

**AN OPEN LETTER TO
THE RT. REV.
WILLIAM C. DOANE**

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649458233

An Open Letter to the Rt. Rev. William C. Doane by G. F. Seymour

Except for use in any review, the reproduction or utilisation of this work in whole or in part in any form by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including xerography, photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, is forbidden without the permission of the publisher, Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd, PO Box 1576 Collingwood, Victoria 3066 Australia.

All rights reserved.

Edited by Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd.
Cover @ 2017

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form or binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

www.triestepublishing.com

G. F. SEYMOUR

**AN OPEN LETTER TO
THE RT. REV.
WILLIAM C. DOANE**

AN OPEN LETTER

TO THE

RT. REV. WILLIAM C. DOANE

(BISHOP OF ALBANY)

IN REFERENCE TO THE

CONSECRATION OF THE RT. REV. DR. BROOKS,

(BISHOP OF MASSACHUSETTS.)

BY THE

BISHOP OF SPRINGFIELD.

G: Franklin Seymour

LETTER OF THE ARCHBISHOP TO CANON CARTER, RELATIVE
TO THE CASE OF THE REV. VANCE SMITH.

"I confess that I do not understand the frame of mind that would lead a teacher of religion to protest against the Nicene Creed, and at the same time to join in a solemn service of which that Creed and its doctrines form, from the beginning to the end, so prominent a part. Neither can I understand any one feeling it right to invite to our Communion Service a teacher of the Unitarian body which so protests."

—LIFE OF ARCHBISHOP TAIT, Vol. 2, p. 70.

SPRINGFIELD, ILL.:
THE H. W. BOKKER PRINTING HOUSE.
1892.

1 Je 01.
 Oct 3 Je 03
 Feb. rec. 22004

CONTENTS.

	PAGES.
PREFATORY NOTE—	
Reasons for delaying the publication of the letter—Why it is not worth while to present the Bishop of Massachusetts for trial—The real issue at stake.....	1-3
THE OPEN LETTER TO BISHOP DOANE.....	5-43
1. Reasons for addressing Bishop Doane.....	5
2. Reasons for publishing the open letter.....	6,7
3. The Rev. Dr. Brooks' theological position made manifest by himself for years.....	8-10
4. The Rev. Dr. Brooks' course as a clergyman of the Church irreconcilable with his belief in the doctrine of the Trinity..	10,11
5. The Church clear and decisive in her formularies on this and other points.....	11,12
6. The steps which the Bishop of Springfield took to secure the Church as to the soundness of faith of the Bishop-elect before consecration.....	13,14
7. Embarrassment occasioned by the secrecy maintained by the Bishops, who have charge of the voting, after the result was reached—the system faulty—remedies proposed.....	14,15
8. The cases of the Bishops of Hereford and Exeter in England—Bishop Doane's extraordinary method of reasoning.....	15-17
9. Bishop Doane's constituency immense: Why?.....	16
10. Demas and St. Luke types of character.....	18-20
11. Our times test men, and compel them to show their real character.....	19
12. The philosophy of the day careless of truth—Calvinism responsible for a great deal of this laxity in the realm of truth.....	21

878

OPEN LETTER—Continued.

PAGE.

13. Illustration of this tendency in the "charitable hypothesis" theory, touching regeneration in the Baptismal Office	22-25
14. The effect of this immoral treatment of the declarations of the Church of God leads to the Cummins Schism.	23
15. Further effects in the free handling of God's word; the fluxing the Creed and Offices with new meanings, and the denial of the verities of the Gospel.	26
16. The interpretation theory as applied by certain men in theology, if put in practice by them in business would probably consign them to prison.	27
17. "Closed Questions." Christ and His Apostles and the Catholic Church have closed them.	27-29
18. The episcopate past and present one. Its testimony settles forever for churchmen the fundamental truths of revelation.	29
19. Partisanship to be distinguished from fidelity to the central truth of Christianity. The issue in the Bishop Brooks controversy is whether Christ in His Person is eternal or a creature. The charge of partisanship is unfounded in fact.	30,31
20. The principles on which men administer trusts in business affairs reversed by some Bishops in dealing with the case of Bishop Brooks.	31,33
21. The precedent which the case of the Bishop of Massachusetts establishes for the future.	33,34
22. The argument urged by certain Bishops from precedent in favor of confirming Bishop Brooks, thrown into a syllogism. The fallacy of such reasoning.	34-36
23. The Bishops who gave consent to Bishop Brooks' consecration, condemn their own action in their declaration on Christian Unity, and, in some instances, in individual utterances.	37,38
24. The constituency and commendations of Bishop-elect Brooks must distress all conservative Christians.	38
25. The position of the Bishop of Springfield touching this Consecration restated.	39,40
26. Frightful illustrations of anomia and disloyalty exhibited by Clergymen in the Church.	41

OPEN LETTER—*Continued.*

27. The real root issue involved in this Consecration, unless retraction is made or satisfactory explanation is given, is Christ or antichrist..... 42,43

APPENDICES.

