Report on the Cathedrals of England as bearing on the Plans for the Chapel of the University of Chicago.

By: Ernest D. Burton.

September 3rd, 1924.

I visited the following Cathedrals, Churches and Chapels in the following order, Liverpool, Coventry, Lichfield, Carlisle, Durham, York, Lincoln, Peterboro' and Ely Cathedrals, King's College, Cambridge, New College Oxford, the Church of St. Mary Redcliffe and the Cathedral in Bristol, Wells Cathedral, Glastonbury Abbey, Salisbury, Winchester, Chichester, Canterbury Cathedrals and St. Paul's and the Roman Catholic Westminster Cathedrals in London, and Westminster Abbey.

In London I also had an interview with Sir Giles Gilbert Scott, the architect of the Liverpool cathedral.

The point on which I chiefly wanted light was whether the very wide bays of Mr. Goodhue's plan - 40 ft. - were permissible. Secondary points were the height, location and design of the tower, the width and height of the Nave, the character of the roof, whether vaulted or timbered, the width and number of the lights of the windows.

Fortunately as respects the first point, the width of the bays, I visited the Liverpool cathedral first. When completed this building is to include a central space 210 ft. x 210 ft. exclusive of buttresses (itself to be surmounted by a high tower and to include four transepts one at each corner), a nave and a choir, each about 150 ft. long,
I attended the following workshops, seminars, and conferences in the fall:

- Workshop on "The Future of Technology in Education"
- Seminar on "Effective Teaching Strategies"
- Conference on "Innovations in Educational Technology"

In addition, I also participated in the following volunteer roles:

- Volunteer at the local library
- Tutoring at a local community center
- Mentorship program for at-risk youth

I also found the opportunity to work on the following projects:

- Development of a new educational app
- Creation of a multimedia presentation on educational technology
- Collaboration on a research project on educational trends

Furthermore, I participated in the following extracurricular activities:

- Member of the educational technology club
- Volunteer at a local school
- Organizer of a community workshop on educational technology

I look forward to continuing my professional growth and development in the field of education.
aisles on each side of nave and choir, a lady chapel at the north east and a Chapter House at the north west corner of the choir. Of this building there has been built the Lady Chapel, the choir and the N. E. and the S. E. transept of the central portion, and the Chapter House. It remains to build the remainder of the central portion, and the nave. What has been built was dedicated July 19th, 1924. A peculiarity of the building is that the nave and chancel are to be of the same dimensions. The choir being built shows what the nave will be. The bays being 40 ft., like Mr. Goodhue’s, and there being three of them in the nave in both buildings, furnished an opportunity to judge of the practicableness of bays of that width. Seeing the building convinced me that this width is not in itself impracticable, and did much to dissipate my doubts about our own plan. But as I visited other Cathedrals and found that the bays of most of them measured only 18 ft. x 22 ft. on centres, York, with its 32 ft. or 33 ft. being a marked exception, and criticized adversely on this point, my doubts revived.

I was particularly interested, therefore, to know what Sir Gilbert Scott would say on the point of the width of the bays. I showed him pictures of our buildings, to give him the setting, and the three simple sketches of our chapel that I had with me. He called my attention to certain marked differences between his plan and ours, in this very matter of the bays. In all the other cathedrals, and in our plan the outer (aisle) wall is lower than the inner (nave) wall, and there is a clerestory window above the aisle. In the Liverpool
Cathedral the outer wall is actually higher than the inner, the inner wall runs up into the roof and the outer wall ends in a parapet or balustrade considerably higher than the spring of the ceiling. The aisles occupy the lower part of the space between the outer and inner walls, the arches connecting nave and aisle start in the choir about 6 or 8 ft. above the floor and extend to the spring of the ceiling. In the nave they will doubtless begin at the floor line. The windows are in the outer wall opposite these arches. There is therefore no clerestory effect at all. Thus though the bays are of the same width as ours, the total construction is quite different. Another fact to be noted is that the Liverpool Cathedral is 116 ft. high inside as against the 80 ft. of ours.

Another important difference is that while in the Liverpool Cathedral there is but one arch between nave and aisle for each 40 ft. bay, in ours each 40 ft. bay is divided into two in the portion which is at the level of the aisles, making in fact six bays on this level, the wide bays pertaining only to the upper clerestory level. It is of course of this lower portion of the wall that usually we are chiefly thinking when we speak of 22 ft. bays, and in this sense it is not correct to speak of our Chapel as having three 40 ft. bays, but of six 20 ft. bays. Yet it is also true that in practically all English Cathedrals - I do not recall an exception - there are just as many bays above as below, and that, as pointed out above, with us the clerestory bays are really the significant feature of the building, and the
October 24, 1927

To: Mr. John Smith

Subject: Notice of Opening Party

Dear Mr. Smith,

I am writing to inform you about the opening party that will be held at our new location.

The event will take place on the evening of November 1st at 7:00 PM. We have planned a variety of activities and entertainment to make the occasion memorable.

Please mark your calendars and plan to attend. You will not want to miss this special occasion.

Sincerely,

[Your Name]
aisles do not give the keynote of scale.

With all these differences and other facts in mind, Sir Giles Gilbert Scott expressed the opinion, unqualifiedly and repeatedly, that in this feature of the plan the width of the bays, Mr. Goodhue's plan was entirely practicable and correct.

King's College Chapel Cambridge interested me particularly. I had seen it several times before but looked at it now with new interest. I had been observing that in practically all the Cathedrals the aisles, though as mentioned above always lower than the nave, were relatively high. As a result the side wall of the nave has first a row of high arches connecting nave and aisle, usually from six to twelve in number, then a triforium of varying height, and then the clerestory windows. These last are likewise of variable height, but sometimes very low and practically always much less in height than the arches leading into the aisle, and the aisle windows, and almost always the principal light of the nave comes from the high aisle windows. In King's College Chapel, on the other hand, there are internally no aisles, though externally the building seems to have low aisles. In fact the spaces between the wide buttresses have been enclosed and roofed over at only about 12' or 15' above the ground, making a series of rooms or chapels along each side, above which are the great windows of the chapel. There is no triforium and there are no arches between nave and aisle because no aisle. The bays are 24' on the centre and there are twelve of them. The whole building is 291 ft. long. Its inside width, 40 to 45 ft., and its height, 80 ft., are
nearly the same as those of our chapel.

In this respect the chapel is more like Mr. Goodhue's plan than any of the Cathedrals, the low narrow aisle in our plan taking the place of the long series of rooms or chapels between the buttresses in King's College Chapel. The beauty of King's College Chapel seems to show that this feature of the Goodhue plan, i.e. the low and narrow aisles, is justifiable. Of course King's College Chapel is quite unlike ours in that it has no transepts and no tower.

In fact the changes that would be necessary to convert King's College Chapel into our plan are rather less than those that would be required to convert any cathedral into it. Cut off three of the twelve bays, add a tower on one side of the seventh bay and a transept on the other end of it, leaving six for the nave and two for the choir, connect the little chapels into aisles and but for the width of the bays you have our chapel.

A second question about which I had become somewhat exercised was that of the transeptal tower. Mr. Goodhue told me that he had no precedent for it but was not disturbed by that fact. I was so satisfied with it myself, that in my tour of the Cathedrals I was not thinking about it, all the more as I supposed there were no examples to be seen. Later I began to think more about it, and then discovered that there were some examples of transeptal towers that I might have seen without much trouble. Fountains Abbey, not far from Lincoln, is said to have a tower on the north transept, though oddly
enough authorities differ and Scott doubts if it is transeptal. Photographs do not show decisively. Exeter Cathedral has two transeptal towers. I omitted both of these because to include them would have added too much both to a day's travel and to a day's seeing. These are probably the only old buildings with transeptal towers. Muirhead's guide says that Exeter is the only example though it also says that Fountain's Abbey has such a tower.

There are, however, several modern instances. The Church at Ottery St. Mary, near Exeter, has imitated Exeter in this respect. The recent additions to Downside Abbey, near Bath, which were begun in 1902, include a tower attached to the south transept. The last is well illustrated in Nicholson & Spooner's, Recent English Ecclesiastical Architecture, p. 52. This work also shows several other instances but none of special importance. See pp. 81, 107, 129.

Of more significance than these examples, none of which I am sorry to say I have seen, but of most of which I have photographic reproductions, is the opinion of Scott. He expressed the opinion very positively that in this respect Goodhue's plan was quite satisfactory.

Of the examples that of Downside is most interesting if one may judge from the view in Nicholson & Spooner.

Of the other features of our plan Scott said:

(a) that in his judgment the "lights" in the windows of the nave were on too large a scale. He advised three lights, aggregating in width that of the two shown on the plan I had with me. It will be recalled that Mr. Goodhue's associates had already recommended three lights,
but also some diminution of the wall space at the side of the windows. This Scott did not think desirable.

(b) that there should be some ornamentations above the windows.

(c) that the east window is too ornate.

(d) that the ceiling as shown in the sketch I had, suggesting mosaic, was not Gothic. He wanted plain stone.

(e) that the tower might have turrets.

On these points and on some others the plans of the Liverpool Cathedral are well worthy of study, though perhaps not always confirming what Scott said.

On other matters not specially discussed with Scott, my own observation of the Cathedrals confirms my own feeling on the following points:

(a) that the height of the nave, 80 ft., is excellent. It should not be lower, it need not be higher.

(b) that the width, 42 ft., is good.

(c) that the low and narrow aisle is an admirable feature of the Goodhue plan.

(d) that a vaulted ceiling is preferable to any wood ceiling I have seen in England.

