it was the plain and obvious duty of Bishop McIlvaine to consult the President of the College at the very threshold of this inquiry. Did he do so? Oh no! His "delicacy and caution" were of a different complexion altogether; not the caution that hesitates under the fear of doing wrong, but that which seeks *concealment*, and dreads only—*discovery*. The inquiry was *secret*. No little address must have been required to keep it from coming to the ears of the President, eight entire weeks, (the Bishop and his consultants being all the while in daily intercourse with me,) till his Trustees could be got together, and the blow struck; but it was not wanting. The mind that conceived the plan had in it precisely those elements of "delicacy and caution" needful for its execution. The eight weeks rolled round; the Board met, and their work was already done before a single note of alarm reached me. Yet the Bishop would have it believed there was no plot, no design, no scheme against me at all.

Who were the persons actually honored with the Episcopal confidence in these proceedings? My particular friends, he tells us; persons who had been advanced by my patronage, and who enjoyed, in some sense, my regard and confidence. This was his idea of "*delicacy*." But why such delicacy if there was no previous design—no presentiment in his

"KENYON COLLEGE.—President Douglass arrived at Gambier the day before the close of the term last week. His connections, in the duties of an Engineer with an extensive company in New York having been rendered unexpectedly difficult of completion by the increase of embarrassments in the business community of the East, have occasioned, necessarily, some delay in his coming to the sphere of his future labors. Meanwhile, however, the full course of study in the College has been vigorously sustained. The Faculty is now very strong. President Douglass has had great experience in education, and been most zealously enlisted in the effort to improve the literature and science of our country by means of Institutions combining the decided inculcation of Christian principles and duties with the pursuit of secular learning. No less than sixteen classes, of as many successive years, at West Point, were trained by him, as he filled successively the Professorships of Mathematics, of Natural Philosophy, and of Civil and Military Engineering. Almost all the eminent scientific instructors, who were trained at that Institution, were educated by him. Prof. Ross, of Mathematics, at Kenyon College, who is universally considered as second to no mathematician or instructor in America, was his pupil. So were the Professors who now occupy the three principal chairs at West Point. To the great devotion and skill of President Douglass in the cause of education, he adds the zeal of a devoted christian, for the highest interests of man, associated with the utmost kindness of manner, and benevolence of disposition. The cause of literature and science in the West has received, indeed, a great accession of strength in the person of this gentleman, and Kenyon College may well be proud of her President."

Who could have anticipated that, *in three years* from the date of this article, the eminent, devoted, and benevolent individual here described, should have been characterized by the same pen as "*chilling and repelling*" in his manners—"constitutionally and habitually unfit for office—only appointed thereto "when it really went a begging," &c., and that he should have been arraigned—dismissed rather—without a previous complaint made, or question asked, *on the presentment of the College bell ringer*. But even this is not the greatest of the marvels connected with this strange proceeding.

\*See the Bishop's letter of condolence, dated the day after my dismissal in my former statement, page 34.

mind against me? Why avoid me, whom, on every just principle, he should have consulted, to tamper with the weak (or unprincipled?) brethren of *my* Academic family? The Bishop himself gives the solution:—“The President had a few days before more than once informed (him) that the College was never in a healthier state. Such (he adds) being the remarkable contrast between *his* idea of the state of things and that of *his officers*, the Bishop proceeded to no further inquiries,” &c. In other words, *my testimony did not suit—theirs did*.\*

The Bishop labors hard to bolster up the respectability of his consultants, and make it appear that they were a considerable portion of the officers of the College; but they were not so, either in numbers, experience, intelligence, or general character. Mr. Blake, as I have already stated, was one of the Heads of the Junior Grammar School. He (or his colleague) had indeed a seat in the Faculty, (for what purpose is not exactly known) but he was *not* a College officer, nor competent, by his own acknowledgment, to have discharged the duties of the lowest Academic station there. Mr. Lang was, in no sense, an “officer” of the College or of the Faculty. He was simply an *undergraduate student*, to whom the perquisite of *ringing the bell* had been given, to aid him in his (meritorious) efforts to complete his education; and for this purpose also I had recommended him as a teacher of Elementary Mathematics in the Senior Grammar School †

Of the four consultants then named by the Bishop, and so often referred to as “*THE officers*,” only *two* were really officers of the College at all. There were in the College altogether, as you probably know, four Professors and two Tutors. The Bishop’s consultation embraced but a single person of each grade. Prof. Ross was not included, any more than myself, nor Prof. Thrall, nor Tutor Comstock; Prof. Sandels and Tutor Gibbs *were*, and to them were added Mr. Blake, the English teacher of the Junior Grammar School, and the undergraduate, Mr. Lang; and it is this compound of odds and ends that is held up in the “Reply” as the Academic corps—the official body of the College—“*my officers*,” &c.

I shall not undertake to distribute very nicely the proportions of dishonor incurred by the individual parties of this quartette. I cannot but hope yet that the agency of some one or two of them is misrepresented in the “Reply.” They were examined separately, it seems and in private. Bishop McIlvaine was at liberty to make any version of their replies he thought proper; nor does he pretend to have submitted that version to be corrected and verified by them afterwards, except in the particular case of Prof. Sandels. The presentment set forth in the “Reply” then, (p. 8-9,) while it purports to have come from the joint and unanimous testi-

\* The Bishop throws in a remark at this point, that I was indifferent to the *pecuniary* welfare of the Institution, and took no concern in its indebtedness, &c. The assertion, however, is wholly gratuitous—not only *unproven* but *incapable of proof*—for it is untrue. During all my early residence on the “Hill” I was unceasing in my inquiries and conversations on this subject, till it became too evident to be mistaken that the Bishop did not intend to admit me, *quo ad hoc*, to his confidence; and it was pointedly intimated to me by Prof. Sandels, when the Bishop’s obliquities towards me first began to be noticed, that *THIS* was a point on which he could not bear to be questioned. “You may get along with him (said he) on all other points, but beware of that,” and accordingly I did, then and for that reason only, begin to *beware*. But I did not cease to feel therefore; and perhaps it may yet appear that I felt as much and as disinterestedly even as Bishop McIlvaine.

† A *College honor* open to undergraduates.



mony of *the four*, really stands upon *his* declaration alone; nor will I believe, till it is established by unequivocal testimony, *under the test of a cross examination*, that either of the others—Lang and Gibbs at least—would deliberately have verified what they could not but have known to be *false*. It is, however, unquestionable, that while they were in daily and familiar intercourse with me—Gibbs and Sandels as members of the Academic family, and Lang as a favored pupil—and all, except Mr. Blake, apparently on terms of the most entire confidence and cordiality; they were for eight weeks also in the relation of *secret correspondents* of Bishop McIlvaine, and, with full consciousness, co-operating in a design to drive me from my office and station, by an attack upon the dearest and most vital of all this world's interests—*my name and character*. It will be said, perhaps, in excuse, that they were called upon by the Bishop. I answer, the Bishop must have known upon *whom* to call, and *how to season* his application. He called upon *them* because *they were available for his purpose*, and *did not presume to call upon others* who he knew were *not available*.\*

But the important part in all this preparatory movement seems to have been played by Professor Sandels; Professor of the Latin and Greek Languages and Literature" in Kenyon College; head of the Senior Grammar School, and "Instructor of Latin and Greek" in the Theological Seminary of the Diocese of Ohio. Such an accumulation of titles and offices would ordinarily imply that the incumbent must be some veteran in literature, deeply read in all the lore of classical antiquity, and perfectly at home in all the disciplinary administration of "Colleges and Halls." In the present instance, however, you must prepare yourself for a different reality. The professor was no veteran; an Irishman by birth, not very long in this country, without any regular education, graduated in no college, and never associated (till he came to Kenyon,) with any academic body whatever. So late as 1840 he was a Theological student in the Seminary; but having made himself in some way useful to the Bishop in the movements of that year, he was suddenly elevated after a short period of tutor's duty,—a little before his ordination—to the Professorship, and other responsibilities above named. His department, as I have already intimated, was, in discipline and attainment, far below the grade of the same department in respectable eastern Colleges. It could not well be otherwise. The discipline, as line, as might be expected, was extremely superficial; in addition to which a considerable proportion of his recitations were often omitted on the slightest pretexts. It is susceptible of proof, that at the date of my removal, the most delinquent person—graduate or undergraduate—connected with the Institution, was the Professor of Languages. He had heard the Freshman class in Xenophon but 17 recitations, and the Juniors in Tacitus but 16, in eight weeks,—and wondered why the latter did not take more interest in the subject. His turn at prayers was omitted—not uncommonly—four or five times out of seven for months together; the

\* Mr. Lang was appointed Head of the Senior Grammar School a few months after. Mr. Gibbs is styled in the "Reply" "an officer of (my) choosing," but he was *not* chosen by me. Prior to his appointment, I had never seen him or heard of him. A Tutor was to be chosen; the Senior Tutor, with whom he was to be associated in duty, strongly recommended a friend and classmate, whose name was Gibbs; I nominated him accordingly, and he was elected by the Faculty. Had I known him I should not have nominated him, for many reasons. Though of mature age, he was in mind, character, intelligence and manners, a mere youth; and over and above all, an open declaimer against the church, by whose endowment he was paid and gratuitously instructed.



excuse being, **THAT HE COULD NOT WAKE UP.** These derelictions of duty were the subject of earnest and oft repeated appeals on my part ; and it is known to Professor Ross, as well as to Professor Sandels, that for a long time it was to me a subject of *deep grief*, that I could not by any admonitions or entreaties, awaken in the latter the least interest in any of the duties to which he was pledged. \*

Such was the character and responsibility of the chief witness in this proceeding ; and it was before such testimony, be it remembered, that the " skill," and " experience," and " zeal" and devotion and Christian character and " benevolence of disposition" of the new President, so recently lauded in all the forms of rhetoric by Bishop McIlvaine, vanished from his mind like the early dew. It was not even necessary to " ask HIS opinion" on a subject of the most momentous concern to himself and to the Institution ; " the remarkable contrast between *his* idea of the state of things and *that of his officers* ; (i. e. Blake, Lang, Gibbs and Sandels,) being in the Bishop's opinion a sufficient reason for making " no further inquiries." The testimony thus drawn out and recorded in the Bishop's private memorandum. (Reply, p. 8-9,) embraces substantially the following allegations : *First*—that the students were without exception extremely dissatisfied with the President's " ways and modes, in the government of the College, and with no person or thing of the Institution besides. *Secondly*—that because of this dissatisfaction they had lost their interest in the Institution and become indifferent to its discipline. *Thirdly*—that the spread of these sentiments abroad, had made parents far and wide unwilling to send their sons. And *finally*—that the same feeling pervaded the Faculty ; the President having usurped all the powers of government, to the exclusion of that body, and *they* allowing it only " from a wish to avoid unpleasant difficulties with him."

These allegations, though of no particular importance as bearing upon the ulterior action of the Board of Trustees,—for they were not laid before that body at all,—are yet of no little significance as developing the grounds of the Bishop's action, and the state of the plot on the 6th of January. I am not arraigned, you perceive, on any charge of *misconduct*, (unless the last allegation be supposed to embrace some intimation of that kind,) but upon an *opinion* of my official conduct and character said to have been held by the students ; as if such an opinion—unstable and fluctuating as it is known to be—was a proper test of my official character and faithfulness as President of the College. Who ever expected that in the discharge of my difficult and responsible duties, I should escape the judgment, sometimes even the harsh judgments, of those under my care ! Bishop McIlvaine called me to Gambier, for the purpose of taking responsibility, in the enforcement of a vigorous system of discipline and study ; and neither he or I ever expected this to be done without great self-sacrifice, and severe trials of firmness and patience.† Yet here I find him with his pliant auxiliaries, making my very self-devotion in this cause, the lever for my destruction ; and that too,

\* The relations in which I found the Professor with Bishop M. on my arrival at Gambier, naturally gave him a large share of my confidence. He also sympathised or appeared to sympathize warmly with me on various matters and occasions where sympathy was needful, (particularly in regard to church matters, and the obliquities of Bishop M. towards me in 1842-3—till September, 1843. His salary was raised then ; and after that I heard no more of sympathy ; and the plot against me was brought to its maturity, precisely in the four following months.

† The following extract from the address of the Bishop to the Convention of 1837, will show what were his sentiments on this subject at that time : " If the

when he knew (every ingenuous student could not but see) that in thus subjecting the highest executive function to the irresponsible, and often prejudiced opinions of the students, he was virtually surrendering all that was dignified and respectable in the character and government of the College. Who, after this, can exercise authority, or administer discipline in Kenyon College, except in such degrees and proportions as the *subjects* of such discipline may be pleased to approve. Bishop McIlvaine having made *their approval* the unqualified test of executive faithfulness, future Presidents and Professors will disregard it at their peril; and what then becomes of the dignity and character of the College?

Apart from the *principle*, I could have had no objection to rest my case upon an appeal to the students actually then present.

I had not indeed made their approval the primary object of my administration, but I had not been therefore regardless of it. Their confidence was very dear to me, and it was one of my most cherished reflections, in the midst of laborious duties and severe trials, that by the uncompromising devotion of myself to the *permanent* welfare of the Institution, and the *highest* interests of those connected with it, I was establishing the surest claim to the ultimate approbation of every intelligent, thoughtful, and right minded student. I had moreover a sincere regard for a large proportion of the students personally, and I could not doubt that that regard was in some degree reciprocated. Without making any particular inquiries, I had sensible evidence that it *was* reciprocated; and when the charge of *unpopularity* was brought out upon me, with the suddenness of an electric shock, on the evening of the 28th of February, I was far less amazed by the *suddenness* than by the *substance* of the allegation, and the confident assurance with which it was made. The clearest convictions of my understanding, the results of all my experience in the daily intercourse of the students—a far more intimate intercourse than any other person enjoyed—were diametrically contradicted by it. And it was only by the spontaneous reaction of the students themselves, a few days after, that I

number of students in the College classes, (he observes) exclusive of those in the preparatory departments, seems small in comparison with other Institutions, it should be recollected that in the West, a College can hardly be expected to sustain a dignified stand, as to the requisites of admission; to enforce a vigorous system of internal discipline, and carry out such a course of study as becomes its profession and its degrees, without sacrificing for a long time numbers for attainments. It is the determination of those in the administration of Kenyon College, to endeavor to attain an enlarged patronage without compromise with any defective notions of education or any humoring of popular caprice. A few young men well educated are worth a host superficially taught. Such a determination in this country requires much patience and firmness in the prosecution; but I trust it will never yield to any temptation to popularity or pecuniary increase; ultimately it must have its reward." Entertaining precisely the same views, I wrote to Bishop M. in the course of our negotiation in 1840, to know whether I could depend upon being sustained in them by the Board of Trustees, and the following is his reply: "The questions you propose as to the interference of the Board, &c. may all be answered in one sentence—they have never interfered in such things—all has been left to the Faculty—all under you will be; so you are left at ease on all such heads; therefore I conclude you will certainly come," &c.

The same views were also taken and sustained in all my consultations with the Bishop before entering upon my duties, and it was announced in the chapel, that thorough discipline and sound scholarship would be insisted upon at all events. Finally, in my address at the commencement of 1842, the same determination was still more strongly and fully expressed, before a very large audience of the friends of the institution—the Bishop being present and tacitly approving. It was a settled system therefore, fully understood and sanctioned by him and duly published, on which I acted.

was relieved from this state of perplexity and doubt. The following are the facts.

I had been giving a course of popular lectures, at the request of the students, on a subject of military history, the last of which was to be delivered on the Saturday evening after my dismissal; but being placed in a new position by that event, and as a hostile feeling was said to exist among the students, I was in doubt whether I might not expose myself to some unpleasant exhibition of that feeling in giving the lecture; and, finally concluded *not* to give it. Immediately on making the announcement, however, I was waited upon by a number of the students, with an urgent request that I would by no means give up the lecture; and in reply to the reason assigned, the most full and affectionate disclaimers were uttered and reiterated by them in behalf of the whole body of the students. Thus reassured, I went to the chapel at the hour appointed, and gave my lecture to a most attentive and respectful audience, adding at the conclusion, as the occasion seemed to demand it, a few words of parting counsel to my young friends, without any reference however to the subject matter of my removal. The professors and their families were there, and most of the population of the "Hill," and many of them will undoubtedly recollect the strong emotion with which these last words were received by the students; the enthusiastic response to the vote of thanks; the call that was made upon me for the charges on which I had been removed, and my answer;\* and the motion to pass a vote of censure upon the Trustees; which motion, I am confidently assured, would have passed by a large majority had I not interposed to prevent it; and finally the adjournment of the students to meet again on Monday. So far from any demonstration of *hostile* feeling, many of the students gathered round me, in leaving the Chapel, with the strongest expression of their sympathy and regard; and I have before me unequivocal evidence that such was the sentiment of the great body of the students—all, indeed, except a very few, and those mostly, if not all, *beneficiaries*—the paid retainers of the Education Committee. At the meeting on Monday they passed unanimously, and of their own motion, without *any influence of mine*, (Mr. Lang being in the chair,) a set of resolutions, much more strongly expressed and more decidedly in my favor than the letter of which the Bishop makes so much account, and it was only when they were discussing an incidental question about publishing the resolves, that two or three beneficiaries came in, and excited some opposition; and even then their plea for so doing was the injury they affected to think the resolutions would do *me*.† So much for the universal dissatisfaction of the students with my administration.