- APPENDIX I. The Bishop of Springfield's Circular Letter, addressed to all the Bishops exercising jurisdiction in the United States, as a warning to investigate the teaching and practice of the Rev. Dr. Brooks, before giving consent to his Consecration,.... 45-47
- APPENDIX II. Letters addressed by the Bishop of Springfield to the Rev. Dr. Brooks, with a view to obtain from the Bishop-elect such explanations as would clear up the case.—The Rev. Dr. Brooks' replies..... 48-56
- APPENDIX III. Letter addressed to the Presiding Bishop, urging him to approach the Rev. Dr. Brooks to obtain some retraction or explanation..... 57-59
- APPENDIX IV. Protest of the Bishop of Springfield against the Consecration of the Rev. Dr. Brooks..... 60,61
- APPENDIX V. Unitarian Baptism of the Rev. Dr. Brooks.—Damaging commendations..... 62-67
- APPENDIX VI. Pelagianism.—The Rev. Dr. Brooks' avowal of his holding this teaching.—This teaching in conflict with Holy Scripture and the Church.—The Rev. F. W. Robertson's erroneous teaching.—Answer to the same.—Excuse made for the Bishop of Massachusetts would not be accepted in any other sphere of life. 68-77
- APPENDIX VII. Arianism.—Letters of the Rev. Dr. E. E. Hale and the Rev. Dr. James Freeman Clarke.—Remarks on the same.—Archbishop Tait's testimony, and that of the Convocation of Canterbury..... 78-90
- APPENDIX VIII. Apostolical Succession.—Bishop Brooks' avowed position in regard thereto.—Quotations from Prayer Book and Canons.—The gift of life on every hand comes to us from the Life Giver by succession..... 91-97

iv.

	PAGE.
APPENDIX IX. "Closed Questions": A Pastoral Letter of the Bishop of Springfield to his Diocese, showing that for Churchmen there are, by their own consent, questions that are forever settled.....	98-108
APPENDIX X. Declaration of the Bishops of the American Church on Christian Unity, at the General Convention of 1886.....	109-111
APPENDIX XI. Illustrations of Bishop Brooks' course in word and deed since his Consecration.....	112-121
APPENDIX XII. Bishop Doane on the "alleged invitation," as he calls it, given to Unitarian Ministers by the Rev. Dr. Brooks, and on Religious Orders, and the Rev. F. W. Puller's reply in London Guardian, with remarks.....	122-133
APPENDIX XIII. Partisanship alleged by certain Bishops as a charge against those who opposed the Consecration of Bishop Brooks. The charge refuted.....	134-141
APPENDIX XIV. The apparent haste with which the arrangements for the Consecration of the Rt. Rev. Dr. Brooks were made and announced.—A remarkable paragraph from the New York Times, with Bishop Doane's explanation.....	142-144
CONCLUSION AND NOTE.....	144-148

PREFATORY NOTE.

This letter would have been printed long ere this had I not waited to see whether the suggestion of his friends, when they were urging the confirmation of the Bishop-elect of Massachusetts, on the ground that when he became a Bishop he would improve and show himself a different man, would be verified in the event.

I have waited in vain. This assurance of his friends, so monstrous in itself, that one who has proved disloyal in subordinate positions would become faithful and true when advanced to a higher office and entrusted with greater responsibilities, generated a hope, which has proved utterly fallacious. The Bishop of Massachusetts has not improved, and the Boston press has in effect told us "we knew as much all along, when his friends were urging Dr. Brooks' confirmation under the assurance that he would make a change in his teaching and conduct when he was consecrated a bishop. Dr. Brooks is not the man to alter his convictions or his conduct. We knew as much all along." Such is the sneer with which the friends of Bishop Brooks comment upon his acts and words of anomia now that he is the Bishop of Massachusetts.

I have not been deceived. I knew full well what was coming. But it was wise to wait, since it might have been claimed by the same deluded friends of the Bishop of Massachusetts, who were loud and persistent in saying, "make

him a Bishop and he will cease to utter and do what shocked the Church when he was a Presbyter," it might have been claimed by them and others, that I had printed my letter before he had time or opportunity to show his character as a Bishop in the Church of God.

Ten or eleven months have elapsed since Dr. Brooks was consecrated, and by word and deed he has endorsed all that he said and did as a Presbyter.

Again it may be said, why not present the Bishop of Massachusetts for trial? I answer, because in his case it seems to me utterly useless, since on the authority of a Bishop, who has better opportunities for knowing whereof he affirms than most of his brethren enjoy, two-thirds of the Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States gave consent to Dr. Brooks' consecration. They knew full well Dr. Brooks' position as a fautor of Unitarians, as an avowed Pelagian, and one who repudiated with something of scorn and pity for those who held it, the doctrine of the Sacred Ministry as embodied in our Ordinal. They knew all this, and yet the Presiding Bishop, and with him a majority of the Bishops say, as in the presence of God, and awaiting the just judgment of God, "let him be made a Bishop, we do not consider these acts unrepented of, these words unretracted or unexplained inconsistent with his making the promises of the Ordinal and taking the Episcopal oath."

Is there any hope that these Bishops, possibly two-thirds of the American Episcopate, who say in 1891, let him be made a Bishop, will in 1892 consent to his condemnation? It would be stultification pure and simple.