I have not had very great success in the study of "halls" in England. At Coventry I visited the well-known St. Mary's Hall, built for the Trinity Guild between 1294 and 1414. The proportions are good, and the timbered ceiling attractive. But it is too small to be
of any special service to us.

The Royal Gallery in the House of Lords is a finely proportioned room and has a fine timbered ceiling. But it also is too small to afford us any guidance.

King’s College Chapel at Cambridge is really a hall, in the sense that it is a rectangular room, without transept or apse. But it is too long for a single audience room - 291 feet, and in fact is divided into two rooms by the screen and organ.

St. Mary’s Chapel at Eton College is another chapel that is almost a hall. It consists of two rooms, the main chapel, 46 x 150 ft. and about 75 ft. high, and the ante-chapel which is about 30 x 60 ft., and is in effect a transept at the west end. The organ nearly fills the arch which connects the two. The main chapel is a finely proportioned room having eight bays on each side, each 18 ft. on centres. The windows are high above the floor occupying practically the upper half of the wall space. In this respect it is like Hutchinson Commons. It has a beautiful timbered ceiling, with wood arches between the bays not coming down low on the wall. The ante-chapel is even more attractive than the main chapel, having similar ceiling and three windows on the west (60 ft.) side or end. The ground area of this chapel is about 60 per cent. of our proposed chapel without allowance for galleries and not counting the aisles of our chapel. Enlarged to hold 2000 people it would be very different from what it now is.
of any experience to me.

The Royal Albert Hall is the home of Tchaikovsky's Piano Concerto No. 1, which is also in G major and

written in C sharp minor.

Knyaz's College opened in Cambridge is really a part in the sense that it is a constituent college without any degree or

degree on its own. It is one of the smaller constituent colleges - 500 students and in fact I

visited its two rooms of the common and 

refectory. A lot of Opus of Knyaz College are written opera and

score a part. It consists of two rooms, the main apartment is 7 x 100

and a part of 7 x 60. The main apartment in the middle is a large

lecture room and in the middle of the main apartment, the main apartment is a library

for materials, music, painting, etc. the room in which the paintings are

window are high above the floor running horizontally

give a real feel of the wall space. In this lecture it is like a holocaust

and the main room. It was a partially successful effort with much colour

between the places. Now the main apartment is divided into smaller

sections, one on the top floor (6th floor) and another on the ground floor.

Now the second floor is empty and can rent or can be bought outright.

Information about the college and its operations can be found at:
I have visited Westminster Hall in the Houses of Parliament. It is 280 ft. long, 68 ft. wide, 92 ft. high (cf. King's College Chapel 290 x 45 x 80 ft.), but gives the impression of being much lower, and is far less impressive. The reasons, I judge, are (a) the greater width which diminishes the sense of height; (b) the fact that the ceiling is composed of such very deep arches, which extend far down the side walls, with the result that a large part of the upper part of the room is lost in the darkness of the deep and narrow recesses between the arches; (c) the windows are high up in the walls, and admit very little light and are in themselves far less beautiful than those of King's College Chapel, which is of the same length and both higher and wider. So marked is the difference that I almost doubt the correctness of the figure 92 which Huirhead gives for the height.

My own inclination is to say:

(a) A hall would not serve our purpose. If large enough to hold 2000 people on one rectangular floor it would be either too long to hear or see, or too wide to be beautiful. If we start with a hall, we had better add transepts, aisles, galleries and towers, in order to bring more people within reasonable distance of the speaker.

(b) The Goodhue plan is practicable and good in all its essential features and dimensions, and it would be unwise to abandon it.

(c) It calls for further study in reference to the nave windows and
the space above them on the outside, the North window, the ceiling, the tower, with a view to making it more aspirational, less brusque.

(d) The South front should not be too ornate, as the West fronts of practically all the old English Cathedrals in my judgment are, and should not be overburdened with human figures. Winchester is the simplest of all that I saw and the best, Canterbury perhaps next to this in simplicity and next best.

(e) A wood ceiling is impracticable with 40 ft. bays, and cannot be considered without a total abandonment of the Goodhue plan.

Incidentally, it was interesting to note that Sir Giles Gilbert Scott, after having given his opinion on the Chapel, made some frank comments on our existing buildings, and without knowing who did any of them praised all of Coolidge's buildings, especially Harper, and sharply criticized all of Cobb’s.
Report on the Cathedrals of England as bearing on the
Plans for the Chapel of the University of Chicago.
By: Ernest D. Burton.
September 3rd, 1924.

I visited the following Cathedrals, Churches and
Chapels in the following order, Liverpool, Coventry,
Lichfield, Carlisle, Durham, York, Lincoln, Peterboro'
and Ely Cathedrals, Kings College, Cambridge, New College
Oxford, the Church of St. Mary Redcliffe and the Cathedral
in Bristol, Wells Cathedral, Glastonbury Abbey, Salisbury,
Winchester, Chichester, Canterbury Cathedrals and St. Paul's
and the Roman Catholic Westminster Cathedrals in London, and
Westminster Abbey.

In London I also had an interview with Sir Giles
Gilbert Scott, the architect of the Liverpool cathedral.

The point on which I chiefly wanted light was
whether the very wide bays of Mr. Goodhue's plan - 40 ft. -
were permissible. Secondary points were the height, location
and design of the tower, the width and height of the Nave,
the character of the roof, whether vaulted or timbered, the
width and number of the lights of the windows.

Fortunately as respects the first point, the width
of the bays, I visited the Liverpool cathedral first.
Report on the Graftonite of Midland as Resuming by the

Plan for the Graftonite at the University of Chicago

The Square D. Rector

September 29th, 1932.

I address the following Graftonite to the

Graffonite at the following agents: Myerfoot, Company

Minneapolis, Coney, College, Company, New College

Oxford, the Group of, Wm. Hagen, Company, Company, and the Graftonite

Minneapolis, Coney, Company, Company, Graftonite Company, in Toronto, and

the House Graftonite, Minneapolis, Company, in Kansas City.

In Kansas I also pay an inspection with the others.

Graftonite appoints the Secretary of the Minneapolis, Company

The point on which I strictly make this note

acquire the work upon which we in 1930, Company, being - 80 & 4.

were paramount. Secrecy and presence move the public. Location

any section of the group and make any other of the group,

the Graftonite of the 1930, separate identity of Minneapolis, and

match any number of the figure of the Minneapolis.

Annex to the Annexes of the plan, the Graftonite.

At the page I address the Minneapolis, Company.
When completed this building is to include a central space 210 ft. x 210 ft. exclusive of buttresses, (itself to be surmounted by a high tower and to include four transepts one at each corner), a nave and a choir, each about 150 ft. long, aisles on each side of nave and choir, a lady chapel at the north east and a Chapter House at the north west corner of the choir. Of this building there has been built the Lady Chapel, the choir and the N.E. and the S.E. transept of the central portion, and the Chapter House. It remains to build the remainder of the central portion, and the nave. What has been built was dedicated, July 19th 1924. A peculiarity of the building is that the nave and chancel are to be of the same dimensions. The choir being built shows what the nave will be. The bays being 40 ft., like Mr. Goodhue's, and there being three of them in the nave in both buildings, furnished an opportunity to judge of the practicability of bays of that width. Seeing the building convinced me that this width is not in itself impracticable, and did much to dissipate my doubts about our own plan. But as I visited other Cathedrals and found that the bays of most of them measured only 18 ft. \( \frac{1}{2} \) 22 ft. on centres, York, with its 32 ft or 33 ft. being a marked exception, and criticized adversely on this point, my doubts revived.

I was particularly interested, therefore, to know what Sir Gilbert Scott would say on the point of the width of
the bays. I showed him pictures of our building, to give him the setting, and the three simple sketches of our chapel that I had with me. He called my attention to certain marked differences between his plan and ours, in this very matter of the bays. In all the other cathedrals, and in our plan the outer (aisle) wall is lower than the inner (nave) wall, and there is a clerestory window above the aisle. In the Liverpool Cathedral the outer wall is actually higher than the inner, the inner wall runs up into the roof and the outer wall ends in a parapet or balustrade considerably higher than the spring of the ceiling. The aisles occupy the lower part of the space between the outer and inner walls, the arches connecting nave and aisle starting the choir about 6 or 8 ft. above the floor and extend to the spring of the ceiling. In the nave they will doubtless begin at the floor line. The windows are in the outer wall opposite these arches. There is therefore no clerestory effect at all. Thus though the bays are of the same width as ours, the total construction is quite different. Another fact to be noted is that the Liverpool Cathedral is 116 ft. high inside as against the 80 ft. of ours.

Another important difference is that while in the Liverpool Cathedral there is but one arch between nave and aisle for each 40 ft. bay, in ours each 40 ft. bay is divided into two in the portion which is at the level of the aisles, making in fact six bays on this level, the wide bays per-
taining only to the upper clear-story level. It is of course of this lower portion of the wall that usually we are chiefly thinking when we speak of 22 ft. bays, and in this sense it is not correct to speak of our Chapel as having three 40 ft. bays, but of six 20 ft. bays. Yet it is also true that in practically all English Cathedrals - I do not recall an exception - there are just as many bays above as below. and that, as pointed out above, with us the clear-story bays are really the significant feature of the building, and the aisles do not give the keynote of scale.

With all these differences and other facts in mind, Sir Giles Gilbert Scott expressed the opinion, unqualifiedly and repeatedly, that in this feature of the plan the width of the bays, Mr. Goodhue's plan was entirely practicable and correct.