\* I objected to any discussion or action on this subject, but as the question was categorical, as to the *matter charged* against me, I felt myself at liberty to give them the answer which had been given to me, by one of the Trustees (Col. Bond) in reply to the very same question, which was as follows: "Nothing at all sir! I have not heard the beginning of a charge against you." A resolution was then moved denouncing the "injustice of my removal," but I admonished them to abstain from any proceedings of that kind, and immediately left the desk. My position was a very difficult one. I asked the opinion of several of the Professors afterwards, as to the propriety of my action. None of them censured me and Prof. Ross in particular, though: I might have gone much farther.

† I am said to have stimulated these meetings, and to have collected the students at my house, and to have "made great efforts to enlist their sympathies against the Bishop and the Board of Trustees;" but it is untrue, in every particular. I did not assemble the students in a single instance; I had nothing to do directly or indirectly, with any of their meetings; my sons were forbidden to attend them. A letter now before me, of which I have



But how, you will ask, could a memorandum have been made so opposite to the truth? I ask in reply, why did not Bishop McIlvaine, if he wished to know the truth in a matter of such deep interest, go directly to the source—the only proper source of correct information—the students themselves? Why did he call to his councils, *secretly*, four special individuals to give *their* opinions of the opinions of the students, when the latter were at hand to give their own version of the matter? Why did he examine them apart, and then, in the secrecy of his own closet, make his own memorandum of their aggregate testimony, without submitting it, afterwards, to either of them except Prof. Sandels? Was this the way to arrive at truth?

The second allegation is, that “they, (the students,) found no fault with any thing, or anybody, but the President.” If Mr. Gibbs, one of the persons upon whose responsibility this declaration is said to stand, had carried back his recollection a few months, it would have embraced a very critical state of things, then existing in one of the classes, in regard to *himself*. It was the subject of an informal consultation, on his own statement of the matter, in the Faculty, and the occasion of some interviews between him and me: and he may *now* know further, that I was waited upon by a deputation, professing to represent the class, with a strong protestation against *him*, as a teacher and as a man; and that it was only through my personal influence that a very serious outbreak was averted.

There was, perhaps, no circumstance in the institution which was so constantly complained of by good students, as the deficiency and inefficiency of the Classical department. It was notorious at all times that there were students present, prepared at other seminaries, who were far more competent to instruct than the College instructors, and who could have no motive to stay, with any view to improvement in that particular; while those less thoroughly prepared, but desirous of becoming good scholars, complained that they made no progress, except as they could learn something incidentally from their more competent fellow students. Several of the most desirable pupils of both descriptions left on this account. But there were other drawbacks to the College. There was no instruction in modern languages; no apparatus connected with the Philosophical department, and therefore no practical instruction in physics;\*

several, on this subject, says, “we met by common consent without a call from any body,” “no body could have prevented our meeting.” Neither did I stimulate them to any action against the Bishop or Trustees; quite the contrary. My clients and all within my influence were cautioned against it, and several of them have since given me memorandums of the words made use of by me. I certainly *did* read the documents, and answer frankly the questions put to me as to the circumstances of my removal, when the students called upon me; but by what rule of rectitude or honor should I have been restrained from so doing? If the removal was *right*, it need not *fear* examination; if *wrong*, it may hope in vain, to avoid it. The first resolutions passed by the students, were pretty severe upon the Trustees; and it was on *this* account I sent for Mr. Lang, who had been chairman, and requested him to modify them, so as to make them unexceptionable to all. Yet the Bishop speaking of this action, with his accustomed candor, says, “he tried to get something of the kind from the students, but in trying to get them to go too far, he failed in getting anything.” Perhaps I may have an opportunity, hereafter, of cross examining some of the Bishop’s witnesses on this matter; we shall then know what passed in the meeting of the students.

\* Almost the only good article of philosophical apparatus, was an Atwood’s machine, made in New York, while I was Professor of Natural Philosophy in the New York University, and purchased by me for \$200, and presented to Kenyon College. It was my intention to have constructed, by the labor of



no sufficient laboratory or apparatus for the chemical department ; no systematic collections ; nor any of the incidental means and appliances by which the interest of college students is ordinarily excited and sustained. And the institution suffered in proportion. These things were constantly mentioned by students *to me*, as grounds of objection, however little they may have been apprehended in that light by Bishop McIlvaine and his counsellors.

The memorandum goes on to state, in substance, that the young men, in consequence of their dissatisfaction with the President, had become disaffected towards the institution, and wholly indifferent to its discipline. The same idea is paraphrased with some improvement on page 16. "Dismission had little 'terror,' they say, because it inflicted no penalty. Students of the best character for morals and study left the college, promising to return if Mr D. should resign," &c. These allegations necessarily imply that there must have been a very debased state of discipline in the College at that time. So great disaffection must needs have been accompanied by an increased amount of delinquency—frequent irregularities, and disorders of a grosser kind tending toward dismissal,—and a more than ordinary number of actual dismissals, or voluntary withdrawals. I think I am right in saying that these circumstances are necessarily connected in the mind of the reader, with the facts alleged ; so that if the former are shown not to have existed, it will be apparent that the latter cannot be true. And now for the proof.

I have before me an abstract of the delinquencies and discipline of the College for the greater part of the time of my Presidency ; from which it appears that during the term in which I was dismissed, there was not a single (*other*) dismissal in the College. About two-thirds of the term had transpired, and in that time *not a single student had been arraigned for any offence whatever ; there had not been an act of discipline of any kind, even so much as a private admonition ; nor had a single student left the College, or shown the least disposition to leave it on any pretext whatever.* I venture to say, another such instance cannot be found in all the records of the institution, from its foundation to the day of my dismissal. Again, the same document shows, in the most conclusive manner, that so far from there being a debased state of discipline, the discipline had never been higher. There had been a regular progressive improvement in that respect, from the beginning to the end of my Presidency. Take, as an exponent, the average proportion of ordinary delinquencies, per student, for a term of  $13\frac{1}{2}$  weeks. In the latter part of 1841, this average was 11 ; in 1842, 10 ; in 1843, it was reduced to 6 ; and in the beginning of 1844—my final term—to  $3\frac{1}{2}$ . Or take the proportion of *non-delinquents*\* during a like term. In the latter part of 1841, it amounted to only 12 per cent of the whole number of College students ; in the latter part of 1842, it had increased to 40 per cent ; in 1843, to 58 per cent ; and in the beginning of 1844—my final term, it had gone up to 69 per cent. The assessments for damages also, furnish instructive evidence to the same effect. In the summer of 1842, it ave-

self-supporting students, a working laboratory in the basement of the College, and to have made by the same means, the ordinary articles of a complete philosophical apparatus. Timber for this laboratory had already been cut and hauled at the date of my dismissal ; and with good seconding, I could have had, in two or three years, the means of illustrating, in a very satisfactory manner, the whole course of physics, without any outlay of money worthy of consideration.

\* Those who had no (unexcused) delinquencies, or not more than two during the term.

raged from \$1.50 to \$2.00 per student, (making proportion for a term of 13½ weeks), whereas, in 1844—my final term—it was only about *one-fourth* that amount.

As to the number of students leaving the College, by dismissal or otherwise, without taking a degree: There had left in this way, within *one year* previous to the date of my removal, 16 persons—about 37 per cent of the whole average number of students for that year. This proportion may seem large to those who are chiefly conversant with eastern colleges, but it is by no means extraordinary in the west, in “where the nature and value of a regular systematic education,” the Bishop tells us, “have yet, in a great measure, to be learned.” I could identify a single year of Bishop McIlvaine’s Presidency at Gambier, in which the proportion thus leaving was 64 per cent of the average whole number, and a series of four years in succession, in which it was more than 50 per cent. For 10 years before I went there, it averaged 40 per cent. Finally, in 1839-’40, the two years before my going there, the number thus leaving was greater than the number entering,—and the whole number who left, including graduates, more than double that number.

But the gravamen of this part of the memorandum is, that I in particular was the author of a harsh and relentless system of discipline; that I was distinguished above all the Faculty in this respect so as to be notorious among the students, and that I was regarded by them, in consequence, as an object of peculiar dread and dislike. The falsity of this allegation in substance, has been already shown. It seems to be connected in the Reply with the idea of an inordinate number of dismissals, of which I was understood to be the author. Let us again look at the facts.

During the term in which I was dismissed there was, as I have said no other dismissal. In all the preceding term there were but two—gross and aggravated cases of habitual delinquency and idleness, and so regarded by the Faculty unanimously. In the long vacation of 1843 *one* person was dismissed by the Faculty for a violent assault upon a fellow student, and refusing to pledge himself not to repeat it, besides other irregularities.\* Finally, in the summer term of 1843, there were

\* There was, however, in the Institution at that time a clique of young men, (alluded to in my former statement) in regard to whom it was urged in the most impressive terms, more than once, by Bishop McIlvaine, that they ought all to be sent away. Their general habits and character, were said to be derogatory to the character of the College, and likely to hinder exemplary young men of Ohio and its vicinity from joining it. But there was a private consideration also. He insisted, (without the slightest evidence however,) that it was they who had made some attempts upon his orchard, and said he had loaded his gun for them in case they came again—an instructive example of “that influence which commands obedience at the same time that it *warms* and *enlists* instead of *chilling* and *repelling* the affections of the heart.” Prof. Sandels also, leaving home in the course of the vacation, made a point of calling upon me to give his vote for the unqualified [dismissal of these young men. They were not dismissed however. Circumstances, with which I had no connection, except as their patron and friend, suggested their withdrawal from the Institution and they were allowed to withdraw, without the degradation of an actual dismissal, except in the one case mentioned. It was some of the persons connected with this clique who are referred to as being personally friendly to me, and at the same time dissatisfied with my “ways and modes” of government; and again, “as students of the best character for morals and study, who “left College for the same reason.” Their competency to judge in such a matter, as well as their “character for morals and study,” may be estimated from the following data: They were *all*, except one, *Freshmen*; all, without exception, of low standing in their classes; *all*, more or less, exceptionable in conduct, not having been matriculated, after a year’s probation, except one, and he had been degraded again. Finally, they had all been dismissed but a short time

two dismissals and one expulsion, clear and unquestionable cases, in regard to which there was not the slightest difference of opinion in the Faculty. The whole number of actual dismissals, then, during a year preceding my own, was but *six*—certainly not a very inordinate number—not more than had been dismissed in a single term under Bishop McIlvaine's presidency, and less than one-third the number peremptorily disposed of in a single act of the Faculty, during the winter of 1842-3, with the unanimous approval of the Board of Trustees.

But on what ground and by whom was I held up as the special and particular author of these dismissals, or, in fact, of *any* dismissal? Dismissals, and all other specific punishments, were awarded by the Faculty—a deliberative body. The President neither moved in them, nor voted, except when there was a tie; and the records will show that, so far from there being a tie in either of the instances, referred to, there was not even a single dissenting voice. I appeal with confidence to those records; I appeal to every member of the Faculty; I pledge myself to prove, by the testimony of Professor Sandels himself, if I should ever be so fortunate as to catch him upon the witnesses stand in any Court of Record, that the attempt to fix upon *me* in particular the authorship of these dismissals or of any dismissals that occurred during my Presidency, is a base and barefaced slander. An instance cannot be named in which I ever went beyond the Faculty in my views of punishment, whilst there were repeated instances in which the severity of *their* views was restrained and mitigated by me.\* But it is said that the students, in point of fact, did particularize me, regarding me as the author of harsh discipline, and finding no fault, in this respect, "with any one but the President." If this allegation were true (which it is not) I would ask, who taught them thus to regard me. The deliberations of the Faculty were secret and confidential; how and by whom were the students taught to refer to any particular individual the responsibility of our corporate acts? The answer is not a difficult one, it was pretty well understood long before my removal, and by others probably sooner and better than by myself, that there was a *lobby intercourse* kept up between the author of this slanderous allegation and a portion of the students, by which false impressions were constantly disseminated among the latter in regard to the proceedings of the Faculty. It was notorious that while no one of that body was more generally harsh and severe in his judgment of the students, or more ready to propose vindictive and severe measures, than the Professor of Languages; he invariably managed to be regarded, even by the persons who were the subjects of those measures, as their zealous advocate and friend; while others who, in repeated instances, were

before by the unanimous vote of the Faculty—*unanimously approved by the Board of Trustees*—and only restored again through my instrumentality. It is not possible that the reason mentioned for leaving the College could have been given by any one whose judgment in such a matter *cannot be proved to be utterly worthless*.

\* Had it not been for my interposition, in the spring of 1842, the whole Senior class would have been dismissed, Prof. Sandels was in favor of it, but it was opposed by me, and by pursuing the course suggested by myself, I was enabled to save the class, without compromising the dignity of the Institution. The papers on this subject are now before me. Had I been left at liberty to pursue the same course (suggested, again by me,) on the occasion of the holiday outbreak in the winter of 1842-3, viz: to assemble the students concerned, and reason the matter with them on principle; the Faculty would not have been obliged, as they were, to dismiss 19 undergraduates in one batch. Nor would they have had the opportunity to take back 13 or 14 of that number, on acknowledgment, if I had not ultimately pursued that course, on my own responsibility. For all which I have, in addition to other evidences, the assurance of the parties themselves.



most reluctant to yield even to the claims of discipline, and never did yield except when those claims were clearly paramount, were represented as harsh and overbearing. With this malign influence thus operating against me, and all the other agencies, of which I have spoken, busily engaged through the winter in exciting the minds of the students against my "ways and nodes" of government, it is not so much a matter of surprise that there should have been *some* thus excited, as that there should have been so few.

It still remains to say a word or two about those not yet fully accounted for, who left the College, within the year before my dismissal, *voluntarily*. Of these, one left on account of sickness, and having lost much time, finally concluded not to return—expressing, however, as it happens, the fullest confidence in the President and *most* of the Faculty. Another was withdrawn by advice of his patron, Prof. Sandels, for reasons to me unknown. Another left on account of inability to meet his bills, and all the rest on account of utter and hopeless inability to get on with their studies. But there were many others, the memorandum goes on to state, that "would go away if their parents would let them," while, in the very next sentence, we are informed, that on account of the bad reputation of the College under my Presidency, parents were prevented from sending their sons. Parents must have been very perverse if both these allegations are true; but what shall be said of the reasoning which draws from both alike an argument against me? Surely, if the sentiment of the parent is good against me in one case it ought to be good in my favor in the other, and with greater weight too: since those who had their sons *in* the College may be supposed to have had a better knowledge of its affairs, and a higher responsibility in what they did than those *who had not*. But the truth is, both allegations, in any sense that would in the slightest degree implicate my administration, are utterly groundless. That there may have been students restrained from leaving the College, by their parents, is not improbable; it is more or less the case in all Colleges, but it was at Kenyon, as elsewhere, a strife between the better judgment of the parent, and the idle, undutiful, insubordinate spirit of the son, without any personal reference to the President or any other officer. Of the sentiment of the students, as a body, towards myself, I have already spoken and may have occasion to speak again. With regard to that of the parents, a single statistical fact will show that it could not have been *very adverse*. The average number of students entering College during the three years of my Presidency, was 26 per annum; and during the two preceding years, under Bishop McIlvaine's Presidency, only 12 per annum. If parents were really unwilling to send their sons then in 1841-2 and 3, what must they have been, according to this statement, (which is documentary) in 1839-40? But by what right, with what color of decency, I may say, do these secret presenters—a foreigner, a young and inexperienced tutor, and an undergraduate—presume, if they really did presume, to expound the sentiments of parents, scattered, as the patrons of the Institution were, over the whole United States? I have before me the results of a large and extensive correspondence with parents and with the friends and patrons of the Institution generally, including several members of the Board of Trustees; and I pledge myself to draw from them at least ten clear and unequivocal testimonials of approbation and confidence for each single allegation of the least value, (of a date prior to the 28th Feb., 1844,) that the Bishop and his abettors can produce from the same source against me.

