

334 5099

UBC HEAD ARCHIVES
COLLEGE FILES
RG 11

Yenching
Corr's
Goucher, John F. 1918-1922

M
M
F
1
5
0
0
0
0

0475

COPY

Baltimore, Md.
June 12, 1917.

Dr. John F. Goucher,
2313 St. Paul St.,
Baltimore, Md.

My dear Dr. Goucher:

I will endeavor to answer some of the questions you asked me yesterday in reference to the property for your proposed Peking University in Peking, China.

Within the last twelve months I have prepared the plans for six colleges and two medical school groups on plats of land varying from twelve to sixty acres in size. I have also worked out the plans for the proposed Peking Government University on their new property of over three hundred acres. From the experience of this work I am firmly convinced that it would be most unwise for you to start building until you have secured or were positive of being able to secure more than the thirty acres of land.

You are more familiar than I am with the conditions of some of the smaller universities in the East, particularly in India where in some cases they are even considering giving up their entire investment in order to secure larger areas of land. We are studying two such conditions at the present time, where a larger vision of men in charge a few years ago would have saved much money now.

I know some of the large universities in this country have small land areas but in Peking, though we have no building laws at the present time, the plans of all buildings must be approved by the Police Department before you can start building operations. This department has intimated to me several times recently that they would not give permits to build high buildings outside of the Legation Quarters. This I believe will make it impossible for you to confine yourself to the small area of land suggested for your use.

In a comparison between the larger site within the city walls as suggested by Dr. Lowry and a still larger area outside of the walls I think several conditions should be carefully considered.

FIRST: Size of Property. I cannot urge too strongly the securing of ample property for your buildings. On the last plat approved by the Chinese Government for your site as suggested by Dr. Lowry they reduced the area available for your use to seventeen hundred and fifty feet square or about seventy acres which with the streets required would reduce it to less than sixty acres of land. I am not sure that even this is large enough for your proposed buildings. The Peking Government University has experienced some difficulty in finding room for all the buildings they think they will require within the next fifty years on a plat of three hundred acres.

0476

SECOND: Possibility of Enlargement; The Parks demanded by the Peking Government between your property and the walls were placed there by the officials only to keep you from owning up the walls and not from any value the officials considered the Parks might have to the city proper. The Government also owns a larger tract directly north of your property. On this they at one time intended to build their new Parliament Buildings, but this idea has now been abandoned.

From the experience I had in working on your plans with the Peking Government officials last year I think it is well within the range of possibilities that the Government could be induced to add both the Parks and this large area of land to your proposed property, if you have a large scheme to appeal to them. When I first started working with the officials they were rather antagonistic to your proposition but when they understood the wonderful possibilities and the broad-minded way in which you intended working them out they changed their attitude and I believe at that time would have been willing to give you every assistance asked for. We left them in a very fine mood.

THIRD: Obligations; Have you considered you might be under some obligations to the Chinese Government. You will recall in March of 1915 the Peking Government proposed an elaborate street car system for the city of Peking. Since that time they have laid out, widened and built new streets through all sections of the city. One of their proposed streets with the street car line passed through your property. Dr. Lowry had me prepare sketches at that time to show the Government the extent of your scheme. I worked with the Minister of Interior daily for over three weeks before he would accept your plan and agree to change the routing of his streets as they were very proud of their scheme and had even spent considerable money on their new streets. These streets they had given up in order to avoid passing through your property. Dr. Raunch did a large amount of work on this and had to use all his influence in order to have the change made. The Minister of the Interior with whom we conferred has now been replaced but the same minor officials are at the head of the departments.

FOURTH: Prominence of Sight; The City of Peking has laid out a Boulevard system extending both inside and outside of the city. This calls for many new gates through the old city wall. I should think in considering your proposed site some consideration should be given to these plans of the city, as the new location of the Boulevard and Railroad depots might have considerable bearing on the prominence of your property.