King's College Chapel Cambridge interested me particularly. I had seen it several times before, but looked at it now with new interest. I had been observing that in practically all the Cathedrals the aisles, though as mentioned above always lower than the nave, were relatively high. As a result the side wall of the nave has first a row of high arches connecting nave and aisle, usually from six to twelve in number, then a triforium of varying height, and then the clear-story windows. These last are likewise of variable height, but sometimes very low and practically always much less in height than the arches leading into the aisle, and the aisle windows, and almost always
The text on the page is not legible due to the quality of the image. It appears to be a page from a book or a document, but the content cannot be accurately transcribed.
the principal light of the nave comes from the high aisle windows. In King's College Chapel on the other hand there are internally no aisles, though externally the building seems to have low aisles. In fact the spaces between the wide buttresses have been enclosed and roofed over at only about 12' or 15' above the ground, making a series of rooms or chapels along each side, above which are the great windows of the chapel. There is no triforium and there are no arches between nave and aisle because no aisle. The bays are 24' on the centre and there are twelve of them. The whole building is 291ft. long. Its inside width, 40ft., and its height 80ft. are nearly the same as those of our chapel.

In this respect the chapel is more like Mr. Goodhue's plan than are any of the Cathedrals. the low narrow aisle in our plan taking the place of the long series of rooms or chapels between the buttresses in King's College Chapel. The beauty of King's College Chapel seems to show that this feature of the Goodhue plan, i.e. the low and narrow aisles, is justifiable. Of course King's College Chapel is quite unlike ours in that it has no transepts and no tower.

In fact the changes that would be necessary to convert King's College Chapel into our plan are rather less than those that would be required to convert any cathedral into it. Cut off three of the twelve bays, add a tower on one side of the seventh bay and a transept on the other end of it, leaving
six for the nave and two for the choir, connect the little chapels into aisles and but for the width of the bays you have our chapel.

A second question about which I had become somewhat exercised was that of the transeptal tower. Mr. Goodhue told me that he had no precedent for it but was not disturbed by that fact. I was so satisfied with it myself, that in my tour of the Cathedrals I was not thinking about it, all the more as I supposed there were no examples to be seen. Later I began to think more about it, and then discovered that there were some examples of transeptal towers that I might have seen without much trouble. Fountains Abbey, not far from Lincoln, is said to have a tower on the north transept, though oddly enough authorities differ and Scott doubts if it is transeptal. Photographs do not show decisively. Exeter Cathedral has two transeptal towers. I omitted both of these because to include them would have added too much both to a day's travel and to a day's seeing. These are probably the only old buildings with transeptal towers. Muirhead's guide says that Exeter is the only example though it also says that Fountain's Abbey has such a tower.

There are, however, several modern instances. The Church at Ottery St. Mary; near Exeter has imitated Exeter in this respect. The recent additions to Downside Abbey, near Bath, which were begun in 1902, include a tower attached
A recent decision made by the board has caused some controversy.

The decision was made on the basis of the fact that it will...

I was not satisfied with the result. I think it is not fair...

One of the board members made a strong argument to explain his view.

I suppose there were no examples to be seen. I have...

I am not sure what the board meant by it. I think we should...

I would like to have a copy of the board minutes to consult.

I suppose the situation reflects some sort of...

I believe the board has made a serious error in judgment.

I believe the property is only for private

I propose a motion. I move the property be...

There are power issues. Recent modern technology...

Costs of office it may be well

In this respect, the recent situation of company shares...

near the end, which made a strong...

so, and we refer
to the south transept. The last is well illustrated in Nicholson & Spooner's, *Recent English Ecclesiastical Architecture*, p.52. This work also shows several other instances but none of special importance. See pp.61, 107, 129.

Of more significance than these examples, none of which I am sorry to say I have seen, but of most of which I have photographic reproductions, is the opinion of Scott. He expressed the opinion very positively that in this respect Goodhue's plan was quite satisfactory. Of the examples that of Downside is most interesting judging from the view in Nicholson & Spooner.

Of the other features of our plan Scott said:

(a) that in his judgment the "lights" in the windows of the nave were on too large a scale. He advised three lights, aggregating in width that of the two shown on the plan I had with me. It will be recalled that Mr. Goodhue's associates had already recommended three lights, but also some diminution of the wall space at the side of the windows. This Scott did not think desirable.

(b) that there should be some ornamentations above the windows

(c) that the east window is too ornate

(d) that the ceiling as shown in the sketch I had, suggesting mosaic, was not Gothic. He wanted plain stone.

(e) that the tower might have turrets.

On these points and on some others the plans of the Liverpool Cathedral are well worthy of study, though perhaps not always confirming what Scott said.
The fact is well illustrated in

the following passage:

"In all work there are errors, mistakes, and occasional defects. That is why we have to learn to accept them."

We must not become discouraged or lose our patience. The problem is to keep improving. To do this, we must be prepared to make mistakes and learn from them.

We express our appreciation very politely and respectfully.

To the examples of outstanding teachers I refer:

(a) They know exactly what they are doing.
(b) They are firm in their decisions.
(c) They are not afraid to make mistakes.
(d) They are patient and understanding.
(e) They are able to adapt to different situations.

On these points and on some others the blame of

the failure to prepare scientifically rests.

Please note the mistakes contained in your report.
On other matters not specially discussed with Scott, my own observation of the Cathedrals confirms my own feeling on the following points:
(a) that the height of the nave, 80 ft., is excellent. It should not be lower, it need not be higher.
(b) that the width, 42 ft., is good.
(c) that the low and narrow aisle is an admirable feature of the Goodhue plan.
(d) that a vaulted ceiling is preferable to any wood ceiling I have seen in England.

I have not had very great success in the study of "halls" in England. At Coventry I visited the well-known St. Mary's Hall, built for the Trinity Guild between 1394 and 1414. The proportions are good, and the timbered ceiling attractive. But it is too small to be of any special service to us.

The Royal Gallery in the House of Lords is a finely proportioned room and has a fine timbered ceiling. But it also is too small to afford us any guidance.

Kings College Chapel at Cambridge is really a hall, in the sense that it is a rectangular room, without transept or apse. But it is too long for a single audience room - 291 feet, and in fact is divided into two rooms by the screen and organ.

St. Mary's Chapel at Eton College is another chapel that is almost a hall. It consists of two rooms, the main
ON OTHER MATTERS NOT SPECIFICALLY TREATED WITH

Letter re my own appearance at the Cappelle conference; my
feeling on the following points:
(a) Are you at the airport or the train? Go IC as excellent.
(b) Pumpa not go lower. It mean not to higher.
(c) Short the watch at IC to begin
(d) Stop the flow and warn to be in remarkable tempests at
the Goonape plan
(e) Short a variety calling to participate to any more calling
I have seen in England.
I have not had very great success in the search of
"Pitt in England" & Country I already the well-known.

ST. Mary's Hall isn't for the Trinity Gate between 1846 and 1914. The proportionate size blog and the proportionate address. If it is you want to do at any specific concert to be.

The forty gallery in the home of London in a library.

1000 7th Avenue and 2nd floor. Proportionate room and pace live. Proportionate room.

And so I'm sorry to attend an any entrance.

The College Chapel of Cambridge in hefty a part.
In the sense that it is a teaching room. Mark of change.
So steep. But if you look for a single exhibition room -
but keep and in your to arriving into two room of the screen.

Here's a copy of how College in another appeal

That is where a part. It screen of two room, the main
chapel, 46 x 150 ft. and about 75 ft. high, and the ante-chapel which is about 30 x 60 ft., and is in effect a transept at the west end. The organ nearly fills the arch which connects the two. The main chapel is a finely proportioned room having eight bays on each side, each 18 ft. on centres. The windows are high above the floor occupying practically the upper half of the wall space. In this respect like Hutchinson Commons. It has a beautiful timbered ceiling, with wood arches between the bays not coming down low on the wall. The ante-chapel is even more attractive than the main chapel, having similar ceiling and three windows on the west (60 ft.) side or end. The ground area of this chapel is about 60% of our proposed chapel without allowance for galleries and not counting the aisles of our chapel. Enlarged to hold 2000 people it would be very different from what it now is.

I have visited Westminster Hall in the Houses of Parliament. It is 290 ft. long, 68 ft. wide, 92 ft. high, (Cf. King’s College Chapel 290 x 45 x 80 ft) but gives the impression of being much lower, and is far less impressive. The reasons, I judge are (a) the greater width which diminishes the sense of height; (b) the fact that the ceiling is composed of such very deep arches, which extend far down the side walls, with the result that a large part of the upper part of the room is lost in the darkness of the deep and narrow recesses between the arches; (c) the windows are high
up in the walls, and admit very little light and are in themselves far less beautiful than those of King's College chapel, which is of the same length and both higher and wider. So marked is the difference that I almost doubt the correctness of the figure 92 which Muirhead gives for the height.
To the President of Kansas State College,

I am writing to express my concern regarding the recent increase in violence and social unrest on campus. It appears that some students are engaging in activities that are not only dangerous but also detrimental to the academic environment.

I urge you to take immediate action to address these issues and ensure the safety and well-being of all students. It is crucial that we work together to maintain a respectful and safe atmosphere for learning.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
My own inclination is to say:

(a) A hall would not serve our purpose. If large enough to hold 2000 people on one rectangular floor it would be either too long to hear or see or too wide to be beautiful. If we start with a hall, we had better add transepts, aisles, galleries and towers, in order to bring more people within reasonable distance of the speaker.

(b) The Goodhue plan is practicable and good in all its essential features and dimensions, and it would be unwise to abandon it.

(c) It calls for further study in reference to the nave windows and the space above them on the outside, the North window, the ceiling, the tower, with a view to making it more aspirational, less brusque.