The last count of the Bishop's indictment implies that there was a deep, radical, and irreconcilable misunderstanding between myself and the *Faculty*; the latter having given up the government almost wholly into my hands, "from a wish to avoid unpleasant difficulties" with me, and "with no hope or prospect of any amendment." This, like the other items



of this precious document, stands, you will recollect, upon the single averment of Professor Sandels. The Bishop might have obtained the opinions of all the officers in particular, but this probably did not consist with his views of "delicacy and caution." He did not even consult the older and more experienced of the Professors. On this as on the other points, the same inexperienced Tutor,—the same head of the Grammar School, half a mile distant,—and the same undergraduate, were his only consultants, besides the Professor of Latin and Greek; and even these, were not called upon to verify the record. The language made use of implies an entire and hopeless diversity between the Faculty and myself; a determination, on my part, to carry out my own particular views, in opposition to the corporate sentiment, and a giving up of the matter, on theirs, in opposition to their better judgment, for the mere sake of peace.

Let me pause a moment here to consider the weight which this allegation ought to have as an argument against me, supposing it true. If the Faculty of Kenyon College had been, as the faculties of most colleges are—men of liberal education and mature experience, thoroughly versed in the administration and discipline of colleges—I myself being at the same time, comparatively, young and inexperienced,—I grant you that a wide difference of opinion between them and me in regard to the administration of the College would have been a fair subject for investigation; and the attempt to carry out *my* particular views without such investigation, indelicate and improper. But even then, the *subject* of difference would have been entitled to a fair hearing, on its merits. The real case, however, was widely different from that here supposed. So far from the Faculty standing *above* me in the particulars mentioned, (I suppose I may say without arrogance, what nobody pretends to call in question), they were greatly behind me in *academic experience* and education, as well as *in age*. They had been collected together as an academic body, in haste, (in 1840) to meet a particular exigency; and were all, except myself, as to college matters, notoriously and confessedly *new men*; perfectly inexperienced in the "ways and modes" of college administration.\* Of the four Professors, I was the only one who had been educated in a college at all; the only one who had been trained to any considerable extent in other departments of a college course, besides his own; the only one who had been connected with the administration of any college, before Kenyon. Professor Ross, who was by far the most efficient and accomplished among them *as an instructor*, was yet a cadet when I occupied the principal chair of Mathematics at West Point; and when nominated by me to his present Professorship at Gambier, confessed his entire want of acquaintance with the *administration* of colleges. Professor Sandels had been Tutor a little while in Kenyon while studying for orders in 1839–40, and that was all *his* previous experience. Professor Thrall was a respectable west country physician. None of these had received an academic degree of any kind, (there were in fact but *two* graduated out of six or seven members of the whole Faculty,) before my arrival. Under such circumstances, had there been a difference of opinion between the Faculty and myself, I submit to every candid and ingenuous mind, whether it ought to have been taken even as *prima facie* evidence against me; much less (as the Bishop would have it considered.) a ground *final* and *conclusive*, for my peremptory dismissal,—without so much as a question asked about the merits of the matter in debate.

\* I am far from wishing to disparage any gentleman connected with the Faculty by these statements; they are however the facts of the case, and the very facts on which Bishop McIlvaine rested his most urgent appeals to hasten my arrival at Gambier in the fall of 1840.

But there was no such difference. The Faculty and myself were upon the most amicable footing, in all respects. So far from any attempt on my part to overbear them, there had not been the slightest disagreement or dissention of any kind in our deliberations for more than a year.\* No deliberative body could have been more perfectly harmonious; they (in their corporate character,) exercising without let or hindrance from me, all the powers which a Faculty ever does exercise; and constantly of their own free will referring to me all sorts of discretionary matters; and all, to human appearance in perfect harmony and good will. The assertion that I had private and particular ends to carry out in opposition to the common weal, is most unjust. I venture to say there is not one of the Faculty who will pretend to have come near me in the devotion of himself, his ease and comfort, and the comfort of his family, to the promotion of the common interest. All the experience of my early life had been a school of *esprit de corps* to me, and it is not very likely that I should have forgotten its lessons when called to preside over a seminary

\* The only occasion of disagreement in the Faculty during all my Presidency were *three*, all occurring in the year 1842, and all, as I am now well assured, connected with certain political movements on the Hill, of which I shall have occasion to speak hereafter. I will briefly state the occasions, that it may be seen how far my claims to confidence as President of the College, were forfeited by the rule or mode of my action, in either case. *First*—the right of the President to convene the Faculty during vacation! That body having been thus convened, on business of importance, the President's right in this particular was unexpectedly mooted and contested with some asperity by one of the Professors. He was not sustained however by the Faculty, and in an amicable conversation some time after I succeeded in showing him that it was *not* an unusual or improper exercise of the Presidential power. *Secondly*—on a question, whether or not to have an *after-noon* recitation in all the *classes*. It was desired by some of the Professors, and claimed as a prescriptive right by one, to have all his particular recitations arranged in the morning hours, by which one of the classes was subjected to the inconvenience of having its three recitations crowded together between eight and twelve in the morning. As the evils of this arrangement were very conspicuous, and had been greatly complained of, I took upon me to represent and urge somewhat strongly the interests of the College in this particular, and in taking the question, for the first and only time during my Presidency, I exercised the right given me by the laws, of calling for a two-thirds vote. It went against me, and I gave it up; but I claim that the position taken was a proper one, properly insisted upon, and perfectly disinterested. *Thirdly*—a proposition made by me to adopt an uniform system of class marks, with a view to the more equitable distribution of the College honors, was resisted somewhat warmly by one of the Faculty, as tending to bring them (the Professors) *unduly* into subjection to the President. The objection was not sustained, I believe by any of the Faculty. Most of them were decidedly in favor of the system proposed, and after a few weeks delay, the dissentient himself conceded his objections, and it was unanimously adopted.

All these instances occurred within a month of each other, in 1842; and were connected, as I shall presently show, with a secret movement of that period, having for its object to detach the Bishop from myself, and connect him in a coalition with his quondam enemies. It placed almost every body on the Hill for the time in a false position, and among the rest created for a *brief period* an estrangement between Professor Ross and myself; and it was *then* that he expressed his intention to have left "the Hill" in case Bishop McIlvaine had removed to Cincinnati, (Reply, p. 35). Professor Ross and myself, however, had been too long and intimately associated to be long estranged; I sought an early occasion for mutual explanations, and the good understanding then effectually restored, was not afterwards interrupted again during all my residence at Gambier.

of learning. The facts would show that I did not forget them ; my influence and vigilance were constantly employed in smoothing little matters of disagreement among the officers themselves, and whenever the common interest was assailed or threatened from any quarter, I was the first and often the only one to stand forth—no matter at what hazard, in its defence.\*

Finally, my private and personal intercourse with the members of the Faculty was unmarked by any external circumstances indicating the slightest want of friendliness or confidence. With all of them, without a single exception, it was cordial, familiar, and [apparently] confidential ; characterized, in all the relations of neighborhood and society, by the habitual interchange of kind and friendly offices. I know very well that these external signs are not proof positive that I *had*, in point of fact, “ the confidence of the Faculty,” and especially as ONE at least, in whom these signs were all very conspicuous, is now known to have been at the same time an active co-operator in a plot to destroy me. But while I confess with sorrow that my confidence in human character is somewhat unsettled by this instance of baseness, I am by no means yet prepared to give it up entirely. I would rather be the dupe of an occasional deception than obliged to live in continual suspicion—regarding all kindness, all courtesy, and all sympathy, as hollow, deceptive, and insincere.

Such was the matter and the manner of the secret investigation, on the grounds of which Bishop McIlvaine proceeded without further inquiry, to convoke the Board of Trustees. It was not necessary, he tells us, [p. 9.] to have any communication with the President on the subject, since the question whether we were running into debt to sustain the College, was one which never troubled Mr. D. It might be asked how Mr. Sandels, an unnaturalized foreigner ; and Mr. Gibbs, a Presbyterian Theological student ; and Mr. Lang, an undergraduate, came to be so much more deeply interested in the pecuniary welfare of the Institution than the President. The latter had been for years regarded, wherever he was known, as one of the firmest friends of Kenyon College : He had taken an active part in the enterprise for paying off the debt ; and no one listened more joyfully to the Bishop’s account of the success of that enterprise.† Who could have supposed that the consummation of that success, when the debt, with its heavy burden of interest, amounting to more than two thousand dollars per annum, had just been extinguished,—was an occasion of financial difficulty and alarm ? I conversed with Bishop McIlvaine on the financial state of the Institution several times, and with more than ordinary familiarity after the 6th of January. He answered all

\* I might mention several instances of this, in connection with the relations of the Faculty to the Agent, Mr. White. In the spring of 1843, for instance, a proposition was passed round among the Professors, to resign *en masse* on account of an alleged impertinence on his part I was probably the only person who discouraged the movement on our part *on principle* ; and at the same time the only one who went forward to assert the honor and dignity of the Faculty, in a personal remonstrance with Mr. White—incurring in no small degree the “ unpopularity” of that individual for so doing.

† I believe it can be shown that in proportion to my means, I have been the largest donor to Kenyon College. My donations prior to 1834, in apparatus and books, purchased expressly for the Institution, and amounting to between 3 and 400 dollars in cash, were thought worthy of honorable mention by Bishop McIlvaine in his address to the Convention of that year. Yet now by a mere change of polarity in himself, he is pleased to represent me as destitute of all concern in the pecuniary prosperity of the Institution ; and would, if he could, by a touch of his potent rhetoric dissipate all my claims to confidence in this respect.



my questions with apparent frankness and cordiality, but he gave me no information, not the slightest hint, of the "alarming" state of things, which he now says was the ground work of these secret proceedings. Such an intimation, I hesitate not to say, would have been most strange and incongruous.\* He spoke of calling the Board of Trustees together, as if their action was necessary in the disposition of the funds collected by him, and advised me in the most affable and friendly manner to make out and present my accounts, [the very accounts for disbursements against which he now declaims so loudly,] *promising to give me a good committee* to examine and report upon them. Such was his countenance to me during that interval, and yet he was at the same time, beyond the possibility of a doubt, meditating—aye, actually working out—my dismissal from the Presidency. For what else, by his own showing, was the Board assembled? What is the meaning of his exhortation to them before acting, [p. 10,] and his approval afterwards [p. 12], if such was not his deliberate purpose? But there is even more direct evidence than this. The call for the meeting of the Trustees was published in the Gambier paper about the middle of January. A few days after its appearance, the Bishop's son, who was then spending much of his time in the College, was asked for what purpose the Board was called together? "To remove President Douglas," was the prompt reply; and the reasons being asked, were given, viz. the *fiscal difficulties* of the Institution, with much of the same declamation as in "the Reply;" but not a word about unpopularity with the students.

With regard to the Trustees, I must caution you not to form any estimate of them from what you have been accustomed to see of College trustees in the East. There, at least in the cases with which you are most conversant, the selection of such functionaries is governed by some little regard to the nature of the trust, and the infinite importance of the great end to which it is consecrated; at Gambier, however, since 1840, the primary qualification has been subserviency to the Bishop. Although elected ostensibly by the Convention, they are virtually appointed by him; and with due care, since the date mentioned, that no one is appointed who is not ready to square all his ideas, whatever they are, in accordance with the Bishop's. Formerly it was not so. The Board had some degree of independence; appointed their own prudential committee, for the management of the domain, &c.; and in 1838, they even went so far—the Bishop being absent—as to define the relative powers of the Board and its President in the management of the property. He assembled them, however, immediately on his return, and compelled them to rescind all that they had done.† Nor did he stop, till in the Convention of 1839 he succeeded in transferring, by a change in the Constitution, the whole discretionary power, which had hitherto been exercised by the prudential committee, *exclusively and permanently to HIMSELF*. Finally, in 1840, a "new Board and a right Board" was elected upon his nomination, and since then the Trustees have had little to do but to pass and record the *fiat* of Bishop McIlvaine.

Intelligence and liberality under such a system were not needed; they might even be objectionable; and the Bishop's policy, as he distinctly

\* I well remember, however, that a note on this key was touched by Mr. Wing, before the Bishop returned from New York; and by Mr. Sandels a little after, very enigmatical to me at the time, but now well understood. Yet Mr. Sandels' salary had been raised from \$600 to \$800, only a few months before, while the success of the Bishop's efforts in raising money was yet uncertain.

† The verification of this statement will be found in the proceedings of the Board of Trustees, of March 21, Sept. 4, and Nov. 22, 1838.



avowed to me in 1842, having been to keep them away as much as possible from Gambier, they were consequently *very ignorant* of the actual condition, as well as of the wants and necessities of the College.\* The constitutional time for their annual meeting was at commencement, but it was so managed during all my presidency, in spite of my remonstrances, that they *never did meet* on that occasion. There were in fact but two meetings (at Gambier) from first to last, and those in the middle of the long vacation. Not an individual member of the Board had ever been present at any one of the college examinations; nor did they on other occasions appear to take interest in its affairs, as a seminary of learning; and the natural, as well as the most charitable conclusion was, that they really did not know what interest it was proper for them to take. Such was the constituency of Kenyon College.†

The members of the board arrived from their remote places of residence, generally on the evening of the 27th of February. On all former occasions, my house, which had become a sort of hotel, was the usual stopping place for four or five of their number, and was now accordingly prepared for their reception again—but nobody came. Three of my habitual guests, Burr, Bury and Allen, absented themselves from the meeting, and Mr. Smallwood came and excused himself on the following morning, having been invited some weeks beforehand to stay *with Mr. Blake!* Prof. Ross and Prof. Thrall also expected guests, but were like myself, disappointed. The whole Board, was billeted upon the Bishop, Mr. Blake, Mr. Sandels, Mr. Wing, and Mr. White—generally two at each place—leaving Dr. Fuller, Prof. Ross, Prof. Thrall and myself, vacant.

The business of the session commenced in form on the morning of the 28th. The Bishop, having read to them, as he tells us, the “*exhibit*” of the “*Treasurer*,” by which it appeared that the receipts were expected to “*fall alarmingly short of expenses that year*,” then said, “*this is your first information of the business for which I have called you. We are more than ever under solemn obligations to avoid any further debts. We must make any sacrifices to do so. You see the present prospect; you are called to inquire into the causes and remedy of this deficiency. I have made inquiries, and formed an opinion, but you shall not know anything that I have learned, or what I think on the subject.*” Here was a riddle indeed—“*the causes and the remedy of this [alleged] deficiency*,” (the dream and the interpretation thereof,) were to be found out forthwith, without the slightest direction or hint from the propounder. But our Trustees, unlike the soothsayers of the Assyrian monarch—were not to be daunted by the difficulties of the case. The way, they were told, had been trodden before them; and with an exhortation to be *ready for any responsibility*, they adjourn their meeting and go forth to *the work*.

In so extensive and complicated an establishment, embracing four organic seminaries of learning,—a College, a Theological Seminary, and

\* A part of the Board, as I have intimated, was doubtless in confederacy and correspondence with the clique on “*the Hill*”; these were of course well supplied with information *ex parte*.

† To any one acquainted with the circumstances, the self-devotion of these gentlemen in assuming the “*responsibility*” of my dismissal, and the *grandiloquent* terms in which they speak of their “*personal knowledge*” of matters and things at Gambier, are quite *amusing*. “*The most wonderful part of the whole affair*,” said an Ohio friend to me, shortly after my removal, “*is that these Trustees should have been so completely duped into the belief, that they were the authors of your dismissal.*” “*Not all dupes*,” I replied.

two distinct Grammar Schools—with their respective systems of discipline, their various departments of instruction, the means and appliances of each, and all the relations, internal and external, incident to such institutions; embracing also an extensive domain of farms, village tenements, mills, and privileges of various kinds; and finally having, as all admit, a most mysterious complication of books and records in the office of the Agent;—it might reasonably have been expected that several days, perhaps even weeks, would have been occupied, even by men of experience and discipline, in the investigation of either branch of the proposed inquiry. But no; the Board adjourned a little before dinner, and met again a little after, having achieved *that meal*, and digested to their own satisfaction, all the complicated interests and relations of the whole institution. This was done, we are told, by dividing the committee of six, into three sub-committees and so, by a labor-saving process, making a circle of domiciliary visits to “every officer of the whole institution, whether of the College, its Schools, the Theological Seminary, or the Treasury, *except the Bishop.*” Let us follow them a little way in this process.