FIFTH: Athletics; I hope you have given sufficient consideration to the question of athletic in connection with your plans. The Peking Government Officials have made the most elaborate allowance for this feature, setting apart about thirty acres for three athletic fields. In working with the Chinese Officials I have been much impressed with the advisability of amply taking care of athletics. I am afraid it will be difficult to secure very large fields for this purpose within the city near your property, but I think if proper influence is brought to bear you could have the new gates opened through the wall in locations so that adjoining property might be secured for this purpose.

The future of your whole university proposition depends so much on the size and location of your property and I feel such an interest in your decision that I am going to take the liberty of making this suggestion to you.

As your Board seems to be so divided on this question and as there are so many conditions involved which can hardly be satisfactorily decided in this country, would it not give you some valuable assistance if you appointed a small Committee of men outside your Mission who have been living in Peking long enough to know all the conditions. There are many men such as Mr. Greene of the China Medical Board, Dr. Raunch, the American Minister, and some Chinese Officials who are intensely interested in your whole proposition and who have a large vision of the possibilities of educational institutions in China and whom I know would gladly give you all the assistance possible. These men if asked by you could make a report in a short time which I think would be of great interest at this time.

As the question of your proposed site of your buildings has been on my mind for some time I have asked a number of prominent Chinese of my acquaintances as to their opinion of the best location for your University. Their replies have been varied, but I think had many ideas worth considering.

I ask your pardon for burdening you with this long letter but I feel a very great interest in the proposed university which I think has the greatest possibilities of any work suggested for China.

I am,

Yours very truly,

(signed) Harry H. Hussey.

HARRIET LANE HOME.
JOHNS HOPKINS HOSP.
BALTO. MD.

0478

GOUCHER COLLEGE
BALTIMORE, MARYLAND

March 5th, 1918.

My dear Dr. Jones:

I have received the notice of the meeting of the Trustees of Peking University for Thursday, April 11th, and greatly regret that it will be impossible for me to attend. The Joint Commission on Unification adjourned to meet in St. Louis on April 10th with the expectation that we will be able to agree with practical unanimity upon a plan of unification, and I feel the responsibility of being present very keenly.

As to the questions which you indicate will come before the meeting, I register my vote in the affirmative to questions one and two, but in the negative as to three, and also in favor of the last item, the one in reference to the London Missionary Society.

Cordially yours,

Geo. F. Goucher.

Rev. George Heber Jones, D.D.,
150 Fifth Ave.,
New York City.

Geo. F. Goucher

0479

COPY

Peking Alumni Association of th

N. C. U. C.,

c/o No. 38 Teng Shih Kou,

Peking, China.

May 2, 1918

Dr. George Heber Jones, Secretary,
Board of Trustees of the Peking University,
150 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

Dear Sir:-

We beg to register at your Board our most profound protest against ~~the~~ the measure passed by the Board of Managers of Peking University at its last meeting held on the 26th of April regarding the adoption of Hui Wen as the name in Chinese for the Peking University now in consideration. In order to lay our case before you before it is too late, we have to send you this hasty note without any explanation in detail, as yet we are unable to make further statements concerning this matter. We expect, however, to write you again in the course of a week or two, to submit to you the reasons we have for making the protest. (This later document is appended herewith.) At the same time we wish to state very definitely in this letter that we, the Executive Committee of the Peking Alumni Association of the North China Union College, on behalf of the Association, shall under no circumstances recognize the said measure as just stated above.

Very faithfully yours,

THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

0480

M
M
F
1
5
3
0
7
0

For the convenience of the English speaking people who do not care to go into the details of the attached Chinese circular the following may serve as a liberal summary of the main points contained therein.

To the leading Church members who have been connected with or interested in the North China Union University.

Dear Teachers and beloved Elders:

In appealing to you for support in our protest against the use of the term Hui Wen as the Chinese name for the future joint institution of the North China Union College and the Methodist Peking University, we beg to be allowed to lay before you the reasons for which we feel that under no circumstances shall we recognize the use of that term.