(d) That the South front should not be too ornate, as the west fronts of practically all the old English Cathedrals in my judgment are, and should not be overburdened with human figures. Winchester is the simplest of all that I saw and the best, Canterbury perhaps next to this in simplicity and next best.

(e) A wood ceiling is unpracticable with 40 ft. bays, and cannot be considered without a total abandonment of the Goodhue plan.

Incidentally, it was interesting to note that Sir Giles Gilbert Scott, after having given his opinion on
the Chapel made some frank comments on our existing buildings, and without knowing who did any of them praised all of Coolidge's buildings, especially Harper, and sharply criticized all of Cobb's.
The Captain made some frantic comments on the situation afterwards.

Any attempt to remove any of our own personnel and supplies appeared futile. Unfortunately, especially Exper, any supplies available at Cape...
October 15, 1924

My dear Mr. Rockefeller:

You will doubtless recall that when your honored father wrote his letter of December 13, 1910, in which he expressed his desire that at least the sum of one million five hundred thousand dollars should be used for the erection and furnishing of a University Chapel, he also requested that before their final adoption the plans should be submitted to you.

In fulfillment of this request I am writing to inquire whether it would be possible for you to allow me to lay before you at an early day the plans for the Chapel in their latest revision. I am coming East to attend a meeting of the Institute of Social and Religious Research on the 24th and 25th of this month. I shall be free Saturday afternoon, the 25th, or Sunday morning, the 26th. I could remain over till Monday, the 27th, but would prefer to leave not later than the Century Tuesday, Sunday.

Soon after assuming the responsibilities of my present office, I had a conference with Mr. Ryerson, and at his suggestion got in touch with Mr. Goodhue. As a result of a series of conferences Mr. Goodhue revised the plans which he had previously submitted to the Board of Trustees. This revision was undertaken primarily for the purpose of reducing the cost of the building from the former estimate of about $2,350,000 to a figure more nearly in accordance with the figures named in your father's letter.

Greatly to our gratification Mr. Goodhue found it possible without modifying the plan in its characteristic features to make changes in the plan which materially reduced the cost of the building. The revised plans were substantially completed before Mr. Goodhue's sudden death.

Since Mr. Goodhue's death we have had a number of conferences with Mr. Goodhue's Associates and I have spent some weeks in England partly on vacation for a rest but partly also by visiting the cathedrals of England to assure myself of somewhat better basis of judgment on such matters.

In some points on which I was somewhat in doubt,

In England I had an opportunity of consultation with Sir Gilbert Scott, the architect of the Liverpool Cathedral 1
October 16, 1944

My dear Mr. Rockefeller,

Thank you for your letter of December 16, 1940, in which you ask me to report on my work at the U.S. Department of the Interior. I am happy to do so.

I am in the process of writing a report on the current status of American energy resources. The report will be submitted to you in the near future. I am confident that it will be of interest to you and to your associates.

I have been working closely with Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Harriman on the preparation of this report. We have had many discussions and have made progress in the development of the necessary data.

I am certain that the report will be of great value to you and to your associates. It will provide valuable information on the current status of American energy resources.

I am confident that you will find the report useful. I will be happy to discuss it with you at any time.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[Handwritten note on the top left corner: "F.8"]
which, as you probably know, has been in the process of erection for twenty years and requires some fifteen years more to complete. Such portion of it as is completed was dedicated this summer and the architect knighted for his work on it. I was interested to get the judgment of Sir Gilbert who is, I think, recognized as the leading Gothic architect of England today. I am gratified to have him express entire approval of the plans in their essential features. On some matters of detail on which we ourselves have had some doubt and on which Mr. Goodhue's associates think that his mind was still open Sir Gilbert expressed opinions which I think will be of use to us in the final work on the drawings.

If I have the opportunity of seeing you the plans I shall lay before you will represent Mr. Goodhue's final judgment in all essential points, confirmed also by that of Sir Gilbert Scott, and in details the latest thoughts which Mr. Goodhue's Associates have matured. On these latter matters some further study may still be necessary.

It would serve my convenience if you could let me know by wire whether I could see you on Saturday afternoon or Sunday morning before church.

EDG

Mr. John D. Rockefeller
26 Broadway
New York, New York
Mr. John O. Rockefeller
52 Broadway
New York, New York

Dear Mr. Rockefeller,

I hope this message finds you well. I am pleased to inform you that I have completed some important tasks related to your assignments. The progress report is attached for your reference.

I have arranged for the delivery of the materials you requested. Please let me know if there are any other items needed.

I look forward to discussing the next steps in our meeting.

Best regards,

[Your Name]
The University of Chicago

The Board of Trustees

26 Broadway, New York,
December 13, 1910.

To the President and Trustees of the University of
Chicago,
Chicago, Illinois.

Dear Sirs:

Referring to my letter of gift of even date, I set down here more specifically my wishes regarding the fund therein contributed.

Pending the delivery of the securities, the General Education Board is to have the right from time to time to change the investments, using the same care and having the same discretion as in the case of its own securities. As nearly as is practicable, the deliveries each year are to be made from the various classes of securities in the ratio which the securities of each class bear to the total.

It is my desire that at least the sum of One Million Five Hundred Thousand Dollars ($1,500,000) be used for the erection and furnishing of a University Chapel. As the spirit of religion should penetrate and control the University, so that building which represents religion ought to be the central and dominant feature of the University group. The Chapel may appropriately embody those architectural ideals from which the other buildings, now so beautifully harmonious, have taken their spirit, so that all the other buildings on the campus will seem to have caught their inspiration from the Chapel and in turn will seem to be contributing of their worthiest to the Chapel. In this way the group of University building, with the Chapel centrally located and dominant in its architecture, may proclaim that the University in its ideal, is dominated by the spirit of religion, all its departments are inspired by the religious feeling, and all its work is directed to the highest ends.
December 17, 1919

To the President and Trustees of the University of
Chicago, Chicago, Illinois:

Dear Sirs:

Relative to the matter of wide publicity of the decision of this Board of Trustees, I have written to several newspapers of the city to make known the action of the Board, and have written a letter to the Chicago Daily News to make known the action of the Board. I have also written to the Chicago Tribune to make known the action of the Board.

The Board of Trustees of the University of Chicago are in the process of making a decision on the matter of the foreign policy of the University. The decision will be made known to the public at a later date.

The Board of Trustees of the University of Chicago are in the process of making a decision on the matter of the foreign policy of the University. The decision will be made known to the public at a later date.

The Board of Trustees of the University of Chicago are in the process of making a decision on the matter of the foreign policy of the University. The decision will be made known to the public at a later date.

The Board of Trustees of the University of Chicago are in the process of making a decision on the matter of the foreign policy of the University. The decision will be made known to the public at a later date.

The Board of Trustees of the University of Chicago are in the process of making a decision on the matter of the foreign policy of the University. The decision will be made known to the public at a later date.
Copy of Mr. Rockefeller's letter
dated December 13, 1910 - #2.

Whether the Chapel can be so planned as to admit of housing the Young Men's Christian Association and all the distinctively religious functions of the University, or whether this will require a separate building, is a matter which can best be decided in connection with the plans of the architects. I will ask you kindly to submit the plans before their final adoption to my son, who will be fully informed regarding my wishes.

Apart from what may be required for the Chapel, the remainder of the fund may be used, in the discretion of the Trustees, for land, buildings or endowment, but no part of the principal sum shall be used for current expenses. No doubt other donors will offer the University many if not all of its needed buildings. Legacies now written in wills, or to be written, will become available from time to time for these and other purposes. I hope, therefore, that this final gift from me may be used for endowment as far as practicable.

Any changes which the future may make advisable in the disposition of these funds may be made by mutual consent. For such purpose I now appoint my son as my representative, and in case of my own death and of his death, he is to be succeeded by my executors.

Very truly yours,

(Signed) John D. Rockefeller.
Westport, the Charter can be opened to intimate; and it

will promote the Young Men's Christian Association and it's

objectives. Would you tell your friends to write to me for

information about this movement? I will try to have you supply

me with the name and address of any young who might

be likely interested in joining the movement.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

[Date]
President E. D. Burton  
The University of Chicago  

My dear President Burton:

I am enclosing for your information a letter from Mr. F. H. Griswold respecting plans for the organ in the new chapel. You may be interested in his suggestions.

Yours very truly,

TREVOR ARNETT  

By G. O. Fairweather

GOF: HH
The University of Chicago

Office of the Vice-President and Secretary-Manager

October 1st

To Dr. D. H. Potter

President of the University of Chicago

My dear President Potter:

I am filling in for your information a letter from Mr. A. H. Alworth regarding personnel plans for the coming academic year. You may be interested in the name of a recent graduate who

Yours very truly,

Trevor H. Elliott

By G. O. Marshall

[Handwritten note at the bottom]
(COPY)

Shreveport, La.

Henry Pilcher's Sons,
Louisville, Ky.

Dear Messrs. Pilcher:-

I want to congratulate you upon the splendid organ which you have just placed here in the Scottish Rite Cathedral, upon which I have had the honor of playing four inaugural recitals.

The Console is a veritable work of art, and the specification a most admirable one. The workmanship throughout is of the highest class, and the voicing of the various stops is of such a high and finished character that it places the organ in the very front rank in this country.

In placing the various sections of this great four manual instrument, you have overcome and surmounted the most formidable obstacles in a masterly manner, and I offer you my sincere congratulations.

The emphatic success of the undertaking is such that you may justly feel exceedingly proud, and I hope to have the pleasure of presiding at many more of your superb instruments.

Yours Most Sincerely,

CLARENCE EDDY

Concert Organist
Chicago, Ill.
Dear Colonel Campbell,

I want to congratulate you upon the opportunity which you have afforded me to have the honor of bringing you into the Service of the United States Army.