The two who called upon me were Col. Bond and Mr. Smallwood. They came into my study just before dinner, very much in the manner of gentlemen in New York making a new year’s call. They did not lay aside their hats or canes, and my impression is that they did not even sit down, but perhaps they did; at all events, their call was very unlike a call of business in any respect, nor did the time or manner of it admit of any thing like formal statements. They spoke at first, generally, of the diminution of numbers, which I showed them was an inquiry relating to the Grammar Schools, not to the College. They then pressed me to speak more particularly of those institutions, and I stated, very frankly, with regard to the Senior Grammar School, that Mr. Sandels had more on his hands than he could do. He was a young instructor, in point of experience, and often complaining on account of his health; about half his recitations, in the College, had been from one cause or other, omitted during the current term; and I presumed an equal proportion of his duties in the Grammar School; that the students of that institution had complained greatly on this account, and must, to a very considerable extent, have lost interest in the school. With regard to the Junior Grammar School at Milnor Hall, I declined making any statements, leaving the principals of that institution to speak for themselves. The whole interview may have lasted twelve or fifteen minutes; and the committee then went over to Mr. Ross’s, where they remained about five minutes. They afterwards called upon Dr. Thrall and Mr. Sandels, which I presume completed the *forenoon* operations of *that* sub-committee. Their colleagues in the meantime were similarly engaged, as I suppose at Milnor Hall, Mr. Wing’s and Mr. White’s office, and in the College with Mr. Gibbs and Mr. Lang; remaining about twice as long with each of the latter as with Prof. Ross and myself collectively.

Such was the *modus operandi* of this so called investigation. And now I pray you look at it for a moment as a judicial proceeding, involving the public station, name, and character of the President of the College. Observe in the *first* place, that although the process had been maturing for nearly two months, with a clear, *acknowledged*, reference to myself, I was still uniaformed of it at the meeting of the Board; and the whole inquiry, such as it was, had been completed, and for hours deliberated upon, before the slightest intimation reached me (and then from a foreign source) that I was the subject of it, or my conduct and character in any way called in question. Observe *secondly*, the organization of the committee of inquiry into sub-committees, taking away from it all its effi-

ciency as a judicial body to weigh and compare evidence, and making it a mere drag net to collect every species of idle gossip. *Thirdly*, the irresponsibility of the testimony. None of the witnesses, *except the initiated*, having any idea of the drift and bearing of the thing, or apprehending at all the value about to be assigned to the casual words of an apparently, common conversation. *Fourthly*, the power of the sub-committees to draw out precisely the testimony that suited them, and repress whatever did not—a power that was used without scruple, (in the case of Mr. Ross and others) whenever the replies did not implicate me. *Fifthly*, the irresponsibility of the sub-committees—keeping no record of the statements made to them, and giving virtually their own versions of such parts as best suited them, and rejecting others. No part of my statement, for instance, nor of Prof. Ross's, and but a small portion of some others, appeared in the committee's report. Was this a fair and honorable inquiry? Has it a single feature of judicial equity in it? On the contrary, does it not everywhere betray the workings of a simple pre-determined purpose to remove me from office, right or wrong, and a perfect symbolism among all the agencies for carrying out this purpose from its first inception in the early part of January to its final consummation on the 29th of February? It is of no consequence how or in what manner this symbolism was effected. I care not to speculate upon the secrets of the Bishop's back parlor, or Mr. Wing's, or Mr. Sandel's, or Mr. Blake's studies, or Mr. White's office; nor will I trouble myself to inquire what passed between these persons and their guests, that night, or that morning, or at any time. There was enough in the Bishop's ominous exhortations and cautions, enough in his significant reserves—the President not being admitted to his councils—to have guided them, (the Trustees) even without any external confederacy. At all events, whether by instinct or inference, their actions show that *they knew very well* what was to be done; no pack “bred out of the Spartan kind” ever fleshed their game with a more sure and certain scent.

The Board reassembled between two and three in the afternoon of the 29th, the committee having already completed their work and made up their report. Between three and five, of the same afternoon, I had an interview with them on matters of ordinary business, and sat for an hour in familiar conversation, ending with an invitation to dine with me on the following day; and still not a lisp was heard of the ruin which awaited me, and which even then must already have been virtually consummated in their secret council. It was not till near nine in the evening that Prof. Ross came into my study, and with startling earnestness exhorted me to go and see the Board forthwith; informing me—and *this was my first information*—not that I was *accused*, but that I had been actually *tried* and *condemned*, and the sentence—the severest which it was in the power of the Board to inflict—was already in suspense over me. Then followed my interview with the committee at the Bishop's, of which I have given a detailed account in my former Statement, and which for the first time unfolded all the realities of the systematic treachery and duplicity with which I had been surrounded.

I need not repeat the narrative, already given, of these painful developments—the night of agony that followed the interview just mentioned—the tampering of Cols Bond and Cummings on the following morning to induce me to endorse my own dishonor by the tender of my resignation—the like plausible attempt of the former and the Rev. Smallwood to draw me into a hypothetical defence of my character and conduct, when it was not pretended that either was impeached—my final protest against the whole proceedings—and finally, in a little more than twenty hours from the first note of warning by Prof. Ross, the *coup de grace* by the Board.



A brief notice of one or two mis-statements in the Reply is all that need now be said on these subjects. "A private advice to resign," it is stated, "was first given to Mr. D. by Col. Bond." This of course refers to the call of that gentleman at my house on the morning of the 29th, that being the only personal interview I had with him during the proceedings. But the writer forgets to mention that there was a *first* communication prior to this. On the previous evening I had an interview of an hour and a half with the investigating committee, in which I was distinctly told that *unless I resigned, I should be dismissed*; and this alternative was never after for a moment lost sight of. It was still hanging over me in all its terrors, when Col. Bond called, with the look and language of a friend, and exhausted all the powers of his rhetoric to induce me to tender my resignation. I can hardly look back upon this crisis without a shudder. I have had many dangers to encounter in the course of my life, and some hair-breadth escapes, but I remember none with more fervent gratitude to a kind protecting Providence, than that while thus surrounded with sore temptations and trials, unaided by any human counsel, I was yet enabled to maintain my integrity, in spurning this insidious advice. The value of the friendship that prompted it may be estimated by what followed. The Colonel, in making his report of the interview to the Board, is reputed to have said, "He will not resign, we cannot avoid dismissing him;" and yet within the same hour, the same gentleman, acting as a committee man, assured me in the most cordial, as well as the most courtly phrase, that there was not the slightest charge of any kind pretended to be alleged against me; and such was also, in effect, the recorded report of the committee of inquiry, as heretofore quoted. Why could they not avoid dismissing a man confessedly innocent?

The version they give of this disclaimer of "charge against me," (p. 17) is, that when I complained "that I was to be dismissed without being informed upon what charges," "the answer was that no charges were brought; that the simple fact was, that the patronage of the institution was not enough for its support;" "a large debt and deficit must accrue that year," &c. &c. I affirm in the most solemn manner, that this statement is, in every particular, utterly false. The matter of the "charges against me," was not called up by me in the way of *complaint* at all; it was a simple inquiry for *information*. When the committee offered me an opportunity of defence, I wished to know, of course, what was to be the subject of that defence, and to this end I inquired, "what are the charges against me?" The answer, after some conversation, was given by Col. Bond; not "that no charges *were* brought;" but, that there *were* no charges; and this was the only answer, consistent with the committee's report just referred to. The "simple fact," namely, that the patronage of the institution was insufficient, &c., said to have been stated to me in reply, is a pure imagination. The *fiscalities* of the institution were not mentioned or alluded to by the committee in any way whatever. Not a word was said on that subject.\*

His next position, say they, (p. 17,) was, that he had been given no opportunity of confronting those who had given information—whereupon "the Trustees immediately sent a Committee," &c., &c. This again, is untrue. It is, in fact, opposed to their own statement, see page 12, where they say, "a Committee was sent (immediately after Col. Bond's report of the *private* interview,) to urge a resignation, and to convey the assur-

\* A detailed account of this interview is given in my former Statement, p. 12, 13. It embraces every subject discussed and the substance of every thing that was said; it has not been, nor can it be controverted in any particular.

ance that if not received by a certain hour, a dismissal would ensue." I shall not try to reconcile these conflicting statements. The last quoted is the true one. As to an opportunity of confronting my accusers, it was neither asked nor tendered. The idea was not expressed or implied in any part of the conversation. I protested against the whole proceeding from beginning to end. I denounced it *then*, as I denounce it *now*, as an inhuman outrage—and I warned them fully that I would "*never cease to protest against it as an act of flagrant cruelty, injustice and oppression.*"

The Reply, page 13, attempts an argument against my claim of tenure for life. I am represented as having said to the Bishop on a former occasion, "that (I) was then in correspondence with gentlemen eastward, about an office similar to what (I) then held;" and as "every bargain has two sides," if I did not *feel myself* bound to stay for life, I could have no *claim* to a tenure for life. This statement and the reasoning from it comes of course from the Bishop, and they are both alike erroneous. I never told him or any body else that *I was in correspondence* with any body, about any office, similar or dissimilar. In point of fact, I never penned a syllable to any gentleman Eastward of the kind here represented, except to decline a very advantageous proposition that was gratuitously made *to me*. But if it were even true that I was in such a correspondence, and that I fully contemplated resigning whenever "an alternative worth thinking of should occur," it would not in the least have impaired my claim to a tenure for life. Officers of the Army resign—Judges of the Court resign—any person holding office for a term of years resigns within that term, if he pleases, it does not alter the tenure. Bishop McIlvaine was fully determined to resign, in a certain contingency, in 1840. He even wrote to me about an "alternative worth thinking of;" does it follow that the Convention of Ohio have a right to turn him out therefore, whenever they please? The idea is absurd. Bishop M. well knows that the right of tenure is *not* a reciprocal right in the sense in which he here affirms it. It is emphatically a safeguard to the incumbent, against the injustice or bad faith of a capricious employer, and in this light I claim it. Whether my claim is good depends not upon whether I might, or might not have been induced to resign under certain circumstances, but upon the expressed or implied conditions of the original compact, under which I accepted the Presidency, and removed to Ohio,—and that *those* may be somewhat better understood, I give here entire the two first letters I received from Bishop McIlvaine—President of the Board of Trustees, on this subject. The first is written, you will perceive, on Sunday morning, just before the solemn services at the close of the Convention at Mount Vernon.

## LETTER I.

*Mount Vernon, Sunday morning, August 9th, 1840.*

My Dear Major—I write in great haste, just to say that I nominated you yesterday to be President of Kenyon College, at a salary not less than \$1000, with house and grounds, pasturage, &c., and that you were unanimously elected, with acclamation, by a *new* Board, and a right Board, representing the Diocese—the Board having been elected almost without dissent. All things have gone as I desired. My troubles in this respect seem nearly over—in case you accept—I write now hastily to say I will write more fully as soon as I can get an hour. Only don't commit yourself to any thing else, and say nothing about it till I can write to ———, and you again. Write me as soon as you please. Yours very affectionately, CHAS. P. McILVAINE.

## LETTER II.

*Gambier, August 10, 1840.*

Dear Major—I wrote you hastily yesterday, announcing your appointment as President of Kenyon College, with a salary of \$1000, a house, and *not*

more than 10 acres of land for pasture, &c. I write now to say that the appointment is exceedingly popular. Only it is predicted by certain, who would not be a little pleased to see my plans fail, that you will not come. I say you will—and all with me depends on that. I consider the living worth at least \$2000 in Brooklyn. I do hope you will consent to consecrate yourself to this work for life. Your department is Moral and Intellectual Philosophy and Rhetoric. Don't be alarmed, you can easily make yourself up for it—with your Mathematical mind, and fondness for reading, and ability to study, you will easily go ahead. We have appointed K—— Prof. of Mathematics and Nat. Philosophy. ——'s health was considered too unpromising. We should not have turned him off, but as we were organizing a College, not supposed before to have existed, he was not appointed. A new Prof. of Languages has been appointed—a new Agent also. I think it probable —— will resign his Professorship. All see now that I am *head*, and will be, and am powerfully backed by the Diocese. We shall be all harmony here. —— is left out. Now I want you to go right up to see K——, and get him to accept. His salary is \$600, and house and grounds. I shall write him immediately. You have a vacation of eight weeks to get ready. The sooner you are here, however, the better. I rejoice indeed in the prospect. You must come. I am killed if you do not. You will find things very much on the mend. —— told me he would not undertake Intellectual Philosophy. That was an insuperable obstacle. But I see now that I have made precisely the choice. All, even my opponents, say so. Let me hear without delay. The sooner I can say in the papers you have accepted, and that K—— has, the better. All wait to hear. It will probably save us some students, if it comes in time. Try to get K——'s ear before —— writes him.\*

Yours very affectionately,  
C. P. M——.

Upon the faith of these letters, followed by many others in the same strain of urgency and conciliation,—removing every obstacle and every objection as fast as it was presented—I finally accepted the Presidency of Kenyon College; wound up my affairs at Brooklyn by a peremptory liquidation, the more ruinous because of the universal embarrassment of the times, and cast all my future fortunes and the fortunes of my family, upon the prospect of honorable employment and usefulness, in the station to which I had been so long and so urgently invoked.\* Was this a compact to be dissolved at an hour's notice, at the mere will of the party of the first part?

The Bishop would fain have it believed, that my appointment was not a compact between equal parties, but a pure gratuity from HIM to ME, involving no reciprocal duty or obligation on his part whatever. To judge from many parts of the Reply, I was almost a stranger to him, scarcely known except upon the footing of a very general acquaintance,

\* I have thought it due to myself to publish these letters entire, to guard against the disingenuous evasions and perversions to which the author of the "Reply" has thought proper to resort, in his notice of the extracts heretofore given from this same correspondence. I deprecate as much as any one can, any reference to such a correspondence in a public discussion, but I claim justification on the ground, which justifies even the taking of life, that it is *absolutely necessary in self defence*. It has been said that the case of necessity can only be made by the order of a civil court, but I submit with all due deference that the order of the court does not *make* the case at all, it only declares it. The necessity, like that of justifiable homicide, is physical; it exists prior to and independent of any such declaration. In regard to the present case, I ask any upright man to realize it as his own—his rights and the rights of his family violated, his property wasted, his name and character vilified, his professional hopes in a measure blasted by the broken faith or vindictiveness of his fellow man, and he with the evidence of that broken faith in his hand, under the sign manual of the aggressor—need I ask what he would do? The two letters now published, however, are at least *demi-official*.



yet it may be shown from the correspondence, that I had been upon terms of the most intimate and unreserved confidence,—the confidence of entire personal equality, for 15 years previous to my appointment as President. His importunity in 1833, and in 1840, he represents as having reference, not to the substantive question but only to the *time* of my coming, &c. But I submit to the judgment of any impartial reader, regarding the extracts already given, whether this is a correct or candid view in either case, and to make it more plain, I shall add one or two *further* particulars. In regard to the Vice-Presidency in 1833,—the Bishop represents me [p. 26,) as having “no business or permanent employment,” at that time, and being “*in need of such employment* ;” yet he knows that I was Professor of Natural Philosophy in the New York University, with the option of lucrative employment also as a Civil Engineer. He knows moreover, that the “pecuniary affairs” that hindered me from going at that time, and upon which he has dilated so largely as a ground of reproach, was a simple transaction (in the stock of a certain company with which I had been officially connected) into which I had been inadvertently drawn without any the slightest fault on my part. He knows this, for I stated it to him fully in answer to his vehement and unceasing solicitations, and I have now before me his letter of condolence in reply ; an extract from which will be a sufficient answer to all the unkind misrepresentations now attempted on this subject, (the Vice-Presidency of 1833.) The letter is dated Gambier, Feb. 14, 1834.

“My dear friend and brother—I received your two, well filled, and interesting sheets a few days since, and had hardly read two lines before I began to feel very sorry that I ever wrote you those letters which in your circumstances must have been exceedingly painful. But Major,, you must set them down to my selfishness, and impetuosity, and love of you, and anxiety to be a co-worker with you, and not to any thing like complaint or alienation of heart from you. I had no conception that your difficulties would prove so great or your debt so deep. In the anxiety and load they must occasion you, I do most deeply sympathise. May you have the consolation of him who is touched with a feeling of your infirmities,” &c. &c.