FIRST: Among the majority of the leading educational institutions in this country under missionary management, whenever there is a case of forming a larger institution by uniting a number of small institutions, such as the Nanking University, the S Foochow University, the Hangchow Christian College, the Canton Christian College and the Shantung Christian University, the guiding principle followed by most of them in regard to the names of the new institutions has generally been:

1. The constituent institutions all give up their own names and adopt a new name for the newly constituted institution.
2. The Chinese name of the new institution follows the name of the place where it is situated, and the English name includes the word Christianity.

But our case now is absolutely contrary to this well recognized and widely followed principle:

1. The name of one constituent school, the Hui Wen University, is not given up but is adopted for the new institution.
2. So that, in the future neither our Chinese name has any reference to the place, nor has our English name any indication of Christianity.

SECOND: We would still tolerate the use of the name Hui Wen, if our objection to it is only based on the principle as above stated. That is, we would still allow it to be used, if it were satisfactory and practical in other respects. But it is not. In addition to being contrary to a well recognized principle, it is also a name that is objectionable in itself, in its very meaning, for our purpose. Generally speaking, Hui means "Converge", "Collect", "Deposit", "Approach nearer together", etc. and Wen means "Literature", "Elegant", "Art", etc. The nature of our new institution is, however a union of two Christian schools for the purpose of establishing a "University founded and conducted on strictly Christian ... principles to aid the youth in obtaining in such

University literary, scientific or professional education" (amended Charter of the University.) The main points then are (1) the union of schools, (2) Christianity, and (3) literary, scientific or professional education. Does the term Hui Wen have any indication of these fundamental points of the nature of our University? If not, a better name should be chosen, and a better name must be chosen unless it is absolutely impossible to choose. Is it impossible? It is not, and since it is not, we demand a new name and shall never recognize the old name Hui Wen.

THIRD: We all agree on the nature of our University, we all know what kind of name we want for it. We all feel that a new name, a name better than the old names, should be chosen. But suppose we are all exhausted in our power of imagination, suppose we are no longer able to think and create new names, and suppose we prefer to have an old name, do we then need much education, logic, wisdom and common sense to see the difference between the two old names Hsieh Ho, the name of the North China Union College, and Hui Wen, and to see which of them is better for our purpose? The meaning of Hui Wen was already stated. That of Hsieh Ho is "Union", "to unite a few into one", etc. Without exaggeration then, we can judge at first glance that even children of high school education can see that if these two names must be used at all, Hsieh Ho is far better and more suitable. If it does not bring out the full meaning of our University it indicates part of it, much more than Hui Wen does. At least, it is not misleading as the latter, for it does not tell people that the University is a collection of or converge to art, literature, etc. Yet, it is said that the authorities in charge of selecting a name for the University have decided on Hui Wen and not Hsieh Ho, the worse one and not the better one. Are we insane, are we all mad, have we lost our senses, and are we too wise and learned to see the plain truth, to distinguish what the average child can? We are not, we have not, and as long as we are not and have not, we shall never recognize the use of Hui Wen.

FOURTH: When the four missions have decided to unite the two schools into one big University, we all and all knew that the Union should be effected through compromises and compromises should be made through sacrifices by all parties concerned. At least, we, the Hsieh Ho men, knew this and therefore, we have yielded to the Hui Wen authorities in their demands, that ~~xxx~~ their president be made president for the united institution, that their grounds be made the place for the university, that their English name be used as the name of the institution, etc. Haven't we made enough sacrifices? Must we also yield to their demand to use their Chinese name for the new institution? If the united institution adopts everything theirs, their name, their place, their officers, their laws, their arrangements, etc. etc. can we still call it a union of schools based on equality of rights, privileges, etc? In such an institution we only see one constituent member "swallow up" another constituent member; the one to become better and the other to extin-

3.

guish once for all. We, the N.C.U.C. students, want a natural death, if die we must, rather than to be "swallowed."

Now, we have stated clearly what the situation is, and would like to have your opinion and enlightenment on this matter. As we have always enjoyed your kindness and sympathy in the past, we hope you will favor us with a reply on the enclosed card before the 25th instant.