I have been employed in the practice of law for a number of years, and have always been interested in the military life. I feel that I can contribute much to the Army in the capacity of a legal officer, and am most anxious to serve in any capacity in which I may be of service.

I am at present engaged in the study of military law, and am well versed in the principles and practices of the Army. I believe that I can do much to help make the Army a more efficient and well-organized force.

I am willing to serve in any capacity, and would be most grateful for the opportunity to do so. I am confident that I can contribute much to the success of the Army.

I look forward to the opportunity of serving my country in this capacity, and I hope that I may be of service to you.

Yours truly,

[Signature]

[Name]
The House of Pilcher

Established 1820
Esse Quam Videri
Pipe Organs
Louisville, KY.

Henry Pilcher's Sons
In foreign lands, where it is a matter of pride that a business descends from one generation to another in the same family, there are many establishments which were founded generations ago by the forefathers of the proprietors; but in this country it is often different, for the successful business usually passes from the personal control of the founder into the hands of a stock company, or some similar commercial combination, the personal element becoming entirely eliminated. In the case of The House of Pilcher, however, the members of the firm are organ builders by natural genius and choice as well as by lifelong experience.

Henry Pilcher began his business career as an organ builder in 1820 in England; and established a factory in this country in 1832.

Henry Pilcher, the second, began his business career associated with his father in 1856.

Henry Pilcher's Sons
Robert E. Pilcher, William E. Pilcher
Sons of Henry Pilcher, the second
The King of Instruments

If the pipe organ is the greatest of musical instruments—"the King"—it is also the most delicate, the most complicated and to the uninitiated, at least, the most mysterious. Where is the person who gazing upon the golden pipes and listening to their sonorous sounds has not been led to marvel at it all? That the uninitiated wonder at the pipe organ, however, is not strange. The pipes, the stops, the air chests, the valves, all have secrets which are revealed only to the careful student of organ construction. He learns that pipes to give pure, rich tone, must be made of selected materials and then carefully voiced. He learns that the mere number of stops is no indication of an organ's resources of tone—that a comparatively small instrument is often better than a much larger one. Air supply he discovers should be based on careful mathematical calculation; also that carelessly made parts will negative all the virtues of an otherwise good organ.
Selection of the Builder

Such vital points as are named on the preceding page, and there are many more, warn the prospective organ buyer that, in lieu of technical familiarity with organs, he would better rely on his investigations of organ builders.

The buying of an organ cannot with safety be decided on the basis of competition or comparison of builder's specifications. A physician is not summoned because he quotes a certain fee, promises to make so many visits and administer so much medicine. A painter is not commissioned to execute a landscape on the basis of yards of canvas, variety of colors and pounds of pigment.

And to the organ builder a contract should not be awarded in consideration of so many pipes, stops, manuals and feet of casing. These things are the externals.

It is the men, their brains, character and achievements, that should decide the retention of their services.

Henry Pilcher's Sons

Four grandsons of the founder of THE HOUSE OF PILCHER are at the head of various departments of this establishment and they bring to their work the skill that comes from long and successful experience in organ building, coupled with a knowledge of the best attainments of the profession in this country and Europe.

Two members of the fourth generation have also become actively associated with the firm, after receiving thorough musical and technical educations.

Although the Pilcher name has been associated with the manufacture of high grade pipe organs for more than a century, their organs do not depend upon tradition for reputation. That they were splendid instruments many years ago by no means guarantees their merits today. Therefore the fact is emphasized that every organ now manufactured by THE HOUSE OF PILCHER is a superior instrument measured by present standards.
The Pilcher Pipe Organ is Essentially an Organ of Today

The past decade has been one in which art and industry have made marvelous strides, and THE HOUSE OF PILCHER has kept fully abreast with the times. Every organ constructed by them embodies not only the experience of more than one hundred years of pipe organ building, extending through three, and into the fourth generation of the same family, but the very best ideas of the twentieth century as well.

In the construction of the Pilcher Organ every improvement of practical value has been incorporated, and many original features are introduced. The organist finds it a revelation of convenience and simplicity—a masterpiece of the organ builder’s skill, and a good representation of the stage to which the art has attained.

Characteristics of the Pilcher Organ

The extreme simplicity of the Pilcher Organ in construction and action is a point which cannot be too strongly emphasized. This feature explains the ease of management and quickness of response that is an agreeable surprise to the organist not familiar with its capabilities.

Every unnecessary detail is eliminated, and at the same time many valuable features are introduced which gives the organist practically unlimited resources. Coupled with the beautiful tone-quality, this makes possible the many unusual, as well as very pleasing effects, for which the Pilcher Organ is noted.

You now have an idea of the possibilities of the Pilcher Organ from the viewpoint of the organist, now what do purchasers think? Are they pleased? Are they satisfied?

Hundreds of enthusiastic letters have been received from purchasers. Noted men in every part of the land speak in praise of it and speak from intimate association. Copies of letters expressive of the very great satisfaction of owners and users of the Pilcher Organ will be sent upon request.
Is it not evident that satisfaction must spring from a definite cause? When those who pay the bills do so willingly, and at the same time write letters of hearty appreciation, is it not logical to suppose that there is a reason for their unsolicited praise?

What is the reason?
The building of a Pilcher Organ is more than a transaction of dollars and cents.

Here is a pipe organ that excels in tone-quality, that is remarkable for its durability and simplicity; resulting in a minimum expenditure for repairs; an organ that makes possible the most delightful musical effects.

Its refinement of finish makes it a thing of artistic beauty, and close attention to every detail of material and workmanship gives it those staying powers which explain why a Pilcher Organ, built many years ago, is in good and useful condition today.

Each individual organ is built upon honor. Every organ built is constructed with as much care as if the reputation of the HOUSE OF PILCHER was to rest upon the excellence of that particular instrument. Therefore the most inexperienced may safely purchase a Pilcher Organ on reputation, confident that the highest standard of excellence will be maintained.

Specifications

We publish a booklet containing a few standard organ specifications arranged for churches, lodges, theatres and auditoriums, which we will be pleased to mail upon request.

Illustrations

The pictures shown on the following pages are of organs, prominent in their respective localities, showing various designs and in harmony with their surroundings.
Three Manual Electric Organ, Detached Console, St. Paul's Episcopal Church, Louisville, Ky.

Three Manual Organ in Fourth Avenue Methodist Church, Louisville, Ky.
Four Manual Electric Organ in First Presbyterian Church, Atlanta, Ga. This organ also includes Echo and Sustainer Divisions.
Chamber Organ in a Columbus, Ohio, Residence

Organ in First Baptist Church, Jacksonville, Fla.
Three Manual and Echo Electric Organ in First Church of Christ Scientist, Athens, Ga.

Diploma of Highest Award given to the Pilcher Organ, World's Columbian Exposition, Chicago, Ills.
October 17, 1924.

President E. D. Burton,
Faculty Exchange.

Dear President Burton:

I notice a tendency to refer to the University chapel as the Rockefeller Chapel. There has been no action which even suggests any such name. If it is the wish of the Board of Trustees that the chapel should be so named, I am wondering if some action ought not to be taken upon your initiative. It would be unfortunate, would it not, to get into the minds of people that the new chapel is to be a memorial to Mr. Rockefeller and then eventually simply to call it the University Chapel. On the other hand if it is to be so called, would it not be better to have it known at once so that references should so indicate.

Yours very truly,

[Signature]

Secretary.
October 18, 1929

[Signature]

Secretary

[Department of the Interior]

[University Charter and By-Laws]

I have a request to refer to the University Charter as the Rockefeller Charter. There is a need to refer within these purposes any such name. It is the wish of the Board of Trustees that the proposed name, as indicated in the proposed charter, shall be the official name of the institution. I am looking forward to your action. It would be most desirable, however, if you could

[Signature]

[Secretary]
MEMORANDUM OF E. D. BURTON
October 25-28, 1924

1. Saturday, October 25th. Presented plans of the University Chapel which I had that day obtained in their latest revision from Mr. Goodhue's Associates to Mr. J. D. Rockefeller, Jr. at his house at Pocantico Hills, Tarrytown and received his approval of them, with minor suggestions.

2. Dined, at the house of Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Sr. it being the eve of the birthday of Mrs. J. D. Rockefeller, Jr.

3. Sunday morning October 26th after further discussion of the plans and the suggestions that (a) the upper edge of the side walls of the nave should receive further accent in some way, the columns of the nave be rounded or in some other way their extreme square plainness softened, it was suggested that I should go that afternoon to West Point to see the Chapel there. I accordingly left the little church before the service was over, was driven to Tarrytown, thence took train to Garrison and ferry to West Point.

It should be added that Mr. Rockefeller, Jr. had on Saturday afternoon asked me how much money was in the Chapel account, and when I told him approximately he expressed surprise and asked if the interest had been used for other things to which I replied in the negative. The next morning I took occasion to tell him that the letter of his father was understood and seemed clearly to mean, not that $1,500,000 of the $10,000,000 was to be set aside for the chapel but that $1,500,000 should be spent on it; and that on a certain date an amount was set aside which it was believed would amount to $1,500,000 by the time that the chapel could be built; but that thereafter no interest was used for any other purpose except that $90,000 had al-
In the year 1928, the University of the Philippines conducted an operation under the leadership of Mr. C. Coquid, who was in charge of the operation. The purpose was to explore the potential for gold mining in the area.

It is clear from the evidence gathered during the operation that the area has significant potential for gold mining. The presence of gold deposits was confirmed through various tests and analyses.