The Presidency in 1840 is held up as a pure gratuity.\* Although “the place went a begging,” it was offered as a favor to me, a “*pecuniary convenience*” ; and the idea that I accepted it with any view to oblige the Bishop is indignantly spurned. Referring to one of my letters of 1840 in which this view was presented, he tells us, it was “immediately answered with a protest” in the following words : viz. ‘I chose you because I wanted you for the College, but believing also that it would be good for you’; which words he says were written, not on the 21st September, as quoted in my “statement,” but on the 2d December, and answered by me on the 16th. If the Bishop “kept a copy” of this correspondence, I can only say he has made a very disingenuous

\* I could show by our intermediate correspondence that the Bishop was always anxious to get me at the head of some institution in the West, and I always reluctant. In 1837 he moved by himself in a particular attempt for this purpose which he had much at heart, and wrote several times chidingly, to me because I did not take the same interest. In 1839, the moment the Journal of the Ohio Convention was out, he sent me a copy endorsed in his own hand with my name, and the words “see page 25”—and, on turning to that page, I found a score round the passage of the Bishop’s address in which he opens the subject of a separate presidency. All *his* friends and mine, to whom I showed it, construed it as an intimation of his “*first choice*.” I do not quote these things to disparage the Bishop’s friendship at that time, but to show what are his claims to *consistency* in the position he *now* takes.

use of it ; if he has *not*, he shows great hardihood in asserting *ore rotundo*, what he could not be very sure of. His letters are now before me, and the passage referred to appears, not as a *protest*, nor in the letter of December 2d at all, but exactly as I quoted it, under date of September 21st—part of an argument to confirm me in the acceptance of the proffered Presidency.\* The real “*protest*,” if *protest* it can be called, is a very harmless thing, and I take leave to quote it is a pregnant commentary upon the position now so arrogantly assumed by the writer. It occurs in the midst of other matters on the fourth page of his letter.—“Dear Major, I do not quite like it, that in your last you set down all your efforts to come here and be President, and the resistance of tempting offers, &c. to a ‘*desire to accommodate my wishes.*’ Is it only for my wishes ? But this is a point which between us is too delicate to be further touched on.” This is the allusion noticed by me in my letter of the 16th. But the most remarkable part of this so called “*protest*” is, that while it was expressly intended (so says the Bishop) to remind me of my obligations as the *favoured party*, it does in fact absolve me *entirely* from any such obligation. “I have had my views for you,” it goes on to say, “but I have no idea of thinking, or *beginning* to think, that you are under any obligations to me.”†

An equally disingenuous and detractive use is made of my letters written (after my acceptance) to explain the cause of my detention at Brooklyn for the settlement of my affairs. By garbled extracts, the Bishop endeavors to make out that I was one of the most abject of prodigals—embarrassed in circumstances—not as every body else was embarrassed at that time, by the monetary crisis, but by my own sheer recklessness and improvidence. I will not enter into a defence of my character in this particular. Perhaps I may not always have been sufficiently regardful of the value of money ; but that is not now the question. As to my embarrassments in 1840, the Bishop knows that the representation he has given of them is utterly unfounded and most unjust. The facts are simply these : Under the advisement of friends I was induced to invest my little capital—(the earnings of my professional life) and some credit,—in Brooklyn property. Being myself wholly engaged in other pursuits, I allowed, as many others did, the critical moment for *realizing* to pass unimproved ; and when the troubles came, agitating alike the whole business community, I had enormous assessments, taxes and interest to pay without the power to sell a foot of land at any price.‡ Of course all my resources for ready money were completely absorbed by these demands, and I was for a time, as I stated in all frankness to the Bishop, most seri-

\* The entire quotation under date September 21, is as follows: “I have been greatly relieved to-day by yours of the 14th, by which I conclude, as on the strength of it I have given out, that you are coming : All sorts of rumour had been spread that you had declined.”—“I could only hope, but I have suffered great anxiety” The “questions you propose as to the interference of the Board, &c. may all be answered in one sentence—they have never interfered in such things—all has been left to the Faculty—all under you *will be*—so you are left at ease on all such heads. Therefore I conclude that you will certainly come ; and Major, I do honestly believe that it is your duty to the Church—to your usefulness—to your family. I know you will never be as happy in Brooklyn as you may be here. I chose you because I wanted you for the College ; but believing also it would be good for you.”

† The letter was in fact an apology for his hasty epistle from Medina, and concludes, after detailing the circumstances under which that letter was written, as follows : “*Now let us have fair weather again.*”

‡ I paid in one instance an assessment of about \$4000 on an acre of ground for the opening of a street on which I had not a foot of front.

cusly and painfully embarrassed. There are many, I imagine, who can realize the case on its merits, however much HE may be disposed to mystify it.

It was in my endeavors to extricate my affairs, and most especially with a view to the interest of my creditors that in 1839 and 40, I declined, as I have stated, all offers of service, however tempting, that would have *taken me away* from Brooklyn. And the question really to be decided, when the Presidency of Kenyon College was tendered to me, was whether I would *abandon all hopes of retrieval*, and submit, in those adverse times, to an immediate and peremptory liquidation. The decision, it may well be supposed, was a very painful one. Nor was it settled affirmatively until I was assured that the aid and agency of kind friends would be given to carry out the best possible arrangement of my affairs, for the benefit of all concerned.\* According to the Bishops account there was no sacrifice in all this; not the least difficulty in closing up all my multifarious concerns, public and private; in the midst of the general depression of that period, on a short notice of six or eight weeks. My removal to Gambier, instead of enhancing my embarrassments, he affects to regard as the grand panacea that was to cure them all. I shall not answer these absurdities, further than to give an extract from my letter of the 16th December, by which, together with that of the 27th Nov., the Bishop might have corrected his sentiments on the subject if he had been so minded.† The quotation is made from a copy which I believe to be substantially correct. "In my early letters, no matter which, I spoke of my debts, and the absolute necessity of arranging them before going to Gambier. Now every body *here* knows that the most tedious, difficult, wearisome, and vexatious of all labors in these times is the settlement of accounts; unless indeed one has money in hand to pay them as fast as they are rendered. That I have had my full share of these trials you will see by my last letter, and I counted upon the difficulties incident to such business, being, as a matter of course, equally well known to *you*, as to *us here*. It was known furthermore that I was President of an important Public Institution, [the Greenwood Cemetery] which was yet to be matured under my administration, and for which, under that view, considerable sums of money had been advanced by different individuals; and besides, *it* was the means by which I was myself to realise funds for the payment of my bills and expenses. Now this consummation has certainly been delayed beyond my own expectations, yet under any circumstances, it could hardly have been expected that an Institution of such magnitude and importance could be peremptorily disposed of."

I might add other evidences to show that my acceptance of the Presidency of Kenyon College was emphatically an act of self-sacrifice, that it was so regarded by both parties, and that Bishop Mc Ilvaine—haughtily as he *now* speaks on that subject—did not *then* presume to think, or "*begin to think* that I was under any obligations to HIM." What then could have been my inducement? I answer again, in the language of my former "Statement," "chiefly my long cherished and uncompromising attachment" to one who had so earnestly "desired to be a co-worker with me"—"to stand by him, and hold up his hands in the struggle in

\* I have before me the draft of a letter to a friend asking his advice on the subject, on the very day (Aug. 15) that I received the Bishop's first letter announcing my appointment, in which the interest of my creditors is set down as the most important point to be considered.

† These letters were considered perfectly satisfactory *at the time*, as to the cause of my delay. Yet the Bishop now uses them, by disingenuous quotations, to make out a case against me.



which he was *supposed to be engaged*, and sustain to the utmost of my power and upon principle, the honor of the Episcopate.\* I believed that the cause of "religion and learning" in the West demanded such sacrifices, and I submitted to them that I might "consecrate myself to this work" of honorable usefulness "for life."

But here I am met with a vague pretence that I did not *fulfil* the object of my mission. It is not pretended that I was wanting in zeal, or diligence, or fidelity, or honesty of purpose, my attainments also are pretty fairly acknowledged—"nobody ever denied these things at Gambier," the Bishop himself tells us. But then it is obscurely thrown out in various forms of indirect speech, that, after all, I *may not* have "succeeded in promoting the welfare of the College"—my measures *may not* have been "good and wise"—and the Bishop was "painfully aware that in nominating me he had committed a prodigious mistake." The *legal* bearing of this exception I do not think it worth while to discuss; every body must see that the thing alleged, if it were even verified by specification and proof, is unworthy of the least notice in this aspect. Men make "prodigious mistakes" every day in the most solemn concerns of life, but who ever heard of this being made a ground for the voidance of a contract? Nor is it of any greater value as a formal justification of the ACT of my dismissal. I was not dismissed upon any allegation that my measures were not wise and good, but because of a certain feeling, said to have existed *among the students*, of the merits of which the Board did not pretend to speak. The whole thing *now* alleged is manifestly an *after-thought*, intended to operate upon the public mind to my prejudice, and so to avert popular censure from the perpetrators of an atrocious outrage, and in this light only I notice it.

Observe in the first place, if you please, how short the time since the *object* of this vituperative insinuation had been held up, by the AUTHOR of it, as the glory of the College, and a great acquisition to the "cause of Literature and Science in the West;" a man of "great experience in education," uniting with great "devotion, and skill," and Christian zeal, the "utmost kindness of manner and benevolence of disposition." Observe also that these laudatory phrases were not uttered in ignorance. The object of them had been in the most intimate and confidential intercourse with the writer, his *bosom friend*, for 15 years; had been his favorite candidate for the Vice-Presidency in 1833, and, with difficulty, resisted his importunity to move to Gambier, at that time; had been urged by him again in 1837, with scarcely less importunity, to put in his claims to another very high Academic office in the West; and finally in 1840 had been induced to accept the Presidency of Kenyon College, by considerations of personal regard and Christian duty, strongly urged upon him by the same individual. To suppose that there could have been any misapprehension in the mind of the Bishop as to the character of his nominee, under these circumstances, is to suppose an obtuseness of understanding for which he is not very likely to gain credit.

Again, notice if you please, the entire want of consistency between the nature of the allegation and the mode of proceeding upon it. Fidelity and zeal, and honesty of purpose, are certainly worth something, and in the very difficult and responsible station in which I was placed, one would

\* It has been said that my statement of the condition of things on "*the Hill*," at the time of my arrival, was incorrect, and by implication that the *Episcopate* was *not* in the condition stated. I shall have occasion to notice that subject presently, but in the mean time, what do you suppose the Bishop means in his letter of August 9th, (quoted above,) by his "troubles being almost over in case (I) accept?" &c.

suppose they should at least have entitled me to a fair and impartial hearing, even though opinions might differ as to the *merit* of my acts. Is a man of eminent attainments, whose Christian character, and moral worth, and zeal and faithfulness in the discharge of his duty, are unquestionable, to be hurled from his station like an outlaw, without warning, on a vague and irresponsible suggestion—the mere breath of human opinion? With what consistency are his character and professional reputation assailed *afterwards*? Is it conceivable, in fine, that a man should be so far gone in unwise measures as to have incurred any formal judicial proceeding, whose acts had never before in a single instance been called in question.

With regard to the actual merits of my administration, I pretend to no extraordinary claims, neither do I fear the utmost scrutiny of fair and candid examination.\* The principles on which I acted had the entire sanction of Bishop Mc Ilvaine, and are beyond all question the only principles on which Kenyon College can have any just claim to public patronage. I had and *still* have the firmest conviction that, in faithfully conforming all my administration to them, I was laying a wide and sure foundation for its permanent and extensive usefulness; and I believe, notwithstanding all that has been said, that I have the witness of the Bishop, and the Trustees, and the Faculty, and the Students, and the Public at large, besides a volume of *internal* evidence, to the same effect.

This is not, of course, the place to enter upon a formal proof of this allegation; but I may without impropriety offer a few particulars in the way of illustration, to show that it is not made by impulse or at random. Some of the evidences from fact I have already in part stated. It was shown for example, that the number of ordinary delinquencies as well as of gross offences, and the amount of assessments for damages, were all greatly diminished during the period of my administration; and it may be added without fear of contradiction, that the general regard for order and decorum, the sense of personal character, and the zeal for study, had as greatly increased. No one acquainted with the College can deny, that there was a very decided improvement in the character of the students, as gentlemen and as scholars, from the year 1841 to 1843 inclusive. In the very term in which I was dismissed, more than at any former period, it was felt that the College, without any diminution of its external patronage, had been freed almost entirely from evil influences within itself; and that it could now be safely recommended to the confidence of the most scrupulous and careful parent. Do these things indicate inefficiency?

That my administration was generally *appreciated* on this account I have also shown in part, and shall now proceed to illustrate further; *first*, by an extract from Bishop Mc Ilvaine's Address to the Convention of 1841: as follows.

“The new organization provided for by the changes in the Constitution of the Theological Seminary, which were completed during the year 1839–40,

\* It was my constant aim and endeavor during all my Presidency, to draw public attention towards the College, and to induce the Diocese and the community at large to look into every part and department of its management. The members of the Convention of 1841, 2, and 3, will remember that *these views* were held forth on each of these occasions, as a reason for the Convention meeting habitually on the day after commencement at Gambier. In the Convention of 1843 I also moved and sustained a resolution for a Visitation Committee to attend the College examinations on the same principle. Perhaps some will remember also that it was Bishop Mc Ilvaine, and the prominent adherents of the Gambier “Clique” that chiefly opposed these several propositions.

went into effect at the beginning of the last winter term. It was not however until more than one half of the year had elapsed that the College could feel any distinct benefit from the new system, on account of the necessary delay in the arrival of President Douglass, who commenced his duties in April last. Since then I can truly say, and none can know the present state of the College in its preparatory departments without concurring with me, that great life and vigor has been infused into all its government and instruction. The greatest degree of zeal and earnestness animate the officers; entire harmony prevails in their counsels; the instruction of the classes is eminently successful; the spirit of the students is that of cheerful conformity to law, zealous prosecution of study, and unusual satisfaction with the efforts made for their improvement, united with a very kindly personal relation to their instructors. The College building is now undergoing a thorough internal repair, by which its aspect in reference to comfortable accommodations will be entirely changed, and the indwelling of the students will be placed on a very desirable footing."

My next quotation shall be from the Valedictory Address of 1842; in regard to which please remark that it was interpolated by the Orator, after the body of his Oration had been overlooked and criticised, and was not seen or heard by me therefore until I heard it on the platform;\* and furthermore that I had the personal assurance both of the speaker and of the members of the Class generally, that it was no unmeaning compliment, but the actual sentiment of them all; It followed the address to the Faculty, in the following words:

" President Douglass—" Our relations with you have been so peculiar and interesting, that we cannot depart, without some faint expression of our thankfulness for the friendly manner in which you have uniformly treated us, and a public avowal of our high esteem for your character, and attachment to your person. During the eighteen months that you have presided over the destinies of this Institution we have daily met you on terms of familiarity and confidence, not often accorded to the pupil, by his instructor. We are sensible that it has been your earnest desire to render our intercourse with you, not merely instructive, but pleasant and improving. We have not been cold observers of your constant attention to our convenience and comfort, nor uninterested spectators of your exertions to add to our means of enjoyment, by improving the natural advantages and beauties for which this place is distinguished.

" But I need not enumerate the labors, nor speak of those traits of character which have won our affectionate regard. It is enough to say, that we have *never doubted* the goodness of your intentions, but have at all times been confident that your aim was our welfare. With this estimate of your worth, we now leave the scene of your instructions; and wherever our lots shall be cast, there you may look for those who are ready and willing to do all that in them lies to defend your reputation and secure your happiness. Farewell!"

I give also an extract from an editorial notice of the same commencement, in one of the Mt. Vernon papers, the writer of which, (as well as the sources of his information,) was then, and is still unknown to me.

" President Douglass explained some important changes in the College discipline, introduced by the present Faculty within the last year. While we have not room to remark upon them, justice requires of us to say that they are changes that will gain for the Institution a character which few seminaries of learning deserve. President Douglass, we are informed, is much beloved by the students and respected as a father by them. Great improvement has been made in the College grounds since last year."

\* Bishop Mc Ilvaine was seated on the platform at the same time.



