April 12, 1885.

My dear Dr. Harper,—

May I call your attention to what Mr. Batterland, a Reader in the University, seems to be doing in this class? Judging by what one of his students has told me, I suppose...
he is indulging in
contempt attacks on
men and many dear to the
whole Christian world.
The tendency of some of
his statements would
be, if I am not wrong,
to muy greatly perilous
to young men, and to
turn them to sceptics.
It seems to me that all
our instructors should
be notified not to
The University of Chicago

Speak disparagingly of the Bible, or of our Christian faith, or in the least to prejudice the hold of either on the minds of their classes, on pain of dismissal. I have been told that President Elliot something like this at Harvard.

Sincerely yours,
Franklin Johnson.
April 12, 1895.

My dear Dr. Harper,

The more I hear of what Botterell is doing, the more firmly convinced I am that it is an unendurable outrage to allow him ever again to open his lips in
one of our classes.

Sincerely yours,

Franklin Johnson
Dear Colleague—

After six years of service as Professor of Germanic Languages at the University of Texas I have suddenly been dismissed without cause. As late as March 1919 President Vinson had expressed his complete confidence in the security of my position. On the 12th of June I received official notice of my reappointment. Two days later the President asked for my resignation. The enclosed copy of my letter to him of June 15th states his reasons for this demand and my reasons for refusing to comply with it.

The President's reply to my letter, dated June 17th, contains the only official or semi-official statement of the considerations leading to my dismissal that I have been given. After defending at length the mere legality of the contemplated action against me, Mr. Vinson continues:

"The reasons underlying all the above are the criticisms found in Ex-Ambassador Gerard's book "Face to Face with Kaiserism", the consequent abolition of your books from the schools of New York City, on the ground that they contained German propaganda, the questions touching your full and complete loyalty to the United States which have arisen and which have not been definitely settled either way, and the firm persuasion upon the part of many citizens of Texas that a man with your supposed antecedents and present connections could scarcely be expected to be as wholeheartedly loyal or as beneficial as an instructor in the University of Texas as might be expected of one in other circumstances. It should be distinctly understood that neither the Board of Regents nor myself, as president of the University, have made or contemplates making any specific charge of disloyalty against you. The whole matter simply resolves itself into the statement which I have heretofore made that all the circumstances surrounding you not only brand the question of your usefulness to the University under serious consideration, but also lead to the conclusion that your presence on the faculty is for the time being and for an indefinite time in the future a responsibility to the institution." (Upon my question the President explained that his allusion to my "antecedents and present connections" referred to my German-Austrian extraction and to the fact that my brother had served in the Austrian army.)
The Regents of the University met in special session on the morning of July 7. I was not given a hearing; as President Vinson stated and I am willing to assume, this was due to an incomprehensible misunderstanding, which had led the President to inform the Regents "that Mr. Prokosch did not desire a hearing." The Board decided to accept my resignation, which I had refused to tender, and the President informed me of this in a casual way. In consequence of my unequivocal statement that I had never submitted my resignation, some of the Regents met again on the evening of the same day and revised the minutes of their meeting in compliance with the facts, i.e., they ordered my position vacated. They rejected a plan, submitted by two of my colleagues, under which my connection with the University could have been continued until February 29, 1920, and made my removal effective August 31, 1919.

I accepted their action as unavoidable and final, but felt that I had a right to ask for an official statement of its reasons. I obtained a belated hearing before the Regents on July 21 - two weeks after my dismissal - and made this request in a formal way. I stated that in my understanding my discharge was due exclusively to the pressure of public opinion, based on Mr. Gerard's attacks against me and on empty gossip - a pressure that had become irresistible thru the attitude of the Legislature against me. I concluded my statement with these words:

"I ask you for an entirely frank, written statement of the reasons of my dismissal, clearly defining your attitude as due either to the relentless demands of the Legislature, or to some evidence, hitherto unknown to me, against my loyalty to the United States.

Admitting, in either case, the necessity of your action against me, I still must protest against ... the fact that I have received the first intimation of my impending dismissal on June 14th, and that you decided, on July 7th, to carry this into effect immediately at the end of this fiscal year ... Such a sudden dismissal is a violation of the established customs of respectable Universities, and I greatly resent that some factors that are unknown to me have compelled you to take such an action."

While the applause of some of the present Regents seemed to show that they were in sympathy with my request for a statement of reasons, President Vinson replied to my surprise, in a rather vehement speech, that his letter of June 17th (quoted above)
had stated the reasons clearly and fully; that the action of the State Senate might have been the outward occasion, but certainly not the cause of my dismissal; that the Board of Regents had freely decided that my services were no longer of value to the University; and that he, personally (altho he had declared, in 1918, that he would never yield to the pressure of public opinion against me) was tired of having to apologize for my presence on the faculty.

These statements of Mr. Vinson’s stand so sharply in contrast to his former utterances in the matter that I am more than ever in the dark concerning the real cause of my removal. My request for a “frank, written statement” has remained unanswered to this day. On my special request the Secretary of the Regents sent me on August 4th all that he was able to supply: a mimeographed copy of two letters of mine to President Vinson, together with the curt statement (mimeographed) that in their meeting of July 17th the Regents had ordered my position vacated (revised minutes), effective May August 31, 1919.

I have felt it my duty to lay this statement of facts before my colleagues.