The findings of the operation indicate that further exploration and development are necessary to exploit the full potential of the area. The government and private investors are encouraged to invest in this promising area.

In conclusion, the operation conducted in 1928 has provided valuable insights into the potential for gold mining in the area. Further efforts are needed to realize the full potential of this resource.
ready been spent on the plan; that the amount available, above this
expenditure June 30, 1924, was $1,566,946.13; that the interest till
March 31, 1925, when we hoped to begin to build, plus the interest
that would accumulate within the period of building was estimated to
yield $1,749,354 and that we believed that this ought to build the
chapel.

Though out of order it may be added that on the follow-
ing Monday Goodhue's Associates told me that the estimate, much of it
based on actual bids, which Wells Brothers made shortly before Mr.
Goodhue's death was $1,584,725 which figure included the subsidiary
building, as originally planned, all the stone carving, there being
an actual bid from Mr. Goodhue's favorite sculptor (Lawrence La?),
and an allowance for furnishing of ($100,000) but not including the
cost of the subterranean passage.

I should think it would be safe to allow for organ and
furniture $125,000 – i.e., additional $125,000.
The amount due the architects may be roughly estimated
at

The subterranean passage would probably cost about $5,000

Making a total of

Deductions for this are possible by simplifying the
subsidiary buildings and by possible reductions in the bids through
decline in costs. It seems probable therefore that there is money
enough in the fund to build and furnish the chapel including organ.

The visit to West Point proved interesting, but did
not in any way suggest modification of our plans, except to confirm
the suggestion that the top line of the side walls be accented and the
interior columns softened.

This chapel is built of rough local stone, dark slate color with Bedford Stone tracery in the windows. The tower, about 140 feet high is over the crossing, but the ceiling of the church is carried through without opening up into the tower as in our former plans. Its general plan is similar to ours, but it is 10 feet narrower, 20 feet shorter, 23 feet lower inside and has seven bays in the nave instead of our three. Its west front is peculiar the windows being very deeply recessed between buttresses, and octagonal corner towers. It stands on the edge of a sharp decline to the left (facing the church) and has a distinctly fortress like appearance. Mr. F. C. Mayer, the organist urged making the chapel large enough, even if the tower had to be postponed (an unnecessary counsel, I judge). He advised sinking the consol and facing it east (ecclesiastically) so that the director could see and be seen by the singers, urged providing ample for the choir (I judge we have) and inclined to stained glass windows, those in the West Point Chapel are I think much too dark.

In conversation with Murray & Mayer on Monday the 27th, the following points were developed.

a) The edge of the roof can receive greater accent.

b) The columns can be restudied and probably softened a little, if we desire.

c) They will prepare a perspective of the west side.

d) The seats in the galleries all afford a view of the speaker.

e) The triforium has a passageway through it wide enough for two people abreast. It was not planned to make any use of it except in connection with the heating.


The text on the page is not legible due to the quality of the image. It appears to be a passage that is difficult to read and interpret. The text is not transcribed accurately.
f) The location of the building on the block can be reconsidered. There is no reason in their minds why it should not be centered east and west.

g) The consol can be faced anyway we think best.

h) There is room for an echo organ at the rear end of the Church.

j) The plans contemplate stone columns inside, acoustic plaster in the bays each side of the windows, and dull finished tile in the ribs of the ceiling. Whether the space between the ribs is to be filled with acoustic plaster or acoustic tile I am not sure.

k) We shall need to decide soon whether we are to have the color in the ceiling or the windows or both.

l) The present plans will be sent to Chicago Thursday and the west perspective perhaps a week later.

m) The west transept can of course be made to extend beyond the nave as far as the tower on the other side if we desire. But the architects incline to think it would not make the building more beautiful. It would of course increase both cost and capacity.

n) Glazed tile such as they propose can soon be seen in the capitol at Lincoln, Nebraska.

o) Acoustic plaster costs about 40¢ a square foot. Acoustic tile about $2.50 (?) times as much.

p) Early study should be given to the subsidiary build-
The position of the piloting on the floor may be
acknowledged. There is no reason in special cases why it should not
be centered over any wall.

(2) The controls can be placed anywhere we think best.

(3) There is room for an extra ocean at the rear end
of the cockpit.

(4) The plans contemplate some common interior connec-
tions in the plans, and that is the reason why in the
place of the cockpit. Whether the space between the tip to to
be filled with common pipes or connexions like I am not sure.

(5) We might need to get one soon whatever we do to have
the room in the cockpit at the window at all.

(6) The plans plans will be sent to Chicago tomorrow.

(7) The room in the cockpit at the window at all.

The room in the cockpit at the window at all.

(8) The room in the cockpit at the window at all.

(9) The room in the cockpit at the window at all.

(10) The room in the cockpit at the window at all.

(11) The room in the cockpit at the window at all.

(12) Yes, that same go, but these three can soon be made
of wood.

(13) Yes, that same go, but these three can soon be made
of wood.
October 31, 1924.

President Ernest D. Burton,
The University of Chicago,
Chicago, Illinois.

Dear Mr. Burton:

I favor the name of Rockefeller as the name of the Chapel, but I raise the question as to whether it should be called a Chapel or a Cathedral. This second point, however, I think may very well wait until it is built and until we get the atmosphere of the place.

Yours cordially,

[signature]

This is an answer to your of Oct. 20.
November Seventeen
1924

My dear Dr. Burton:

On Saturday, November 15th, Mr. A. E. Wells and Mr. Powell, of Wells Brothers, came to the office in response to my inquiry as to whether the bid which they had made for the Chapel, amounting to $1,684,725 - inclusive of a fixed fee for the contractors - might be reduced by them on account of changes which might have occurred, since the bid was made, in building costs.

Mr. Wells reported that if he could get some more detailed information about the kind of stone and some other features of the present plans, he would perhaps be able to make some reductions; but that on the basis of general conditions he felt that he could not put in a lower bid. He was willing, however, to state that the present bid should not be increased if the plans and specifications remained the same. He was very emphatic, though, in urging that the University undertake the work as promptly as possible - preferably before the beginning of next year - so that the orders for the steel, stone and other material might be placed before that date, so as to get the advantage of present prices. Both he and Mr. Powell felt that there would likely be a considerable increase in building material after January 1st. Already steel prices are quoted at a higher figure.

I told Mr. Wells that the plans were not yet in final shape, but that the University officials were planning a conference with the architects before the close of the present month and that we should certainly give earnest attention to his suggestion.

Very truly yours,

Trevor Arnett

Dr. Ernest D. Burton
The University of Chicago

TA:EB
November 18, 1924.

My dear Mr. Donnelley,

I have received from Mr. Mayers a telegram indicating that he and Mr. Murray will come to Chicago, as suggested in a conference on the plans of the Chapel, on Saturday the 29th. It is suggested that we meet at the Board Room at 10 o'clock.

Meantime I have received from Mr. Arnett the letter of which I enclose a copy.

In view of the possible advantage to the University of early closing of the contract I beg to raise the question whether we might not on the 29th also have a conference with Mr. Wells while Mr. Mayers and Mr. Murray are still here, looking to an early closing of the contract with the Wells Brothers, making possible the action suggested by them.

Very truly yours,
May 13, 1894

Mr. Battles

I have received from Mr. Battles a telegram in which he states that he and Mr. Mackay will come to Chicago to attend a meeting of the Board of the Chicago Library Co-operative. It is requested that we meet at the Board Room at 10 o'clock.

Meaning I have received from Mr. Battles after the latter.

In view of the possible changes that may be made in the University at early closing of the contract I beg to make the suggestion that we meet and have a conference with Mr. Battles and Mr. Mackay at 9:30. The earliest possible time that Mr. Battles and Mr. Mackay can come is at 9:30.

Very truly yours,

R.B.
December 4, 1924.

President E. D. Burton,
Faculty Exchange.

Dear President Burton:

I am assuming that you will report
to the Board, at its December 11th meeting, the
approval by Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., of
the plans for the University Chapel, in a formal
way so that it will conform to the conditions
of Mr. Rockefeller’s letter of December 13, 1910.

Yours very truly,

[Signature]

Secretary.
My dear Mr. Rockefeller:

Because your father's letter of gift stipulates that the plans of the Chapel shall receive your approval before their final adoption by the Board of Trustees it seems desirable that there should be a record of such approval other than my oral report to the Board of our conversation. If, therefore, you feel prepared to confirm the approval which you expressed to me at your house at Tarrytown last Sunday I should be glad if you would either embody such approval in a letter to me or, if more convenient, merely write the word "approved" and your signature across one copy of this letter.

It was a very great pleasure to me to spend a few hours in your home and to meet not only yourself and Mrs. Rockefeller but your father and your children.

In a letter which I have just written to Mrs. Rockefeller I have embodied some of the impressions which I gained in seeing the West Point Chapel. It is very suitable to its place and purpose but I feel confident that all the differences between our plan and it are in the interest of making our Chapel also eminently suited to its purpose and position.

We shall of course be glad to consult with you further respecting any changes to be made in the plan if you so desire. It is my impression, however, that the architects will readily make the changes which we discussed and that no other important modifications will be necessary.

Very sincerely yours,

Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr.
26 Broadway
New York, New York
My dear Mr. Rockefeller:

I trust this letter finds you well and in good health. I regret to inform you that I am unable to accept the offer of employment you have extended to me. I have reconsidered my decision and feel that it is in my best interest to pursue other opportunities.

I wish to express my gratitude for your consideration and the time you have taken to meet with me. Your kindness and generosity have been much appreciated.

Very sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr.

30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York
26 Broadway
New York.

November 7, 1924.