In the same strain I might quote a multitude of letters from the parents of pupils, and from students after their leaving College. A large file of them is before me, almost every letter of which is interspersed more or less with expressions of approbation and thankfulness. Not to occupy too much surface however, I content myself with a single example from a very estimable and exemplary student, whose leaving College before the completion of his course is very likely to have been charged to my account. It is dated in February, 1843:—"No length of time," he remarks, "can ever efface from my memory the recollection of one whom I cannot regard but as a father. Never, so long as life lasts, shall I forget your kindness to me while at Kenyon. I think at times that I can still hear the sound of your voice, warning me and my fellow students, with all the anxiety of a parent, to avoid those shoals and quicksands on which young persons are so apt to fall and be wrecked—that I can hear you telling us of the path of duty and honor, and pointing out the way to distinction and usefulness." \* \* \* "From the improvements which have been and are still being made in the College, I hope to see her at no distant day take that station among the institutions of our country, which her friends would have her take."

The following is from a member of the Board of Trustees, dated January, 1843:—"I assure you I think of you very frequently, and do hope that things may be so arranged to your comfort and satisfaction, that Kenyon College may become all that you desire to make it." \* \* \* I trust you will still have patience with our difficulties at Gambier.\* Do not, until it would be wrong to do otherwise, yield up your efforts in the cause of the first Institution in the west. I know that you have things to contend with, sorely trying to your temper, your patience, and your Christian fortitude. \* \* \* I consider your service of immense value to the Institution," &c. &c. I might make other quotations from the letters of the same individual, and from other Trustees, to the same effect.

The following is from a prominent clergyman of the diocese:—"I feel a lively interest in your present improvements at Kenyon. The welfare of our Western Church depends much on the prosperity of the College; and the higher the standard of education there, the more able will our young clergy prove, and the greater influence will our church at large attain to. I wish you every success, and every blessing on your labors."

The following is also from a clergyman, high in the confidence of Bishop McIlvaine, and dated in June, 1843:—"I would comply with your request, if for no other reason, from a principle of gratitude for the eminent service you are rendering the Church of my affections, in your efficient superintendance of every thing connected with the interests of Kenyon. I want you to feel that the Clergy of our Church appreciate your able and hearty services. I want you to feel that we are thankful, and that we would rejoice in any opportunity of surrounding you with an affectionate and hearty co-operation. You are serving God with abilities, which few if any of us possess; You occupy a place on the walls of our Zion, second in importance to none. Most fervently therefore do I implore for you grace to persevere without wavering."

The following is also from a Clergyman very favourably situated for knowing what he states, written after my removal:—"As regards the College I may be allowed to bear evidence to what I consider a distinct

\* Alluding to the pecuniary embarrassments, just after the special convention at Newark; and in answer to some remarks upon the conduct of the Agent, by which considerable excitement had been produced in the Faculty.

fact ; that wherever I went you were spoken of in the highest terms ; and there appeared to be a general impression among the people that now things will go well. Your Presidency seemed to me to establish confidence in the Institution, and I never heard one syllable of doubt or unpopularity breathed against you.”

A corresponding strain of remark was constantly made, *viva voce*, by the members of the Convention and by the friends and patrons of the Institution visiting “the Hill” from all parts of the country. During the sessions of the Convention, the prevailing topic in the intervals of actual business, was the improved condition of the Institution, in every respect of which any judgment could be formed in time of vacation. Comparisons between the past and the present, always complimentary to the latter, were in the mouth of almost every visitor who had ever been on “the Hill” before.\* It was constantly the subject of complimentary language to me ; and persons otherwise unacquainted with me not unfrequently introduced themselves for the purpose of speaking it.

I have thus endeavoured to illustrate by facts, and also by some evidences of current and responsible opinions, that my administration was in substance, as well as in common repute, an efficient and beneficial administration to the ends for which the Presidency was conferred upon me. It remains to notice the few particulars, in which the “reply” seems to controvert this position, with anything like fact. And first as to the management of the Matriculation system (p. 42.) This the writer says, “was erected in theory and broken down in practice till it became almost or quite a nullity.” The assertion is simply untrue. The system had, as it was expected to have, peculiar difficulties to encounter on its first introduction. The means of estimating the character of the students was less perfect than it would undoubtedly be after the system had been for some years in operation ; but in the mean time there was no lack of care, —the wisdom of the whole faculty was employed,—to make it in practice what it was in theory, a moral restraint ; and that it was so in an eminent degree, I most solemnly aver, with a much better opportunity of knowing, than any other person could possibly have.

The Bishop notices also the Patronage system, and pretends to illustrate its operation by a distorted account of, what he could not but have known to be, a special and peculiar case. He represents a youth, who was committed to my care with a deposit of \$200 previously estimated by me for the expenses of one year. After “fifteen months” residence (having been dismissed) “his father [it is said] had been called by me to pay \$350 more which he paid [making \$550 in all] and more is still called for ” “The father,” it is further said “has received no satisfactory account of the matter, and the sum still called for, he refuses to pay.”

I must give the Bishop credit for no small degree of art in getting up this case for effect. How far it is entitled to confidence we shall see. My first commentary upon it shall be an extract from the last letter of the father of the youth referred to, dated August 5, 1844, some months before the reply was written, and covering a remittance of \$75 ;—“The sum of

\* It was on an occasion of this kind, in the latter part of 1842, when this comparison was strongly expressed by a visitor in the presence of Bishop, McIlvaine, that the latter betrayed, for the first time in my presence, but most unequivocally the jealousy to which I have alluded in a note to my former statement (p. 23) ; and a very short time after, occurred the outbreak of indignation in his study, mentioned in that statement. (p. 29.)

§75," he writes, "covers the amount of what *you have paid*, with interest for a period somewhat over one year. I shall be in New York about the time of the General Convention [D. v.] and shall be glad to see you and pay any balance which you think is justly due." The balance here spoken of, has reference to *one*, of two or three small bills, *not due to me*, but which I had merely forwarded at the request of the parties concerned. There was some uncertainty, whether I might not have paid this one at my own risk, but not finding the voucher, I did not include it in my return of bills *paid*; and it was the adjustment of this (possible) balance, to which the quotation refers. It will be seen then that so far as I was concerned the statement that "more is still called for and refused," is destitute of truth. Every cent rendered in my abstract as having been paid or pledged by me, was more than covered by the §75 remitted, and the party was even willing to have settled an additional balance, if upon inquiry it was found to have been so paid. The statement implying that I had given no satisfactory account of the matter, is also, as to me, incorrect. I wrote in succession five long letters, to the father, explaining with minute particularity the conduct of his son. To these letters I received no answer, and after waiting eight or nine months, till I began to think of collecting the balance of my disbursements in some other way, I met a private opportunity and sent the naked bills with a request for their immediate payment,—and *then*, for the first time, it was made known to me by a letter of complaint from the father that none of my previous letters had reached *him*.\* I wrote another long letter in reply, but while I was meditating upon the means of sending it, with the certainty of its being received, I, and my family, were overwhelmed with our own troubles, and this letter, getting mingled with other papers, was lost sight of. A briefer explanation, written after my return to New York, was all that my situation and engagements then permitted. That *some* explanations may have still been wanting, *to the party concerned*, under these circumstances, is very probable; but if so, I repeat it was not from the want of any possible care or pains taking on my part, and of this, that gentleman was made aware by the letter just referred to.

The amount of expenditure in the case of this young man, stated to have been \$550, is afterwards more correctly stated at \$525. In either case, however, it was without doubt most extravagant, and such as any father would have just reason to complain of; but before the responsibility is placed upon the College patron, it should be observed, First: That the father, with particular views on the subject of expense, and deprecating any thing like stint, enjoined upon me, again and again, to supply his son on a liberal scale, and to advance beyond the amount deposited, if necessary for that purpose; and when at the end of the first year I rendered him an account of \$320, (in all,) including College advances for the following term, (a part also having been incurred surreptitiously by the son,) he entirely approved of my doings, and reiterated strongly the sentiments just mentioned. *Secondly*: The aggregate sum \$525 comprehends several items of extraneous expense, not embraced or supposed to be embraced in any estimate of ordinary expenses. Such as an excursion to the North in the Vacation of 1842—\$35 for his expenses home—an outfit of extra clothing for the same occasion—the surreptitious bills above mentioned; (which finally proved more considerable than was at first supposed)—and a considerable amount of expenses incurred at Mt. Vernon, (after he withdrew from the College and from my oversight,) the payment of which could not be avoided:—All together amounting to

\* That they had been received and read by his son, however, was made known to me by a token not to be misunderstood.



about \$170 or \$180—which being deducted from the 525, leaves a nett amount of \$350 for his proper expenses for one year and a half (Academic reckoning) under my patronage.

I could give, if the occasion required it, many other particulars of these surreptitious bills and the expenditures at Mount Vernon, that would exonerate me from all blame in regard to any of them. Most of them were for articles of necessity, (money furnished by me for such articles having been diverted to other objects.) These could have been recovered at law. A few of a more doubtful character might not have been recoverable, but being peremptorily demanded, and a suit threatened, they would, at least, have detained the young man some weeks in Mount Vernon, where his associations were of the most demoralizing sort. In my opinion it was of *vital* importance to disengage him from those associations and send him home immediately, and such also was the urgent request of his father. Without a moment's hesitation, therefore, I assumed the payment of those bills, and got him off. I had been requested to act for him as I would act for my own child, and, whether appreciated or not, (God is my witness) I did so most faithfully.

The use made by Bishop Mellvaine of this case would stand as a conspicuous example of sophistry, if it were not lost in the multitude of other like examples. It is the substitution of an obvious *exception* to a general rule for the *rule* itself; a mode of reasoning which would at once break down all distinction between truth and falsehood in morals. With regard to my patronage duties generally, I may add, that they were ever held by me as of the most solemn obligation, and discharged with uncompromising devotion, even in the midst of other and very pressing duties. About half the students in the College at the time of my dismissal were my clients, and though it may be that my efforts were frustrated in a few instances, as those of the most careful parents sometimes are, by the wilfulness or wickedness of those for whose benefit they were intended, I have the happiness to know that, in general they were justly appreciated, and in some cases conducive in no small degree, to the permanent welfare and happiness of the client.

The next set of allegations to be examined in order, are those which relate to the expenditures, made or administered by me at sundry times on the College and College premises; than which, probably no part of the pamphlet is more unsparingly or more rancorously virulent.\* Turn, if you please, to the 36th and following pages for an example. The Bishop here gives an account of the repairs in the College building in 1841, and of my connection with them. These repairs he first tells us, were originated by Messrs. Blake and Badger, of Milnor Hall, so that I was entitled to no credit on that score; they were finally assented to, however, in a conference with me, on condition that I would "make such arrangements with the persons to be employed that no payment should be demanded except at such and such intervals." This condition he goes on to say, was neglected by me, and after a few paraphrases upon the troubles that ensued, it comes out at last that *this* was the cause of all the financial difficulties of the Institution." "Thus were we swamped. Here was the crisis which required the special convention to consider

\* The motive to this, will be better understood by a reference to what I have elsewhere said, on the theory of the whole movement, viz. to divert from *Bishop M.* to me the odium of *his* mismanagement, as head of the trust. The Bishop has a peculiar tact in this way. At the convention at Newark all the responsibility of these embarrassments was thrown back upon his predecessor, Bishop Chase.

whether to meet the debts by sale of lands or otherwise. Thus came the necessity of the application made last year at the east and in Ohio for \$30,000—"eleven buckram men," again, "grown out of two."

To any one who has taken note of the progress of things at Gambier, or attended to the representation of its embarrassments elsewhere made, by Bishop M., a reply to this fanfaronade can scarcely be necessary. I shall notice it, but as briefly as possible. In the call of the special convention, the Bishop speaks of it as a *notorious fact* that the institution had always been greatly embarrassed with pecuniary difficulties. In writing to me in 1840-1, he represented it as very nearly "swamped"; and when I conversed with him on the subject soon after my arrival, he put entirely out of sight the possibility of any other alternative than the *sale of the lands* for relief. What else can we do?" was his reply to every thing I said in opposition to sale.\* The chief source of alarm then and always, was the New-York mortgage—\$15,000—of which the interest had not been paid for nearly two years. It was understood when the Ohio delegates went on to the general convention of 1841, that they and the Bishop were to make a joint effort to "stave off" that claim; but the latter writing to me on the subject while in New York, spoke in utter despair of accomplishing any thing; and it was the ultimatum of the administrator of Mr. Ward's estate that chiefly made the crisis on which the special convention was convoked. Listen to the Bishop himself on this subject. "Much the larger part of the debt is owed to an estate in New York now in the hands of an administrator, who holds a mortgage upon all the real estate of the Institution," \* \* \* "He will not with, hold his hand from the lands unless the debt be forthwith discharged," &c.

In his address to the convention, Bishop M. gives an account of the different items of expenditure out of which *the debt*—about \$36,000 in all—had arisen,—beginning with a pretty large old score charged to the administration† of his predecessor, Bishop Chase. Then comes a sum for improvement of lands, and buildings, including the noble edifice erected under the eye of Bishop M. for his own accommodation. Then his salary for several years, and the expense of his removal to Ohio. \* \* And finally the repairs here alluded to, of which he speaks in the following terms :

"The last particular in this account is an expenditure upon the repairs of the College building, and furnishing the rooms with certain articles of standing furniture for the sake of the better ensuring order and propriety therein. I am aware that some have supposed there was extravagance in this, considering the indebtedness of the Institution, and I believe it was made a handle of by some to its prejudice. In justice to the gentleman under whose supervision that measure was carried forward, I feel bound to say that while it was possible there might have been better terms with the contractors, as to times of payment, there is not the least reasonable doubt that all the expenditure was good and very useful, and the great burden of it absolutely demanded. The College had undergone no repairs of

\* Mr. Fox (Sands and Fox, of N. Y.) will recollect that when at Gambier in the summer of 1841, I requested him to speak to the Bishop on this subject. All that was wanting was good financial and prudential management, in the office and over the grounds: Clergymen were unfit for such a management, and this unfitness was the real element of all our trouble.

† It now appears that a specific asset was left by Bishop Chase for the express purpose of paying off all arrearages created by him; viz. the "north section of College lands." These were afterwards sold for about \$22,000, and the "arrearages" were only quoted at \$20,000. Yet the whole of the latter are put down in Bishop M.'s expose as so much debit to the administration of Bishop C.

“any permanence since it was built. Its condition was a disgrace. We were either to be ashamed to receive students or make repairs.”

This language expresses in very moderate terms, the sentiment under which I put my hand to these improvements. My first visit to the College building filled me with surprise and disgust, at the foul and dilapidated state of it, regarding it as a place of habitation for young gentlemen. Early in the summer (1841), I drew the attention of the Faculty to the subject,—got a special committee raised,—put myself upon it,—spent some days in exploring the whole extent of the evil, and drew up a report, which being highly approved by the Faculty, I was authorized to communicate to the Bishop. As the evil was a very serious one however, and some expense would have to be incurred, I requested the members to cooperate with me in bringing it strongly to his mind, and purposely kept back my report until it was known that some of them had seen him in accordance with this suggestion.\*

The concurrence of the Bishop being at length obtained, and the arrangements made, I entered upon the work, immediately after commencement, and in about eight weeks, with unceasing toil, and care, and labour and vigilance,—having western men and western mechanics to deal with,—and using, with my own hands, as occasion required, the paint brush, the hammer, the hod, or the wheel barrow;—I succeeded in renewing and finishing the *whole interior* of the building, wood, plaister, paint, and paper,—and furnished it with bed-steads and mattresses, chairs tables and wash stands complete.†

The Bishop took the liveliest interest in the whole proceeding at the time—ventured into the dust occasionally to cheer and encourage me, and spoke in the most laudatory terms of what was doing, to the Convention at Chillicothe. His letters from New York where he went to attend the General Convention, breathe the same spirit. But now turn to the spirit of the “Reply;”—Is it conceivable that it could have flown from the same pen? My neglect in not attending to a certain stipulation, in the making of the contract,—the consequences of that neglect,—the accumulation of consequences as the ball rolls on,—*crescit eundo*,—till the whole Institution was “swampd.‡” The answer to all this, however, is very brief. I DID NOT MAKE THE CONTRACT. The workmen were engaged by the agent; the plaisterer and his men came to commence the work without my having spoken a word to them, nor did I know anything about the terms on which they were engaged. I may have catered for a hand or two in the progress of the work, but if so, it was upon conditions pre-

\* This accounts for the part assigned in the reply to Messrs. Blake & Badger.

† The whole expense of furniture was about \$800, and of repairs \$1300: in return for which, an addition of \$2.00 was put upon the room rent and \$2.00 charged for use of furniture, making an additional annual receipt of \$260 (on 65 College and Grammar School Students) for an outlay of \$2100. The “repairs” were estimated before hand, at \$300, but when we came to touch the plaister, it fell down in masses over our heads, and had to be almost entirely removed. Much of the wood work was also found so saturated with vermin, as to make it necessary to remove it very extensively; hence the increase of cost.