We remain

Very faithfully yours,

THE SPECIAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FOR N.C.U.C.

Alumni Associations of Peking,

Pungchow and Tientsin

Peking, May 1918.

M
M
F
1
5
0
0
0

0483

Peking University,
Peking, China,
June 20, 1915.

Dr. George H. Jones,
Board of Foreign Missions,
150 Fifth Ave.,
New York City, N. Y.

Dear Sir:-

Remaining that you have heard about the difficult position in which the Board of Managers of the Federated University has been placed by the agitation started by the Alumni of the North China Union College against the name of Peking University in Chinese. We, the members of the Students' Union and Alumni Association of Peking University as a body deem it fair and obligatory on us to acquaint you as a representative of the Methodist Mission with all the important facts of the case with a view to improving the present situation, as it so vitally concerns the welfare of the Institute both in the success of its organization and in the successful workings of its establishment.

We learn from the recommendations made and agreed upon by the three Missions in Peking on entering the federation that the first paragraph states the name under which the federation is to be effected: "to request the Trustees (of Peking University) to make some alteration in the By-Laws of the Institution as to provide for the Missions in North China to federate with Peking University in education" etc. This leaves the matter beyond all doubt for the other Missions (Presbyterian and American Board and Inter-London Mission) as to what is the name of the Institution with which they will come into federation in education.

That Peking University is the name of an existing and not of a prospective institution may be inferred from the clause in the second paragraph of the same document: "To separate the Peking University from the Methodist Episcopal Church" and that Peking University is to be the name for the new institution is contained in the third paragraph of the above quoted agreement: "To authorize the Board of Managers to establish the buildings and equipment of Peking University on the newly acquired land, etc."

This name though recommended by the Missionaries in North China could only be regarded as tentative; fixed until a vote was taken by the Board of Regents in New York City, December 21, 1913, on the recommendation of the Board of Trustees of Peking University to be used as the name for the new institution.

But it is only fair to say the people of the other missions would have given the word Union or Christian to the name, had it not been for the fact that they were at last convinced that if they were to take advantage of the prestige of the old charter of Peking University, they had better leave the name alone. However, we learn with surprise from the circular letter sent out by the Alumni of North China Union College at Peking, China to protest against the name Peking (Chinese name of Peking University) that there are still people ac-

0484

renouncing the English name because, as they say, it is shorn of any Christian significance. (Paragraph 11 of circular issued in May 1918).

Realizing that nothing could be done with the English name, the representatives of the other missions concentrated all their attacks on the Chinese name simply because of the occasion that Hui Wen is not mentioned in the Charter. They seemed to have overlooked the fact that Hui Wen and Peking University are one name in two languages for the same institution. They objected to it on the ground that Hui Wen is not a literal translation of Peking University. This objection is devoid of all weight in face of the common fact that Mei Kue (M.C.K.) is not a literal translation of America -- the first meaning of "beautiful country" and the latter being the name of the discoverer. Any foreigner who comes to China will readily admit that there is no more sense in making literal translation of names.

If the missions really mean to federate with Peking University, they mean implicitly also to federate with Hui Wen which is one and the same institution. If the authorities representing Peking University or the old status are consulted and will give their consent to a change, then the Board of Managers can advise any name for the institution as they see fit. And they could with just as much ease to change the English name if they did not wish to use the old charter. But the other missions can not be justified in forcing a change by virtue of an overwhelming majority on the Board of Managers. Because, since the name Peking University has been adopted, the name Hui Wen has just as much rightful claim to be the name of the new institution as Peking University.

Finally, being fully convinced of the logic of the case, the representatives of the missions left off squabbling and on April 26, 1918 passed the name Hui Wen at the meeting of the Board of Managers by a majority vote. Everything promised to go well after the settlement of this long vexed question.