Dear Dr. Burton:

Your letter of October 30th is received. I assume that my letter of October 28th to you has already reached you and that it covers the ground. If not, please let me know.

Very sincerely

[Signature]

President Ernest D. Burton,
University of Chicago,
Chicago, Illinois.
Your letter of October 2nd

I trust that the letter of
October 2nd to you and the attached Negro
and receipt of original by Shange in San Diego,
I will please
for me know.

Very sincerely,

Assistant Secretary of War

W. E. B. du Bois
November 8, 1924.

My dear Mr. Rockefeller:

Accept my hearty thanks for yours of October 23 giving your general approval to the plans for the University Chapel as presented to you Saturday, October 25.

This letter of course makes unnecessary any reply to mine of October 30th.

I am very glad that these plans meet with your approval, and I am hoping that we can now go forward steadily in the perfection of the plans in details and in the erection of the building itself.

Very sincerely yours,

E. D. Burton

Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr.
25 Broadway
New York, New York.
My dear Mr. Rockefeller:

Accept my respects.

We look forward to October 26 giving your General Assembly the plane for the University Center as promised to you several times in October.

This letter of course makes unnecessary any reply to mine of October 4th.

I am very glad that these plans meet with your approval, and I am pointing that we can now go forward actively in the preparation of the plans in getting the very necessary funds.

Very sincerely yours,

C. P. Stimson

Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr.

10 East 52nd Street, New York, New York
October 28, 1924.

My dear Dr. Burton:

It gave me much pleasure to look over with you at Pocantico last Saturday the plans for the Chapel at the University of Chicago, which, as stated in your letter of October 16th, you desired to lay before me in compliance with the request contained in my father's letter to the University of December 15th, 1910. It is a pleasure to say that with the exception of the one or two minor matters which I mentioned to you, I thought the building as designed most dignified, appropriate and pleasing, and am happy to know that so beautiful a structure can be erected, even in these times of higher costs, with the minimum sum which the Trustees have set aside for that purpose from my father's last gift to the University of Chicago.

Mrs. Rockefeller and I thoroughly enjoyed having you in our home, and only regretted your premature departure on Sunday morning. I hope the visit to West Point justified the extra exertion incident thereto.

Very cordially,

John D. Rockefeller Jr.

President Ernest D. Burton,
University of Chicago,
Chicago, Illinois.
October 28, 1936.

My dear Dr. Burton:

I am glad to hear from you of your appointment to the new position as Dean of the College of Education at the University of Minnesota. It is a great pleasure to see that your appointment to this important position is a fitting recognition of your outstanding contributions to the field of education.

I am also pleased to see that the University of Chicago has appointed a distinguished and able dean to lead the College of Education. I am confident that under Dr. Burton's leadership, the College of Education will continue to excel in providing the highest quality education to its students.

I am also pleased to hear that you and your family are settling in well at the University of Chicago. I hope that your stay in Chicago will be both enjoyable and fruitful.

Very truly yours,

John D. Rockefeller Jr.

[Signature]
December 31, 1924.

Dear Dr. Burton:

Your letter of November 14th, in regard to a name for the University Chapel, was duly received. I have not replied sooner, for I wanted to talk the matter over with several people, including Father.

The Trustees' desire to have this building bear Father's name is entirely agreeable to him, although, as you know, few buildings bear his name and that recognition is one which he never seeks. The one question which arises in this connection is as to whether the chapel should be called the "Rockefeller Chapel" or the "Rockefeller Memorial Chapel." Mr. Gates strongly feels the latter is preferable. Since the chapel is being built with money which Father has himself contributed, Mr. Gates' fear is that it will seem as though Father were seeking to build a monument to himself, were his name now attached to the chapel. But if the chapel were generally known as the University Chapel for the present, and when Father dies should then, by resolution of your Board of Trustees, he named the "Rockefeller Memorial Chapel," the memorial to Father would clearly be indicated as springing from the Trustees and could not be attributed to Father.

I must confess that there seems to me much in Mr. Gates' point of view. How does it strike you?

With apologies for this long delay in replying to your letter, and with the Season's Greetings, I am,

Very sincerely,

John D. Rockefeller

President Ernest D. Burton,
University of Chicago,
Chicago, Illinois.
December 31, 1925.

Dear Dr. Burton:

Your letter of November 14th, in regard to a name for the University Chapel, was duly received. I have not replied sooner, for I wanted to talk the matter over with several people, including Father.

The Trustees' desire to have this building bear Father's name is entirely agreeable to him, although, as you know, few buildings bear his name and that recognition is one which he never seeks. The one question which arises in this connection is as to whether the chapel should be called the "Rockefeller Chapel" or the Rockefeller Memorial Chapel." Mr. Gates strongly feels the latter is preferable. Since the chapel is being built with money which Father himself has contributed, Mr. Gates' fear is that it will seem as though Father were seeking to build a monument to himself, were his name now attached to the chapel. But if the chapel were generally known as the University Chapel for the present, and when Father dies should then, by resolution of your Board of Trustees, be named the "Rockefeller Memorial Chapel," the memorial to Father would clearly be indicated as springing from the Trustees and could not be attributed to Father.

I must confess that there seems to me much in Mr. Gates' point of view. How does it strike you?

With apologies for this long delay in replying to your letter, and with the Season's Greetings, I am,

Very sincerely,

(Signed) John D. Rockefeller, Jr.

President Ernest D. Burton,
University of Chicago,
Chicago, Illinois.
Dear Dr. Button:

Your letter of November 16th, in regard to a name
to the University of Chicago, is only accidental. I have not
taking special care to look the matter over with
several people. Involuntary pressure

The Trustees, having to prove this publication best
affairs, seem to have an absolute to their subscription, as you
know. You promise that you will now say that association is
the "Museum of University of Chicago." Since
I have only an absolute letter to the Trustees, I need to prove
the above, as part of their work with which I have promised the
above is the subscription letters to the Trustees, and it is the absolute.

With best wishes, I am

Very sincerely,

(Signed) John D. Rockefeller, Jr.

President, Board of Trustees
University of Chicago

Chicago, Illinois
January 5, 1925.

My dear Mr. Donnelly,

I am enclosing here a letter from Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr. with reference to the name of the Chapel. After the action of the Board of Trustees and my letter to Mr. Rockefeller there was made to me a suggestion which rather appeals to me, namely, that the Chapel should be permanently known as Founder's Chapel. It occurred to me since receiving the enclosed letter that we might suggest to Mr. Rockefeller that while his father lives the Chapel, instead of being called the University Chapel, should be called Founder's Chapel. This might lead to the suggestion on the part of the family that this be the permanent name. I should not, however, intimate that, but only put forth the suggestion that during Mr. Rockefeller's life it might bear a name which should indicate its relationship to him without actually employing his name, which they wish to avoid.

I shall be glad of your thought about this.

Very truly yours,
My dear Mr. Rockefeller:

Your letter of December 31, answering mine of November 14, has lain unanswered a full month for reasons similar to those which delayed your reply to mine - I have wanted to consult with other members of the Committee, and, as you will notice from the date of this letter, I have fled from the high pressure of work in Chicago for a little mid-winter vacation, such as for twenty years I have always found it necessary to take.

The suggestion of Mr. Gates that the eventual name of the chapel should be "Rockefeller Memorial Chapel" commends itself to us all, and I feel sure it will appeal to all the Trustees.

As respects the name which the building should bear during your father's lifetime, it has occurred to me that there is a name which has had an honorable history elsewhere, and which might possibly even better than "University Chapel" serve as an ad interim name for our building, viz. "Founder's Chapel". Your father is of course in fact and by official recognition the founder of the University - "Founder's Chapel" would therefore carry an implicit reference to him, but would avoid the actual use of his name during his lifetime. Afterward the change from "Founder's Chapel" to "Rockefeller Memorial Chapel" would be a very natural one, introducing the memorial idea and converting the implicit reference to your father into an explicit one.

The members of our Committee whom I have consulted are not wholly of one mind in the matter. To some of us the term "Founder's Chapel" seems rather preferable; others incline to Mr. Gates' suggestion "University Chapel". We are indeed just about equally divided in our inclination. I am sure any preference which you or your father might have would turn the scale in our minds to a decision in favor of your preference.

I should be glad therefore if we might know your mind in the matter.

It is a matter of great satisfaction to us all that practically all details of the plan of the building have
been settled, and the financial aspects of the matter so adjusted that we confidently expect to break ground for the chapel within 60 or 90 days.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr.,
26 Broadway,
New York.
January 13, 1925.

President Ernest D. Burton,
The University of Chicago,
Chicago, Illinois.

My dear Dr. Burton:

I have just received your letter
dated January 5th, but postmarked the 10th,
relating to the name to be given to our
Chapel.

I think the one you suggest,
"Founder's Chapel", might still be open to
Mr. Rockefeller's objection since it would
be but another way of designating his father.
It would in my opinion be better to adopt
the suggestion that it be for the time being
called "University Chapel".

Very truly yours,

Martin A. Ryerson
January 12, 1925

Dr. Ernest DeWitt Burton
University of Chicago
Chicago, Illinois

My dear Dr. Burton:

I am in receipt of your letter of January 5th and Mr. Rockefeller's letter of December 31st concerning the naming of the chapel. I can appreciate Mr. John D. Rockefeller's feelings in regard to naming a chapel for himself. I rather like the idea of calling it the University Chapel temporarily and then officially naming it "The Rockefeller Chapel" after Mr. Rockefeller's death. I am afraid that this will not be very far in the future on account of his advanced age. I really believe I like Mr. Rockefeller's idea better than the suggestion of the Founder's Chapel.