‡ There is another version of the *Mount Vernon Suits*, which are here said to have precipitated the crisis. They were brought, or brought about, to make another gentleman (the agent Dr. Crittenden,) unpopular, and get *him* to resign. The chief of them, was for an account with a firm, of which the *senior partner* stepped into the vacated agency the moment it became vacant.



viously established and without assuming any responsibility in that respect at all. With regard to the furniture, it did fall in my way to negotiate a contract for the article of bedsteads, but even this was in an understanding with the agent, and duly reported to him.

But there is still a sequel to this matter more malignant if possible than the main allegation; and in the discussion of which Bishop M'lvaine is enabled to place in striking contrast *his* devotion to the welfare of the institution, and *mine*; for example, "In the midst of the suits which had now come upon us, when the Bishop, to save expense, was teaching in two professorships in the Theological Seminary. [N. B. The whole rank and file of that Institution, including the two College Tutors, was *three Students!*] Mr. D. brings in a bill of \$82 for that very labour, &c. Eighty two Dollars charged for the labours of a vacation by the President, while the Bishop had been labouring twelve years in gratuitous instructions! charged too in the midst of the embarrassments and trials of the institution, when the Bishop and all others were considering what to do to keep the College from sinking." How disinterested the Bishop! How selfish the President!! The Bishop seems to forget that *a little while before* HE brought in a bill for \$80 for teaching one of my classes while I was detained at Brooklyn. But perhaps it makes a difference that it was not brought "in the midst of the suits." Be it so, I will not spend time upon these bagatelles. Let us go to that which was the veritable substance of all the suits, *the debt*. It amounted, you will recollect, to about \$36,000. Would you believe it, that upwards of \$15,000 of it—more than two fifths of the whole—was incurred (either directly, or by diverting the funds of the institution, to the purposes of the Diocese,) for the accommodation of this very, disinterested man! His residence, second to none in Ohio, had been built; his salary for several of the first years, paid; all his expenses in moving his family from Brooklyn to Gambier, added to the *debt*, and adding also, its interest to the other burdens of the institution for some eight or ten years! I might speak of other, local, facilities enjoyed by Bishop M., besides all this: but I let them pass. I do not dwell upon the things here mentioned as regards their propriety or impropriety in themselves, but I do presume to question the taste of a man who, has been so well cared for, and whose convenience and comfort have made so considerable items in the indebtedness, of the Institution, taking so much credit to himself for his *disinterestedness*.\*

My explanation of the obnoxious charge, the Bishop broadly repudiates. "He had no claim," he says "no bill of timber was ever heard of by the Bishop," &c. With all due deference, I must correct this statement. I repeat in the most solemn manner, that a *bill of timber* was the gist,—the essential matter of the whole conference. Dr. Crittenden was settling up his affairs to leave; I found a bill of timber charged in my account, which I supposed had been furnished, as timber for like purposes was furnished to Mr. Ross and others, without charge. I objected to the charge, and carried my claim to the Bishop, with whom the matter was fully discussed. He made no objection to the *principle*, but feared the precedent, as Dr. C. and others had built fences, and would expect the same allowance. Returning to the office, I was informed that the principle of allowing *compensation for extra services in vacation*, had been settled in the case of one of the Tutors; and as my claim had been refused to save a prece-

\* The Bishop's talk to the people in New York and Brooklyn about the *hardships* and *poverty* of his condition at Gambier (!) is much of the same character. He is a comfortable farmer, with an abundant salary, and money at interest; and lives on the fat of a most plenteous land.

dent, I thought it not unjustifiable to use a fair precedent, in return, to save myself. I accordingly drew up the bill referred to, and called a second time upon the Bishop, to whom the whole matter was minutely and particularly explained. The Bishop, according to the Reply, and in his account of the matter elsewhere, assumed a very magisterial tone, —refusing to allow the whole bill, and he even affects to repeat the very words in which his refusal was expressed. I again declare, with the most clear and perfect assurance, that no such tone was assumed, nor any such words used, *on the occasion*. The Bishop did not refuse any part of the account. The reduction from \$2.00 to \$1.50, per diem, was my own voluntary act; suggested by myself, on the principle that it would then, cover the timber furnished *from the College Saw-mill*, and with this I was willing to be content.\*

But I am to notice yet some other matters (of account) of a later date, to which the Bishop is pleased to allude in the same amiable and liberal terms. "All other expenditures," he observes, p. 38-9, "which Mr. D. involved himself in, were deeply regretted by the Bishop, because he knew he could not afford them." "He was only injuring the Institution by such things." These allusions have reference to certain additions and alterations made in my house, and to certain improvements on the College grounds in 1843. With regard to the first; the members of the Convention of 1842 will probably recollect some pleasantries of that date, about "building three Tabernacles." Objection having been made to the proposal to meet again at Gambier, on the ground that the accommodations were too limited, I replied with great earnestness to secure the object, and after expatiating on its benefits to the Institution—"it is good for us to meet here, and if there is any lack of accommodation, let us build three Tabernacles," &c. The point was carried, and in the spirit of my suggestion, (as well as to provide employment for two meritorious young men, who wished to support themselves in the Institution by mechanic labor,) I undertook, in 1843, to make such enlargements in my house as would enable me to accommodate more than *my* proportion of the Convention. With very great exertion, these improvements were ready in season; and by furnishing a large room in the College with beds, I was enabled to keep open house for some 25 or 30 guests during the Convention week, including several of my constituency, the Trustees, and *their families*.—And now comes the sequel. Three or four months are passed, and lo! *my own family* is turned unceremoniously out of house and home, by these very Trustees, and my pains taking and labor to promote their comfort, and the comfort of the Convention, is cast with insult into my teeth, as a piece of useless and wasteful prodigality! Does the Diocese of OHIO endorse this proceeding,—in taste, in feeling, in rectitude, or in equity? †

\* The Bishop makes a reflection upon the *style* of the fence, as if it was something extra;—It certainly was a good substantial fence, but with as little pretension to style as possible, nothing in fact but a rough oak picketing. He also speaks invidiously of my enclosing grounds "without authority," for my own private use. What use? Was it for orchards or gardens or grain fields? O no! My garden when I went there was a very small patch, slightly fenced, and surrounded with a deep triangled thicket of cat-briers, almost impracticable. In building new fences I took in a portion of this thicket, lying between the College and the Chapel, and expended upon it about \$150 to clear it out, and make it,—look beautiful! And this was all the use I had of it.

† I never pretended that I had an *original* claim to reimbursement for these expenditures, but as they were incurred in the discharge of my official hospitalities, and in reliance upon the permanency of my station, they are justly chargeable, and will have to be paid.

Secondly, as to expenditures of the same date on the College grounds I had been constituted, at a meeting of the Trustees at Chillicothe, in September, 1841, the agent for laying out and improving the (park) grounds around the College. I was engaged in this duty in the Spring of 1843, with a small balance of appropriation, at command, which I was expending, (with the unanimous approbation of the Faculty,) in the construction of a substantial and tasteful path way, underlaid with stone, from the College towards the village. My balance ran out as I reached the front of the Chapel, and there I proposed to stop. But as the students and most of the people on the Hill, were struck with the utility and beauty of the improvement,\* I was induced (*by their solicitation*) to make out a plan and estimate for finishing it, with a substantial gate way of stone at its outer terminus in the village. Not to multiply details, I proposed that if \$100 could be raised by subscription within the College, I would proceed, taking the risk of raising the balance in some other way, and upon this arrangement the work was already far advanced towards completion when the Bishop returned from (his first trip to) N. Y. Nothing could exceed the fullness of his approbation, both of the work itself and the progress made in it, when we first looked at it *together*, in coming from the Chapel, a day or two after his return. "How do you manage as to the expense?" he inquired. I explained the arrangement to him, stating that the *whole* subscription would probably reach \$150, and that there would still be a deficit of about \$130. "O! we'll take care of that," said he in reply, and so I considered the matter settled. Some time after, he asked me about the front fence, and desired that I would put that in hand also, and have it done, if possible, by the meeting of the Convention, (in Sept.) which I did. The work was not entirely finished, however, till the Bishop left, on his *second* trip to N. Y., and of course nothing more passed till his return. A week or two after that event, I called upon him in relation to the subject, and requested his interposition, as I had been put to some inconvenience, from having had to advance most of the amount myself. "Make out your bills," said he, in the most kind and affable manner, "include every thing; I shall have to call the Trustees together on other business, and it will be a good time to present them." Alas! could I but have known what was in that secretive mind, at that moment!—but I spare you any unnecessary reflections. It was finally agreed that the accounts should be referred to a "good and liberal minded" Committee, and I left him without a doubt that he was entirely concurrent with me, in all respects.

After my dismissal, as nothing seemed to have been done on this subject, it began to be rumored that my claims were not to be allowed, and one or two persons who had balances still due them, called to know how they should get their pay. I referred them to Mr. White, the Agent, and lodged a certificate in the office, that the improvements were made by me as an agent, specially appointed to lay out and improve the grounds; that the path and gate-way, (when part done) had received the sanction of Bp. M., President of the Board of Trustees, who pledged himself that the *deficit* should be provided for; and finally, that the fence had been built at the specific request of that personage. Upon this certificate one of the creditors immediately put his claim in suit, *against the Institution*; and some interest was excited on the Hill, at the prospect of the *trial*. But care was taken that it should *not* be tried. The Agent received instructions to settle it, the evening before the day of trial, and all

\* Substantial stone paths were a great desideratum in that country. This was 10 feet wide, trenched out from one to two feet deep, and filled with stone and gravel. Great quantities of loose stone and rubbish were also removed from the grounds in making it.



the other unpaid balances were then also assumed. If Bishop M. thought *my claims* so very unfounded why did he pay *these* balances which were a part of them? Why did he evade a legal decision, which would have set the matter at once and forever at rest?

It was in relation to these matters that the correspondence arose, in which I am accused of having spoken unbecomingly to Bishop McIlvaine; and which, on that ground, was taken by him as a pretext for breaking off our further intercourse. I will not deny that my letter was a very severe one,—more severe, it may be, than was consistent with my own dignity, but consider! I was seated in the midst of the ruins of all my household comforts in a desolated house,—writing, peradventure upon a barrel-head, with a medley of boxes and baskets and crockery piled around me,—my furniture having just been sacrificed under the hammer of the auctioneer, to meet *for the second time* a forced liquidation: All this at the hands of my “old friend.” A letter is brought to me. Six long pages of the most refined special pleading, to show that I was not technically authorized to make certain improvements on the College grounds; that the Bishop, though he appeared to approve of it, did *not so in reality*; and that *one hundred and forty-two dollars and twelve and a half cents*, if you please, expended on such improvements, were therefore to be superadded to the burden of my other cares. Is it surprising that under such circumstances I should have written as I did, (a private letter) to the author of these things? The Bishop has seasoned his reply with a few garbled extracts. I give them more fully.

\* \* \* You say that our conversation (at the time you promised to make good the deficit) was exclusively about the gateway. I affirm, in the most solemn manner, (and there are others to corroborate me if needful,) that this is *diametrically contrary to the fact*. We were standing in front of the chapel, which we had just left,—it was within a few days after your return from New York—you began the conversation by remarking in the most approving manner, that I had done “a monstrous deal of work here”—pointing directly to the path, which was full before us in an unfinished state.—Almost the *whole conversation was of the path*. I told you how many tons of stone there were in it—how many loads of earth had been removed—what grading and levelling had been done, and was doing upon the right and left, &c. &c. The gate *was* spoken of, but much more remotely, and the statement of expenses was distinctly and emphatically for the whole work.

I further, and most solemnly affirm that the *deficit*, which was then and there assumed by you, was not a mere deficit in name, but an estimated amount in dollars. (viz. \$130)—conditioned upon the fact that the \$150 which I said I had hoped to raise by private subscription, was actually so raised. I affirm also that your language and manner at that time and afterwards, were of the most cordial and *unqualified* approbation of the *whole work*, as a great and eminently beneficial improvement to the College; and that from that time to the date of your recent letter, I never heard from you *one word* of disapprobation. The indebtedness of the College was never once alluded to. You had just returned from New York whence you had written, and brought the most flattering account of your success in raising money, with the prospect of speedily paying off the whole debt of the Institution. Any discouragement on that ground therefore would have been strangely out of place; while on the other hand, a little *bonus* for the improvement of the College, was not only justified, but under the circumstances, the most natural suggestion of common good taste and feeling. \* \* \*

Speaking of my call upon him after his (second) return from New York, the letter proceeds:

You received the application in the most gracious manner, made not the slightest objection,—said not a word of disapprobation to any part of the work, and yourself suggested that I should make out a statement of the whole, and bring it before the Board of Trustees, saying that they were about

to be called together on other business. I beg you to note particularly that up to this time, and in fact to the very meeting of the Board, you had never on any occasion made the least objection; or intimated by any sign *to me* that you did not cordially approve of the whole work. On the contrary, on the occasion just referred to, your words and manner were most decidedly favorable, and such as left in my mind no manner of doubt that you were so, in feeling and sentiment as well as in taste.

And now, sir, I am prepared to account for the *exceeding* modesty, as you are pleased to call it, of my application to the Board. You had, in the plenitude of your kindness, promised me a special committee, with whom I could confer at large on the subject of these expenditures, and it was only necessary therefore to address *the Board* in such terms as would bring the matter fairly before them. There could be no need of an *ex parte* statement where no antagonism was known to exist. The Board were presumed to be liberally minded;—its chairman, professedly, and to all appearance, my friend. The hostile and illiberal feeling you *now* exhibit was *then*, as yet concealed—a mental reservation in the deep recesses of your dark double mind; and so completely disguised under the outer garb of smiles and courtesy, that to my poor simple apprehension, there was not the slightest ground of *suspicion*. that all was not *equally fair within*.

You proceed to say with a good deal of declamation, that the Board felt “deeply and strongly” that the works referred to “were not good and proper improvements;” I know very well now, the process by which the opinions of the Board are formed; but how does it happen that they should have passed a vote of thanks for these very works in September last? Sir, I have the best reason for believing that they had *no such feeling* as that here represented. The greater part of them declared to me and others on the Hill, that they thought the improvements highly important and valuable, and *that they ought to be paid for*—and, (unless they too practice upon the ethics of the *secreta monita*) there is no reason to doubt that a vote to that effect would have passed, if you had not been perfidious.

A word or two as to the *substance* of your present feeling—you *think*—(and such it appears was your *secret mind*, even when you were *professing the contrary*)—that the works in question, were in bad taste, considering the indebtedness of the Institution, and that those who had money to appropriate to such objects, might better have employed it, in removing that indebtedness.

This is certainly a *disinterested* and *liberal minded* thought! Why did it not occur to you, when you were laying out 7 or 8000 dollars, for your own *private* accommodation, on your house. There was indebtedness *then* as well as *now*—and the appropriation of this sum at that time—besides reducing the *principal* debt, would have saved to the Institution at least 5,000 dollars of *interest money*. Your predecessor was content to live in a very humble dwelling, so that he could appropriate his means and energies to the welfare of the Institution—you build a splendid palace for yourself—suffering Kenyon College to degenerate into the filthy *sty* I found it in 1841, and when in the progress of my unceasing efforts to give it somewhat of the dignity and character which a College ought to have, a few hundred dollars are expended, it is denounced by you as a “most unjustifiable expenditure.” Such is however the narrow, illiberal and selfish spirit, by which all your administration here, has been characterized.

There is one more topic in your letter, on which, before taking leave of it, I must make a few remarks, *viz.*—your bold and unblushing avowal of that most dishonest of all jesuitical artifices; *mental reservation*. A large part of your letter is the quotation of your *secret mind*, as the criterion of obligation and duty, in diametrical opposition to the plain and explicit declarations of your lips. I can hardly realize it—I ask myself in amazement, if this can be the same man in whom I used to place confidence—alas! how are the mighty fallen. But, while I am slow to realize this double-dealing policy, the avowal of it has I confess unlocked a world of mystery which I had otherwise found it even *more* difficult to realize. I now see how your pledges and promises, so lavishly proffered to me before I came here, have been utterly disregarded since.