Unfortunately, when the students and the Alumni of the North China Union College got wind of the decision, started a campaign against the action of the Board of Managers in adopting the name Hui Wen. Circulars were sent out to their former students and alumni and also to the leading members of all churches throughout the country strongly opposing the use of Hui Wen as the name for the new institution.

In the circular they base their objection to the name Hui Wen substantially on the following grounds:-

First, the federate university is a new institution, therefore following the usage of other combined schools it should be given a new name, signifying the Christian and union nature of its organization, while the name Hui Wen is contrary to this principle.

Second, Hui Wen does not take into the implications of its meaning the theological and science departments of the University and therefore may be ruled out as unfit.

Third, the name Hui Wen (Peking University) being an old name when used for the new institution will make it appear like the absorption of all the other constituent missions by a single mission.

0485

The first argument has an infirm footing because it is an unwarranted generalization of particular cases. It cites the cases of Tung-shan Tsu Hsueh or Soochow University and King-ling Tsu Hsueh or Hanking University by way of proof. To be sure, they are both combined institutions, but there is neither any indication of Christianity nor union in their names. Furthermore, this Hanking University is founded upon an old charter and has inherited a name which is anything but new.

In the second argument, they take the two characters Hui wen at their narrowest meaning, and translate Hui as "converge" and wen as literature; while in this present case, Hui is rightly intended to mean confluence and Hui besides being the character used for literature is also the character used for civilization and culture. This doubtless was the conception of the author when choosing a name for the university capable of expressing the nature of a great educational institution. Culture, according to Matthew Arnold, consists of the best that is thought and known in the world, and civilization, as it is stated in the International Encyclopedia contains the departments of Industrial Arts, Government, Arts of Social Intercourse, Sciences of Morality including religion, Science, Literature and Fine Arts. If Hui wen means a confluence of culture or civilization, then it remains for the opponents to show how theology and science or any other such institutions are excluded from it. The second part of the name Tsu Hsueh (University or Studium Generale) has a wide enough connotation as to embrace Theology, Science, Law, Engineering, Medicine and everything else. Moreover what does Harvard, Syracuse, or Columbia signify with reference to literature, Theology, and Science. Yet they are not objectionable as names for Universities when there is good basis for these names, for the word University is sufficient to indicate the purpose and work of the institution.

The third argument betrays a groundless apprehension of being absorbed, or at least it would appear so, as they say. Even this apprehension exists only in imagination. But what are the facts? There is a Board of Trustees of equal representation from the missions entering the Federation. There is the Board of Managers in China of equal representation from the constituting missions in North China. There is the faculty of the institution to be constituted by equal number of teachers from each mission, and each constituting mission has equal right in recommending students to this federate institution. The resident, Dean, and professors are to be chosen and appointed by the Board of Trustees representing on an equal footing all the constituent missions. This being the case, then where is the absorption or the "swallowing up" as the circular says?

As a result of the anti-Hui wen campaign set on foot by a score of the North China Union College Alumni, many members of the Board of Managers representing the Wesleyan, the American Board and the London Mission who had voted for the name Hui wen on April 26, took back their vote at the meeting held June 6, and cancelled their own decision of the previous meeting to reconsider the question. The only reason given by the members of the Board for revoking the decision was that the students and Alumni of the Union College of Tung Chow were dissatisfied with the name.

M M 3 1 5 0 5 0 1

They never seemed to have stopped to ask themselves whether they could afford to so easily take back their words ~~and~~ of honor in such an important function; and who were the students and alumni, and what they had to do with the fixing of the name; and whether it was right to allow their judgment to be thus unduly influenced by a body of irresponsible opinions; and, lastly, whether this step would not arouse opposition of the students and alumni of the Methodisteking University, which, if it did, would only make matters more complicated and a peaceful solution more remote.

Therefore, the members of the Students' Union and Alumni Association of Peking University would not have assumed the liberty of writing this letter to you at all, if everything had been allowed to take its natural course. Since a dilemma has been brought about by the changeable attitude of the Board of Managers we make bold to present the whole case to you in sincere hopes that you will not spare any effort or influence in reaching a satisfactory decision.

