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On June 7, 1916, at 10 A.M., according to arrangement, the Knoxville members of the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees, consisting of President Ayres, Judge Hu L. McClung, and Mr James Maynard, accompanied by Mr T.D. Morris, Treasurer and Registrar of the University, met Mr Stough and a number of the gentlemen connected with the Executive Committee of the Stough Evangelistic Campaign, at the Central Y.M.C.A. Building. Mr Stough read the preceding correspondence with the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees. President Ayres called on Mr T.D. Morris to explain the impatient manner in which Mr Stough received these communications, and to repeat the statements given by him in his letter herein included. Mr Stough then handed to each member of the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees a typewritten paper, a copy of which is attached and marked Exhibit A. (A few days later Mr Stough furnished the Committee with a typewritten paper, a copy of which is attached and marked Exhibit B.) It will be observed that all the statements on these two papers, which constitute all the information furnished the Executive Committee by Mr Stough, have reference to a lecture given by Professor Asa A. Schaeffer before the Anti-Vice Association of Knoxville at their repeated request, on the subject of "Hereditary in Relation to Vice."

This lecture was given on Thursday, June 19, 1913, and a report of it, written by Mrs L. Crozier French, one of the ladies whose statement is given in Exhibit B, gives an account of the lecture, but does makes no reference whatever to a discussion of the
moral standard. (see paper Exhibit C.) This lecture was given three weeks after the close of the University session and no students were present at the lecture. In no sense, therefore, substantiated the statement of Mr Stough as to the existence in the University of a "professor who taught his students in certain classes, etc." Mr Stough having said in his letter of June 6 - "I will be pleased to give you any information at hand", and these two papers (Exhibits A and B.) being the only thing furnished us by Mr Stough, it is evident that he had no basis for his public statement, and there is no evidence that any professor of the University ever taught his students anything similar to the teaching charged by Mr Stough. It would appear, therefore, that the case of Mr Stough's public charge falls to the ground for lack of anything to support it, and that he is self-indicted as a maker of false statements.

The papers furnished by Mr Stough (Exhibits A and B.) constitute, in effect, an independent charge by certain ladies of Knoxville. The Executive Committee has no information that Mr Stough ever made any public reference to this lecture before the Anti-Vice Association, so that only indirectly, by the fact of securing and furnishing the Committee with the statements of these ladies, does he become involved in this latter charge.

Attention is called to the correspondence between President Ayres and the three ladies whose statements were first furnished to the Executive Committee, also the statements from Professor J.C. Pridmore, professor of agronomy in the University,
Mrs J.C. Pridmore, and a Miss Ruby Franklin, librarian of the Agricultural Experiment Station, who were present at the lecture referred to, also to the statement of Professor Schaeffer. The statements of Mrs J.H. Knox and Mrs H.M. Dobson are substantially that Professor Schaeffer advocated a double standard of morals in the course of his lecture. The statement of Mrs Margaret N. Craft and Mrs L. Crozier French are that he made the statement in a conversation with a small group of women after the lecture. The statement of Mrs R.W. McGranahan indicates that she does not remember exactly when he made the statement, but says that it is possible it may have been in the conversation following the lecture. The statements of Professor Pridmore, Mrs Pridmore, and Miss Franklin are emphatic that no reference to moral standards was made in the lecture, and the same statement is made by Professor Schaeffer himself. In view of the fact that nearly three years have passed and of the uncertainty of the human memory, the first point to be established is whether, in the face of his personal denial of the fact, the evidence is sufficient to convict Professor Schaeffer of having made any statement in the course of the lecture to the Anti-Vice Association? If it be decided that he did not make the statement in the lecture before the Anti-Vice Association, did he make it before the small group of women who remained behind at the close of the lecture and discussed some questions and interrogated Professor Schaeffer in regard to his personal standing on the question of the double standard of morals? If it be held that the conversation regarding the double standard of morals took place in this private gathering at the close of the lecture, the question is whether Professor Schaeffer is guilty of having declared for a double standard of morals as
in his judgment is right and proper, or whether he was mis-
understood by the ladies present?