Those eloquent appeals, and that solemn adjuration in the name of the church by which I was induced to come "and consecrate myself to this work for life"—alas! how quickly dishonored and forgotten by you. The smiles and courtesy with which you received me in public, while you and those in your confidence, were endeavoring by secret detraction to undermine and destroy me. Your disclaimer in regard to my dismissal, when by your own confession you were holding secret councils to bring it about: And finally, the overflowing expression of your kindness and sympathy in your letter of condolence, when within three days after, you were laboring with your utmost zeal to disparage my life and character, and render me odious and contemptible to my former pupils:—These things *were* somewhat mysterious, but now I understand them.

Bishop! I speak plainly to you on these subjects from principle—it is high time somebody should do so, and there is nobody *else* on this hill, who *dares*. The time-servers and flatterers whom you have drawn around you have other business in hand, and *would not*, if they *dare*; and sir, if you are not speedily roused to a sense of your perilous position, and led under the guidance of divine grace, to repent and do your first works, you are a lost man.

Respectfully yours, &c., D. B. DOUGLASS.

I know this is very severe. I will not say that regarding the *office* and *dignity* of Bishop McIlvaine I was wholly justifiable in writing it. It was "out of my grief and my impatience" that I did so. But I must say, after mature deliberation, that as regards *the man* who had thus wronged, and was wronging me, I do not see that I could have expressed myself very differently. Deeply do I regret that he did not see fit to act upon my suggestion.

But I feel that there is a mystery involved in all this which ought not longer to go unexplained. The question which you and other friends have asked, will naturally press itself upon the mind of every reader who has followed me thus far. "How could the Bishop, so long, and so unreservedly your friend, prior to 1841, have become so bitterly your enemy in 1844!" That question I will now attempt to answer.

I suppose it will not be denied—it was a fact very notorious at the time, that, for some years prior to 1839–40, there had been a division of sentiment, a party feeling, gradually growing up on the Hill at Gambier, and in the Diocese of Ohio, against Bp. McIlvaine; that this opposition rallied under the name of Dr. Sparrow, [embracing pretty nearly the same elements that had been opposed to Bp. Chase,] and that, somewhere about the date first mentioned, it had become so formidable as to have made it a practical question, *which* should prevail. The collision in the Board of Trustees, noticed in a former part of this letter, viz: with regard to the powers of the President, [of the Board] and the discretionary functions of the Prudential Committee, were a part of this controversy: And in the Convention of the same year, [1839] at Steubenville, the whole matter was brought to a direct issue by the Bishop himself.\*

The points specifically presented for debate, were certain amendments in the Constitution of the Theological Seminary. First, to exclude all officers "of the Seminary or any institution annexed thereto" [virtually Dr. Sparrow and his friends] from seats in the Board of Trustees. Secondly, to vest the power of the Prudential Committee, permanently in the Bishop—putting an end to all antagonism from that quarter. And finally, to annex, *pro forma*, a College, [which had already been annexed, endowed, and in full operation for 13 years]—with a separate Faculty and President—to be nominated by the Bishop, [another exclusion to Dr. Sparrow.] The Convention was a small one, but a favourable report having been obtained from a Committee of reference, the measures were

\* He had no alternative as he distinctly informed me, but to put down that opposition or quit the Diocese.



eventually carried with some modifications. The party question, however, was not considered as settled, till the Convention of 1840. The steps which were taken to ensure a preponderance in that Convention, it is not necessary now to particularize. The Bishop was still doubtful of the result when he visited New York and Brooklyn in the summer of that year, and spoke determinately to me and others of his intention to resign in case he should be out voted. He was *not* out-voted, however, the question was settled in his favor, and the results were decisive, to wit—a “new Board and a right Board” of Trustees; an entire new Faculty in the College; a President, *not* Dr. Sparrow; the resignation of the latter, and other of the Professors and officers; changes in the headship of both Grammar Schools; a change in the Agency; and generally, the displacement, by *some* means, of every officer, who had been at all prominent in the late *opposition—except Mr. Wing!* MR. WING WAS ALLOWED TO REMAIN, not, as the Bishop informed me, because he had confidence in him,\* but because he thought him *harmless*. Mr. Blake, and perhaps one or two others, suspected of a leaning towards the Sparrow interest, were also retained, and besides them of course, the rank and file of the party generally.†

Such were the circumstances under which I commenced my Presidential career, in the Spring of 1841. Chosen by Bishop McIlvaine as a “dear and old friend”—“elected with acclamation by a new Board and a right Board”—and announced on my arrival in terms which I need not now repeat. The occasion was hailed as a new era in the prospects of the College. At the date of the Convention of Chillicothe, my administration was spoken of as having already “infused new life and vigor into all the government and instruction.” And again in the Spring of 1842, a highly complimentary vote on the state and prospects of the Institution, was passed by the Board of Trustees at Cincinnati. *Generally*, it may be said, the improved condition of the College in every respect, external and internal, *was* a subject of remark and congratulation to all the friends of the Institution, conversant with it. Even the Bishop’s “opponents” concurred in this. But now in the midst of these bright prospects, when every thing seemed to point with unerring certainty towards the consummation of the good wishes and high hopes of the friends of the Institution; what was my grief and mortification to find the countenance of Bp. M. averted from me; our intercourse, without any failure on my part, grown cold and formal; my plans and aims, involving no expense, disparaged; the popular approval of my administration listened to with evident repugnance; and myself studiously thrown back to such a distance from himself and the Board of Trustees, as almost to preclude the possibility of any confidential intercourse with either.‡

\* They were scarcely upon terms of common intercourse.

† My representation of the state of society on the Hill, at the time of my arrival in 1841, is controverted in the Reply, but not with truth. There was nothing like social intercourse so far at least as Bishop McIlvaine and his family were concerned. The principal families next in order, were Prof. Sparrow’s, Prof. Wing’s, Prof. Muenscher’s, and ex-Prof. Bache’s; and I should like to know in which of these, there was any cordial intimacy or intercourse kept up with the Episcopal mansion. Prof. Ross—a stranger until I arrived—was so struck with the state of things that he was tempted, as he told me, if I had much longer delayed my coming, to throw up his appointment and return to New York.

‡ They try very hard to make it appear that I had some ambitious project, some “new views” or “claims that were inconsistent with the decisions or

While I was yet in the midst of my grief and amazement under these painful experiences, lo! another *wonder* is presented:—Mr. WING, assisted by Mr. Blake, taking the lead, in a [*glorification*] movement, and a memorial addressed to the Bishop in the fear of his removal to Cincinnati. [Reply, p. 34.] The very men whose opposition two years before had nearly sent him an exile from his Diocese, now rushing to his side with sanctimonious horror at the bare idea of his removal from the Hill.

Then, after an interval of three or four weeks, came the Bishop's *angry and violent outbreak upon me* in his study, [see Statement, p. 29]\* revealing in its connexions and consequences, the fact, that Mr. Wing, one of the leaders of the late *anti-Bishop* party, was now in the full and exclusive confidence of the Bishop; and *I* an alien.

Then followed two or three days afterward, the [*cruel*] letter to the Faculty on the subject of the Catalogue, of which a copy is given in the Reply, [p. 43] The Bishop thinks it was not cruel, but if he can point out a more insidious device to create a breach between me and the Fac-

the Convention of 1839. Mr. Smallwood, I believe, has something to say on this subject; but it is all false. Neither Mr. S. or any body else can name a single claim ever urged by me that was inconsistent with those decisions, or with any established rule or law of the Institution. If any thing, I thought that *too much* had been conceded to the Presidency of the College in those decisions, instead of *too little*, and so declared myself to the Bishop and others repeatedly. One of the reasons assigned by me to Bp. M. for the *immediate* drawing up of a code, was that *I* should be willing to concede many things for the sake of a right organization, which *another* perhaps would not. (See former Statement, p. 26.)

\* The Bishop gives a modified version of this interview, (p 41—2.) from a memorandum which he says was penned within five minutes after I left him. Had he waited four or five *hours*, it would probably have been less affected by the excited impressions of the moment. The *stamp of the foot* of which he speaks is a pure invention. God is my witness that there was nothing of the kind. The phrase "we'll see to that," was *not* used in the connection in which he places it; and the attempt at "explanation," which the Bishop says he made, was *not* made at all. Every word uttered from the time I took my hat till I left him, was the bitterest recrimination and reprimand. In regard to what did take place, I solemnly re-assert all that I said in my former statement, and I could, if it were necessary, go into other particulars. He was in a state of *excitement* when I went in. All his answers were testy and impatient—the answers of an angry unreasonable man; and I changed the course of my remarks once or twice, to avoid his angry mood. We were talking of matters perfectly indifferent, when he branched off into an invidious parallel between *his* labours and *mine*. I still answered nothing, except to acknowledge the greatness of his labours and express my willingness to aid him if in my power to do so; to which he replied with the insulting sneer, as heretofore stated. When I was about leaving the room, he said, in a loud authoritative tone, I want to know, sir, what it is you are grumbling about;—I can fight it out *now* as well as any time." I disclaimed having any thing to *fight out*, and he proceeded with increased vehemence, "you want to be independent, I understand, but I'll let you know I am President over every part and parcel of the College, the same as over the Seminary." Pestered at length out of patience, and greatly surprised at this new assumption of power, I turned upon him and replied: "I was not appointed, sir, with any such understanding, and I *never* will recognize you in that character." (I conceded almost every thing, however, in the subsequent interview.)

I am not unaware of the responsibility of these declarations. I make them upon my conscience, and with certainty that they are categorically correct. My habits of attention had been disciplined by seventeen years daily exercise with pupils at the black-board, and were not likely to fail me on such an occasion as this.

uly, he is more perspicacious in that way than I can pretend to be. I will not waste words on the subject, however, further than to give, in the margin, an extract from my letter in reply.\*

Next, after another short interval, came the petty intrigue to throw me out of the delegation to the special convention. The Bishop speaks of *this* as an evidence of my great unpopularity, but *the people* had no more to do with it than yourself. By *their* vote I was in fact *already* a delegate; a legal delegate, incapable of being displaced by any vote of the vestry; and the movement to displace me instead of being a popular movement was directly opposed to the popular decision. A pretence was made (by those who *knew* at the time that it was *illegal*, according to the articles of our association) to elect a special delegation to that convention. A little cabal of three persons (Scott, Warner and Sims,) was moved to oppose my election, and several ballots were taken before a choice was made. As this was the first instance of an obstinate division in the vestry since I had been senior warden, I asked Mr. Scott what was the meaning of it? and his answer was, "we were told, sir, that *you were opposed to the selling of the lands.*" This revelation then, seemed to unravel the mystery of all the recent proceedings. The only persons with whom I could recollect having conversed on the subject of selling the lands, were Bishop McIlvaine and Mr. Wing. The latter in particular, had repeatedly argued with me at great length, and with earnestness, the policy of *sale*; and putting all these things together, I could not doubt that the ascendancy to which *he* had now raised himself in the confidence of the Bishop, had **THIS** at least for one of its objects; and under this impression I immediately sat down and wrote the following note.

Dear Bp—I write in all sincerity *as in times past*. I have indeed been most deeply wounded by your changed conduct towards me, (changed I solemnly declare, without any just cause,) after so many years of uninterrupted intercourse and confidence, and after so conclusive an evidence of my devotion to yourself and the Institution, as was given you in my coming *here*. But I am *now* satisfied that your mind must have been abused in regard to me *for sinister purposes*, and I am greatly mistaken if there be not a plot in progress boding no good to either of us, or to the Institution. Is it fit that our little differences should keep us under these circumstances, where our enemies would wish to keep us, *at sword's points*? There is nothing on **my** side that may not be settled between us in five minutes; and if I have seemed to give any cause of offence to you, I think it may be explained in as little time. If you are disposed to meet me on this ground, (and I repeat my belief that it is of vital consequence to ourselves and to the Institution), I will come to you alone at 8¼ o'clock this evening. Drop me a line, and give no intimation to any one of my intended visit.

Yours, &c.

\*"Your note to me of the 24th June last, contained no intimation of any desire or expectation on your part that it should *be laid before the Faculty*. On the contrary the note and all the circumstances connected with it, gave me the impression without the shadow of a doubt that it was for me alone; and that it required no answer. I had conversed with you at my study on the 23d, and informed you of what had transpired in the Faculty on the subject of the Catalogue, and also that I was then engaged in the work of preparing it. You replied that you would request Mr. Wing to act with me on behalf of the Theological Faculty, and the note received on the day following was, as I understood it, a mere announcement that you had done so."

"Allow me a further word in regard to the subsequent failure of the arrangement. I supposed it a matter of too great notoriety to need the form of an explanation that within a few days of the date referred to, my eyes, in consequence of excessive application, and mental anxiety, were attacked with the first symptoms of a malady, apparently of the most dangerous and fatal character, so that it became necessary to suspend all literary labour of whatever kind, for several months."



The meeting took place as proposed, and in the spirit of my note I conceded and was willing to concede every thing (concedable) for the sake of harmony and the interests at stake. To some extent I succeeded.—Many strange misapprehensions into which the Bishop had been betrayed either through the blindness of his own passions, or by the arts of those around him, were removed; and as far as I was able to draw his mind from its concealment, he expressed himself satisfied. The relations of external courtesy were restored, and I cannot doubt that this circumstance gave me the position in which I was enabled to act with so good effect in the convention for the saving of the lands.\* But the designs of the "Clique," as it turned out, were not limited to that object. They still retained their position "*behind the throne.*" keeping appearances, indeed, with me, *while the Bishop was raising his funds in the East*; but the moment that end was attained, the blow was struck, and —\*—  
 Dr. SPARROW NOMINATED BY BISHOP McILVAINE as my successor!! "What think you now," said an Ohio correspondent, "of the power behind the throne?"

The Dr. (wisely) declined the appointment, however, and two or three others have since declined; and the Presidency of Kenyon College, with all its "pecuniary convenience," is now literally "a begging" again. *He* will be an adventurous spirit who *accepts* it, under a *regime* which is ready to *repudiate* all its solemn obligations at the next change of the moon; and to add contumely and insult, if the "temper" of the victim should render that necessity "imperious." \* \* \*

I am sorry for Bishop McIlvaine. Greatly as he has injured *me* and mine, I mourn with unfeigned sorrow over the position in'o which by his

\* The part taken by me in the proceedings of the special convention, as set forth in my statement is denied of course in the Reply, and reference is made for proof, to the Journal. Will the respondent please to tell us from the journal, whether the books of the Institution were before the Convention? The Bishop introduced them in his address, were they forthcoming? Will he tell us from the journal, on *what business* the house went into committee of the whole? and what report was made by that committee when it rose? What resolutions were referred to a select committee? and what became of them afterwards? The journal is very lame on all these points. The fact is, that when every one was filled with doubt and fear and uncertainty, as to the course to be pursued, and it was understood that the committee of reference would only report in general terms. I proposed at a certain breakfast table, that a direct attempt should be made to get, in Ohio, 100 subscriptions—individuals or clubs.—of \$100 each, payable by instalments in two years, and to make that the basis of an appeal out of the state. The proposition being approved, I brought it before the house as soon as the committee's report was disposed of. After some discussion it was referred to the committee of the whole, and there debated for *some hours*. It was the test question between the *advocates* and *opponents* of sale, and no pains were spared on the part of the former to defeat it. It was eventually carried, however, in the form in which it appears, and has proved as it was intended, the effective beginning of the entire movement for paying the debt. I do not wish to disparage the labors of Bishop McIlvaine in raising the money, though I greatly deprecate in some particulars the means employed; but there was a time when the Bishop and the principal leaders of opinion on the Hill were loud in favor of sale, and I repeat the declaration that it was my motion in the special convention and the debate thereon, that chiefly defeated that policy. Mr. E. H. Cummings, who lends his name to the denial of this statement, knows all these facts. He and Col. Bond know also that the statement of the language used by them in my study, in regard to Bishop McIlvaine's overbearing deportment in the Board of Trustees is *TRUE* Cummings asserted it in terms; and Bond, with a shrug far more significant than words, expressed his assent.

lust of *temporal* power he has betrayed *himself*. Gladly would *I* have avoided the necessity which *his* wrong doing imposed upon me, of speaking of him as I have ; and though I may yet have other steps to take for the maintenance of my just rights, I shall never cease to utter for him with reverence and simplicity, the prayer which the Church puts into the lips of her children, for "all those who have done, or wish us evil."

Ever yours, &c.

P. S I find I have inadvertently passed over some insinuations which I intended to expose. But it does not signify.

D  
791  
4D7

**University of California  
SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY  
405 Hilgard Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90024-1388  
Return this material to the library  
from which it was borrowed.**

---

--	--



P\*

UC S



A

Unive  
So  
L