It fills us with infinite sadness to say that the Methodist Mission has been made to take the defensive part of the struggle ever since the proposal of the federation plan. The present case may be taken as a typical instance. The fundamental agreement entered into by the Missions states clearly the site, the name, and the nature of the work of the new institution. But out of sheer disregard of the stipulations, some of the representatives wanted to remove the institution outside of the city, some urged to bring the preparatory Department into college, and others agitated for a change of the name.

The Methodist Mission is doomed to defeat in point of numbers, as the other three Missions are always lined up on one side on almost all questions in the Board of Managers. Our Mission has only the fundamental agreement to fall back on as a means of defence, but we are sorry to say that even this agreement has more than once been trampled upon as nothing more than a mere scrap of paper.

Recently our Alumni Association has twice been notified by Mr. Porter and Mr. Cloysteen to elect five men from Peking University to meet the same number of men from Tung Chow in the capacity of advising a new name for the federate university. But we feel ourselves not in a position to accept this invitation because, firstly, as alumni we are not competent to participate in this important function; secondly the name has already been passed by the Board of Managers and the revocation of the action is under the circumstances unavailing.

Therefore, the representatives of the Students' Union and Alumni Association of Peking University have of late held a joint-meeting and unanimously passed the following resolution:

Whereas, it is provided by the fundamental agreement for the North China Missions to federate with Peking University; and whereas the Board of Trustees has named the federate institution Peking University based upon the old certificate of incorporation filed June 25th, 1890 in the office of the Secretary of State and the State of New York; and whereas, the Chinese name of the said institution sustained by the said certificate of incorporation has, since the execution of the certificate, been Pui Chen Lo Shien (Peking

University) and whereas, the Board of Managers empowered by the Board of Trustees to agree on a Chinese name for the federate institution passed the name Hui Wen on April 26th, 1918, by a majority vote;

Therefore, be it resolved that the students and alumni ofeking University will by no means recognize any other name and can never regard the cancellation of the decision of the Board of Managers made April 26, 1918, as justifiable or lawful.

We feel no small amount of relief from the present embarrassment of the thought that we have a man like you reeling at the head of affairs of the Methodist Church. We all feel a deep sense of gratitude towards you and the other gentlemen representing the Methodist Mission on the Board of Trustees for your firm attitude and clear insight which have saved us many a difficulty which threatened to impede the progress of the Lord's Kingdom in China by our Mission.

We apologize for intruding upon your business to read this lengthy note, and can only justify our action by the urgency and importance of the case, believing that any federation effected in this spirit and under the present circumstances can only result in a state of things detrimental to the best interests of God's Kingdom in China.

Very respectfully yours,

(Signed)	Lu Fang, Chairman, Students' Union
"	C. P. Wang, " Alumni Association
"	Li Fein Lu, Secretary..

M
M
F
1
5
0
0
0

MEMBERS

ARTHUR J. BROWN
WILLIAM P. MERRILL
HENRY W. HODGE
JOHN L. SEVERANCE
JAS. L. BARTON
MRS. GEO. M. CLARK
EDWARD C. MOORE
ARTHUR PERRY
FRANK MASON NORTH
WILLIAM V. KELLEY
JOHN F. GOUCHER
H. A. INGRAHAM
MISS ALICE M. DAVISON
MRS. J. M. AVANN
LUTHER B. WILSON
EDWARD LINCOLN SMITH
E. M. MCBRIER
GEO. HEBER JONES

TRUSTEES PEKING UNIVERSITY
NEW YORK

PRESIDENT
WILLIAM P. MERRILL

VICE-PRESIDENT
ARTHUR PERRY

SECRETARY
GEO. HEBER JONES

TREASURER
E. M. MCBRIER

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

EDWARD LINCOLN SMITH
CHAIRMAN

FRANK MASON NORTH

JAS. L. BARTON

ARTHUR J. BROWN

WILLIAM P. MERRILL

WILLIAM V. KELLEY

—
GEO. HEBER JONES
SECRETARY

150 Fifth Avenue,
NEW YORK CITY, Aug. 27, 1918

The Rev. John F. Goucher, D.D.,
2313 St. Paul Street,
Baltimore, Md.

