To Sankey L. Blanton

15 October 1951
Boston, Mass.

King thanks Sankey L. Blanton, who in 1950 replaced E. E. Aubrey as president of Crozer Theological Seminary, for sending him the first fellowship check helping him to study at Boston University. The J. Lewis Crozer Fellowship required him to remain enrolled in graduate school and "show proficiency" in advanced study.

Dr. Sankey L. Blanton
Crozer Theological Seminary
Chester, Pennsylvania

Dear Dr. Blanton:

Your letter of October 3 was received along with the check for $300 which constitutes one half of the fellowship grant for 1951-52. I can hardly express in words my appreciation to you and Crozer Seminary for this generous grant. Certainly it will be of tremendous aid to me in facing financial difficulties. And I assure you that it will be used very wisely.

So far I am enjoying my work here at Boston University to the highest. Although the student is very large, I find an intimacy between faculty and students which is quite reminiscent of Crozer. All of my professors have a very high respect for Crozer and the quality of men it produces. Naturally this attitude has made me feel good. I feel that my background from Crozer will be of a great help to me in my work here.

I am very happy to know that you are having an unusually fine year at Crozer with such an excellent student body. I plan to be in that vicinity in the near future and I will be sure to stop in to see you.
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The Martin Luther King, Jr. Papers Project

From Morton Scott Enslin

26 October 1951
Chester, Pa.

The students in L. Harold DeWolf's Seminar in Systematic Theology reviewed a number of theological journals, among them the Crozer Quarterly. Preparing to give the presentation on the Crozer journal, King wrote a letter to Enslin, his

---

Dear Mr. King,

Your good letter reached me. It is pleasant to hear from you and to learn of your work at Boston University. Please give my most cordial greetings to Professors Brightman and DeWolf.

I am interested in your historical discussion of Crozer Quarterly in connection with the course in contemporary American theology. I think that you will find about all the real historical data in the complete file of the Quarterly itself. I presume that at Boston University or Harvard there is a complete file. It was started with the January issue in 1924. Dr. Pollard was the first editor. It was the result of a feeling by the faculty at that time, under the direction of Dr. Evans, that such a journal was needed. Andover and Rochester were invited to join in the project but found it impossible to accept. Accordingly Crozer has continued it alone from the start. The several editors who have successively directed it have been: Edward B. Pollard, Spenser B. Meeser, A. Stewart Woodburne, R. E. E. Harkness, and Morton S. Enslin. You will find from a study of the various numbers that generally each editor had some column or department in which he gave expression to his own slant or policy for the journal.

Book reviews have always been a part of the Quarterly. In recent years they have become a very important section. And the publishers are eager to have their books in our paper. We have had many indications from here (or the Library of Congress) and abroad that our pages are widely used as a source of standard review. Reviewers are entirely free from editorial pressure as regards the [tone] and slant of their reviews.

We have had a bit wider field of interest than many so-called "theological" journals, and a glance at back issues will show the wide field in which our authors and reviewers have worked.

Until Jan 1950 the price was kept at the [original] figure $1.50; then it was raised to $2.50. It has never been financially self-supporting and was not intended to be. Its aim was to provide a journal of liberal authors and general values at a figure ministers on limited salary could afford, and we have regarded it in part a missionary effort. I also feel that it has been of value to the Seminary [through] the resultant [publicity], as it is widely found in the libraries of universities and colleges here and abroad.

I shall be interested to see the result of your study if you have to present it in written form.

Sincerely,
[signed] Morton S. Enslin

---

2. King used the preceding three sentences, with minor adjustments, in his presentation. See King, "Crozer Quarterly," 12 December 1951, p. 93 in this volume.
Mrs. Heacock is still away from the office in consequence of the broken ankle she suffered last July; hence my letter is long hand. I hope that you can decipher it.
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"The Personalism of
J. M. E. McTaggart Under Criticism"

4 December 1951
[Boston, Mass.]

Writing for DeWolf's course on Personalism, King presents and criticizes the views of J. M. E. McTaggart, whose ideas King had contrasted with Edgar S. Brightman's six weeks earlier. King takes issue with McTaggart's atheism: "We shall also notice that many of McTaggart's arguments against an omnipotent God are far from adequate. Indeed, the reader gets the impression sometimes that McTaggart is simply indulging in logical tripping, that the discredited theistic doctrine is unworthy of serious consideration and may be caricatured to any extent." Throughout this paper King rejects many of McTaggart's views, concluding: "We have also seen that McTaggart is usually negative on the idea of freedom. For these and many other reasons, we have found it necessary to reject most of McTaggart's views. Any system which seeks to establish itself on the unreality of time seems to me rationally unsound and empirically unverifiable." DeWolf gave King an A for the paper and commented: "Excellent, incisive criticism. A superior paper."

Personalism is usually thought of as being theistic in nature. Indeed, the very word was used in the beginning as a general term descriptive of theism, by way of distinction from pantheism. This, however, must not lead one to assume that all Personalism has been theistic. While it is true that most Personalistic philosophies have remained true to their theistic origin, it is also true that there have been exceptions to