Believe me,

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

TED/MCN
January 14, 1925.

President Ernest D. Burton,
The University of Chicago,
Chicago, Illinois.

Dear Mr. Burton:

Answering yours of January 5 in reference to name of
the new Chapel:

I greatly prefer the name "Founder's Chapel" to that
of "The University Chapel."

I cordially agree that you might write Mr. Rockefeller, Jr.,
suggesting the name "Founder's Chapel" with the understanding that
after the death of Mr. Rockefeller, Sr., the Board would probably
prefer to change the name to "Rockefeller Memorial Chapel." However, I
think our preference as between "Founder's Chapel" and "The Uni-
versity Chapel" should not be so strongly expressed as to preclude
Mr. Rockefeller Jr. from saying he doesn't like it, as after all
I should prefer to defer to his wishes. Perhaps, on this account,
you might say that the idea has been informally suggested and
rather appeals to you and ask him for his ideas before expressing
ours too strongly.

Yours cordially,

Harold H. Swift
December 25, 1924.

Mr. Trevor Arnett,
1938 - 230 So. Clark Street,
Chicago, Illinois.

Dear Mr. Arnett:

The day of the November meeting of the Board, which was held at the University, I arrived early and went with Mr. Martin A. Ryerson over to the new Theology Building, where Mr. Ryerson wanted to establish in his own mind just where the Bond Chapel when built should be placed. My memory is not clear in the matter but I think the question was whether the Chapel should be in alignment with Cobb Hall or in alignment with something else. The matter consisted of a change of only a few feet and had to do with improvement of the vista, etc.

I am sorry that I cannot give you more about it, but I recommend you establish the point from Mr. Ryerson before contracts are actually let or work begun for the Chapel, i.e. I think Mr. Ryerson believes the present location can be improved by a movement of only a few feet so that I think this point should be carefully covered with him before work begins.

Yours very truly,

HAROLD H. SWIFT

HHS@GB

cc - T.E. Donnelley
E.D. Burton
Dear Mr. Alfred:

The day of the November meeting of the Board

I have been delayed by the University, I am writing early and want

to express my satisfaction with the move to the new Thompson building.

where Mr. Haysom was able to accommodate the one minute that

was to be done. I am sorry to see the passing of the church and

the changes that have taken place at Gopp Halt. I am obliged

for the open space in the arrangement with Copp Halt, and I hope

the church will be able to accommodate a change of

motion a few feet and work to go with improvement of the

case.

I am sorry that I cannot give you more about it,

but I recommend your secretary the point from Mr. Hayson's

position, and eventually feel to work to keep the church and

I think Mr. Hayson believes the present location can be im-

proved by a movement of only a few feet so that I think this

point should be carefully considered with him before more decision.

Yours very truly,

HAROLD H. SMITH

[Signature]
December 31, 1924.

Dear Dr. Burton:

Your letter of November 14th, in regard to a name for the University Chapel, was duly received. I have not replied sooner, for I wanted to talk the matter over with several people, including Father.

The Trustees' desire to have this building bear Father's name is entirely agreeable to him, although, as you know, few buildings bear his name and that recognition is one which he never seeks. The one question which arises in this connection is as to whether the chapel should be called the Rockefeller Chapel or the Rockefeller Memorial Chapel. Mr. Gates strongly feels the latter is preferable. Since the chapel is being built with money which Father himself has contributed, Mr. Gates' fear is that it will seem as though Father were seeking to build a monument to himself, were his name now attached to the chapel. But if the chapel were generally known as the University Chapel for the present, and when Father dies should then, by resolution of your Board of Trustees, be named the "Rockefeller Memorial Chapel," the memorial to Father would clearly be indicated as springing from the Trustees and could not be attributed to Father.

I must confess that there seems to me much in Mr. Gates' point of view. How does it strike you?

With apologies for this long delay in replying to your letter, and with the Season's Greetings, I am,

Very sincerely,

(Signed) John D. Rockefeller, Jr.

President Ernest D. Burton,
University of Chicago
Chicago, Illinois.
February 28, 1925.

My dear Mr. Scott:

Please see that the originals of all the recent letters, perhaps three from me to Mr. Rockefeller and two from him to me, on the matter of the University Chapel, are transmitted to Mr. Dickerson, but that copies on ordinary paper are filed with the copy of the attached letter to Mr. Dickerson in the President's office.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

EDB:WD.
My dear Mr. Holder,

Please note that the signature appears to be illegible.
February 28, 1925.

My dear Mr. Rockefeller:

I am in receipt of yours of February 20 and am glad to learn your judgment and desire respecting the naming of the chapel. I am transmitting to the Board of Trustees a resolution in accordance with your suggestion for action at the next meeting of the Board.

Work upon the plans of the chapel, making the final changes in detail, has occupied, as so often is the case, a little more time than was expected. We had hoped to break ground by the 1st of April. It appears now that the final plans and specifications will go to the contractors at that date. Inasmuch as before Mr. Goodhue’s death the matter of costs had been gone into very thoroughly with the contractors and definite bids received, and inasmuch as the changes since made are not likely materially to affect the costs, we are hoping that the process of securing confirmed or modified bids and of letting the contracts can
Mr. Gray, Mr. Rockerfeller:

I am in receipt of your letter of December 8th and am glad to learn your interest in the matter of the bill for the remittance to the B.D. of the amount of the remainder of the deposit I paid on the bond of the Osage Association in accordance with your suggestion for protection of the Osage.

Work upon the plans of the applicant

making the plans complete in detail and occupying

as so often is the case, a little more time than

was expected. We may hope to proceed early pr

the fall of April. If ample now that the plans

and specifications will go to the competent

engineer as per contract, it may be that the competen

engineer may take the matter of course and proceed into ve

photographic work with the contractors and geologists

and acquire and accumulate as the amount of experience since made

very

many years that the progress of the contract can

be materially advanced until after the contracts can

be initiated upon.
be carried through rather rapidly. It will be a very happy day for us when the ground is broken for this beautiful building and a still happier one when it is finished. My own satisfaction with the plans increases the more I see them. I feel sure that we are to have, not the largest, but perhaps the most beautiful build-
ing of this general type that America has so far pro-
duced.

Very sincerely yours,

Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr.,
26 Broadway,
New York City.

EDB: WD.
It will be a very

paper very long as I know the language of paper for fine

printing, an own estimation with the plane increase.

and of this country think America can so far progress.

Very respectfully yours,

Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr.

Seashore

New York City
February 28, 1925.

My dear Dr. Dickerson:

The enclosed correspondence with Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., with reference to the name of the University Chapel, should, I think, be filed in your office. I am transmitting it to you for this purpose, retaining copies in the files of the President's office.

Very truly yours,

Dr. J. S. Dickerson,
Faculty Exchange,
University of Chicago.

EDB: WD.
My dear Dr. Pickman:

The enclosed correspondence with Mr. Jow

Dr. Hooker's letter with reference to the name of the

University of Oxford, also I think, be filed in your

office. I am transmitting it to you for that purpose.

Receiving copies in the files of the President's

office.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

Mr. J. R. Pickman
Professor of Chemistry
University of Oxford
February 20, 1925.

Dear Dr. Burton:

Your letter of January 31st is received.

Since your Trustees are divided as between the name "Founder's Chapel" or "University Chapel", and since the former is open to somewhat the same objection that would attach to naming the chapel the "Rockefeller Chapel", may I say that the adoption of the name "University Chapel" would seem to me to be the best solution of the problem for the present.

Very cordially,

JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER, JR.

President E. D. Burton,
University of Chicago,
Chicago, Illinois.
Dear Mr. Parent:

Thank you for your request to accommodate the name alteration that you are making to your daughter's name. I have been informed by the University's Chancellor that they are willing to accommodate the name alteration that you request.

I am happy to request the approval of the name alteration to "Universtiy of Chicago" and to change it to "University of Chicago" as of the date of your daughter's birth.

Thank you for your patience and attention to this matter.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
To be sent to
Mr. F. E. Donnelly
for consideration
presentation to the Board
of Trustees.

Meeting of 9/5/70
with statement of
status.
Board of Trustees
Meeting March 12,
1925.

The Committee on Buildings and Grounds, through the Chairman, T. E. Donnelly, reported that correspondence having been had with Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., with reference to the name of the University Chapel, and the names "Rockefeller Chapel", "Rockefeller Memorial Chapel", "Founder's Chapel", and "University Chapel" having been considered, Mr. Rockefeller had eventually expressed his preference that during the lifetime of his father the chapel should be known as "University Chapel", and after his death as "Rockefeller Memorial Chapel". The Committee recommended that, in accordance with the desire of Mr. Rockefeller, the chapel be hereafter known as "University Chapel", with the expectation and intention that on the death of Mr. Rockefeller its name be changed to "Rockefeller Memorial Chapel".
The Committee on Publication and Ornament, having been
pleased by the advice of T. H. Darbishire, Esq., to interfere with the
publication of Mr. J. C. Hooker's 'Flora of North America,' have been
confronted with the question of the name of the University Chapter of the
Botanic Garden's Chapter and the name of the "University Memorial Chapter,"
"Botanic Garden's Chapter," and "University Memorial Chapter" having been
consulted with the expectation that granting the name of the Botanic
Garden's Chapter to "University Memorial Chapter" would be as satisfactory as
satisfactory to the members of the committee as to the members of the
Committee on Publication and Ornament. The Committee, in accordance with the
recommendation of the committee of the University, have decided that the name of
Mr. Hooker's Chapter shall be "University Memorial Chapter," with the expectation
that the name of the "University Memorial Chapter" will be as satisfactory as
the name of the "Botanic Garden's Chapter."