Dear Dr. Goucher:-

In connection with the discussion concerning the name in Chinese of Peking University I have received two documents, one from the Alumni Association of the college at Tungchow and the other from the Alumni Association of the Peking College. As this matter will doubtless come before the Board of Trustees for consideration, I am sending these documents to you so that you may have before you the two statements.

Cordially yours,

Geo Heber Jones

GHJ
EAB

0489

December
Tenth,
1919.

Rev. John F. Goucher, D.D.,
2313 St. Paul Street,
Baltimore, Maryland.

My dear Mr. Goucher:-

TRUSTEE
PEKING UNIV

I enclose herewith a copy of the minutes of the meeting of the Trustees of Peking University held on December second.

It has seemed to me as I have considered the actions taken by the Trustees at this meeting that it was a most forward looking and progressive session - that a good many of the difficulties that have made progress difficult have been cleared away by the approach to a definite program for the University.

As rapidly as the matters committed to the Executive Committee are crystalized and acted upon, I will see that the Trustees are informed in order that they may share as largely as possible in the development of the program.

If you should have by any chance any recommendations concerning the revision of the proposed program of advance which was sent to you before the meeting of the Trustees and any suggestions concerning the methods for the campaign which we believe will be necessary, both in connection with the amounts which the Boards are prepared to under-write and also in connection with whatever additional amounts may be necessary, I sincerely hope that you will write to me in order that we may make these suggestions available to the Executive Committee and to Mr. Luce and Mr. Wheeler.

I am sure it is a great gratification to the Trustees that these two gentlemen have decided to join their forces with us in the promotion of the interest of the University.

With all good wishes, I am

Cordially yours,

EMM
BW

0490

GOUCHER COLLEGE
BALTIMORE, MARYLAND

January 12th, 1922.

Dr. Erick M. North,
150 Fifth Ave.,
New York City.

2
TRUSTEES OF
PEKING UNIVERSITY

My dear Dr. North:-

I received yesterday your letter of January 4th, enclosing a circular from Dr. Wheeler requesting the Trustees of the Peking University "for personal subscriptions or underwriting of the current expenses up to the sum of \$250.00 each." I will be responsible for that amount to be paid on or before July 15, 1922. I may be able to hand it to you earlier than this, but if it does not come to you by the 10th of July, I will be glad to have you remind me of it. ✓

I regret to say that I may probably be detained from attending the meeting of the Trustees of Peking University called for January 18th.

My daughter has had a serious attack of shingles, which has been exceptionally painful and has confined her to her bed for four or five weeks past, and though she is improving she is still required to remain in a darkened room and the physician thinks will not be out for two or three weeks more. As there are but the two of us in the family, I cannot be away for any length of time.

0491

GOUCHER COLLEGE
BALTIMORE, MARYLAND

Dr. Erick M. North.---2.

In addition to this, the physicians say I am greatly needing rest, being much overworked by the exceptional activities which have occupied me for sometime past, and they are urging me to spend from fifteen to eighteen hours a day on my bed, assuring me that I have no disease but am only over tired. If I should not be present, please make my excuse as owing to sickness in the family.

I regret more than I can tell you my inability to be at Atlantic City this week, for it postpones what we have tried to plan for several months past, namely an interview between your father and you and myself in reference to the Foreign Educational matters of our Board. There are some large and urgent problems which should have deliberate consideration, and I have been anxious to have an opportunity to talk these over with you both, and while heretofore we have been unable to arrange for an engagement, I was looking forward to the meeting at Atlantic City as a time when it might be arranged. We will have to look forward to it in the future, for I fear our work in the ^{Far East is} threatened with very serious consequences unless we can reach some definite conclusions concerning the lines of action to be pursued and a policy for pursuing them.

Cordially yours,

John Goucher

0492

RECEIVED
MAY 14 1922
1/14/22
BY _____
FILED _____

M M J 1 5 2 0 0 0

0493

TRUSTEES OF
PEKING UNIVERSITY

February 8, 1942

Dr. John F. Coeher,
2313 St. Paul Street,
Baltimore, Maryland.

Dear Doctor Coeher:

I regret that continued preoccupation with absence from the city has prevented me from answering sooner your very cordial letter of January 18.

I am sure we much appreciate your subscription to the needs of the University.

I presented your excuses to the meeting of the Trustees on February 18. The Minutes of this meeting should have reached you before this.

I greatly regret that you are needing prolonged rest and trust that your progress for the regaining of strength will be much more rapid than you anticipate. Pa her and I are still looking forward with hope that the time can be found when we can have the conference with you upon the educational situation in the Far East. We are awaiting with interest the report of the Educational Commission which I understand has completed its deliberations and is returning to the United States.

Faithfully yours,

MM
JL

0494

M
M
F
1
5
0
0
0

Trustees Meeting

33 #3 St Paul St

Baltimore, Md.
March 30th, 1922.

Dr. Eric M. North,
156 Fifth Ave.,
New York City.

J
TRUSTEES OF
PEKING UNIVERSITY

My dear Dr. North:-

I greatly regret that owing to the slowness of my recovery I will not be able to be in New York at the annual meeting of the Trustees of the Peking University on April 11th. I regret this very much because the matters coming before the Board are of such great interest and the opportunity of hearing directly from President Stuart will be a very rare one.

My judgment is very clear that is it not advisable to divide the work of Peking University as suggested. Such separation of the pedagogical work from an immediate organic relation with the other departments of the University would largely increase the expense of maintenance and development of the department, as well as the administration, and the department, if separated, would lose the broadening of horizon and inspiration coming from contact with the body of specialists engaged in the other departments of the University, and the appeal of pedagogical work to the students, who have not fully chosen their life mission, would be weakened. I understand the medical work at Tsinan is to be primarily in the vernacular, and the other departments of the Institution there will necessarily partake, more or less, of the same limitations.

There is no more urgent demand for the enlargement of the work of Christian education in China than through the

M
M
5
1
5
0
0
0

0495

Dr. Eric W. North,---2.

development of capable Christian leadership in the educational work. This should be secured in the most thoroughly equipped University department, exceptionally well manned, and with an atmosphere thoroughly Christian, alert and up to date in everything pertaining to the work which it offers. These requirements ramify throughout the various departments of the University work and cannot be secured so efficiently separated from the various departments manned, as they will be we hope in the not distant future, in the most thorough manner. The inspiration of such an environment, as well as the opportunities of such contribution, would prove invaluable and are absolutely essential to the work.

Regretting my physical inability will prevent my being present at the meeting, but very deeply interested, and praying that the meeting may be under divine guidance in every particular, I am,

Cordially yours,

Just Goucher.

RECEIVED BY	
SID M. NORTH ()	
(DATE)	
8/1/22	
BY	

0496

M
M
J
M
C
M
M

April 19, 1922

J
J. Peking

Mr. John F. Goucher,
313 St. Paul Street,
Baltimore, Maryland.

My dear Doctor Goucher:

I have had your letter of March 30 and presented your excuses to the Trustees of Peking University on the 11th. As you will see from the Minute of the meeting, which will reach you shortly, no final action was taken. The matter was referred to the Executive Committee for full consideration and report. The Executive Committee is to meet this week to go into the matter.

I have also seen your letter to father upon the subject and I think he may read portions of it to the Executive Committee.

The Shantung Board has taken action stating that they agree to develop the Senior College of Arts and Sciences into a School of Education. I think there is a feeling on the part of some of us that if they insist upon this, it will - so far as we are concerned - automatically shut off any prospect of union even if it were desirable upon other grounds.

Faithfully yours,

EMM
JL

0497

3
3
5
5
0
0
0