With cordial regards,
President Robert E. Vinson,
University of Texas,

Dear Sir:

Yesterday, on the 14th of June, you informed me that the Committee on Finance of the State Senate had passed a practically unanimous resolution demanding my removal from the staff of the University, and that you had been instructed by a part of the Board of Regents to secure my resignation. On my question you stated that this action was the result of Ex-Ambassador Gerard's criticism of certain parts of my elementary text-books, and of the general atmosphere engendered by that criticism. On my repeated question you stated that this was the sole reason. You advised me to comply, in my own interest, with this request for resignation and informed me that in the event of my failure to do so the Board of Regents would without doubt order my formal dismissal at their next meeting.

Nevertheless, I found it necessary to refuse compliance with your request; I stated the following reasons for my refusal:

1. You asked me to submit a "voluntary resignation, without any statement of reasons." I object to terming a forcible dismissal a "voluntary resignation."
2. Under the circumstances, my resignation might be construed as a virtual admission of disloyalty. However, I know that I am now, and have always been, a loyal citizen of the United States.
3. During the last two years I stated to you on several occasions that I appreciated the difficulty of your situation in regard to me and that I understood that sooner or later you might have to yield to the pressure of the agitation against me. But I made it very clear to you that I believed myself to have a right to expect a dismissal, if such should become necessary, very early in the year — say, not later than February, i. e., at a time when I should have a chance to secure another position. As late as March of this year you made this statement: "Your position, Professor Prokosch, is entirely as secure as that of any other full professor in the University." Therefore, I protest against being informed of my impending dismissal at this late time of the year.
4. A "voluntary resignation without statement of reasons" would make it extremely difficult for me to find another position. The fact of a forcible dismissal under existing conditions could hardly fail to enlist for me the support of my colleagues, while such a resignation might easily have the opposite effect.

In spite of these objections you saw yourself compelled to insist on your demand. You stated again, in the most definite terms, that my formal dismissal at the next meeting of the Board of Regents was entirely certain, unless I preferred, on further consideration, to tender my resignation.

I know this summing up of our conversation to be substantially correct, but shall thank you for correction if you should find it inaccurate in details.

Yours sincerely,

E. Prokosch,
Professor of Germanic Languages.
Dear President Kirkland,

I am writing to convey my appreciation for the course offerings of the University. The faculty, particularly in the field of mathematics, have been instrumental in shaping my academic journey. I have found the approach to teaching innovative and engaging, which has significantly contributed to my academic success.

I am currently enrolled in the advanced mathematics course and have found the material challenging yet stimulating. The course has not only expanded my knowledge but also sparked my interest in pursuing further studies in this field.

I would like to express my gratitude to the mathematics department for their dedication and hard work. Their commitment to excellence is evident in the quality of education provided.

I hope this message finds you well and that your day is filled with joy.

Sincerely,

[Your Name]
Chicago, December 31, 1914

Dear Sir:—

My attention is called to an editorial in the Examiner of December 25th, in which it is said: "Mr. Rockefeller, for example, has much to say about what the Chicago University shall teach, or what college professors may do if they hope to draw pensions from his Education Fund."

 Permit me to say in comment, first: Mr. Rockefeller has nothing to say, and never has had anything to say, about what the University of Chicago shall teach; second: Mr. Rockefeller has no "Education Fund" from which professors draw pensions.

Very truly yours,

A.P.J.—D.

The Editor
The Chicago Examiner
336 West Madison Street

Chicago.
Benevolence and Tax Dodging by Some Very Rich Men

PRINTED thus, side by side, the foregoing headlines from a morning paper are exceedingly suggestive. The newspaper man who placed them thus in juxtaposition may not have philosophized over their significance. Perhaps he merely saw two items about Rockefeller, and knew it was good editing to put them together. But probably his subconscious mind was asking the while, "Why is it that Mr. Rockefeller and men of his type are willing to give enormous sums for charitable purposes, and yet are not willing to pay taxes for the support of the government?"

In the Rockefeller case the sums given to charity or to public purposes are almost incalculable. The Chicago University, the General Education Board and the Rockefeller Foundation have received endowments in excess of $150,000,000.

Obviously it would be mendacious folly to accuse a man capable of such broad benevolence of stinginess or miserliness.

But when the authorities of Ohio sought to tax Mr. Rockefeller on his enormous estate he put in a plea of non-residence, and tendered to the Treasurer of Cuyahoga County the munificent sum of $29.64 as payment in full of all his taxes.

That DOES look like miserliness and stinginess.

In both these acts Mr. Rockefeller stands as representative of many very rich men. To begrudge payment of honest taxes while willing enough to give freely in charity is characteristic of the class.

Perhaps this attitude is explicable by the fact that their charitable donations are never wholly out of their control. (Mr. Rockefeller, for example, has much to say about what the Chicago University shall teach, or what college professors may do if they hope to draw pensions from his Education Fund.)

When he has paid his taxes he can control the money no further, except by the exercise of his power as a citizen to supervise the expenditures of public funds.

But when Mr. Rockefeller buys a piece of property he doesn’t expect to have anything to say about the money he paid for it. When he enjoys the protection of a government, which safeguards his great holdings and furnishes him with courts and officials to protect him, he ought to pay for this service in taxes. It is amazing that the class which most begrudges its support to the government, which fights hardest to avoid paying its fair share of taxation, is the great propertied class to which the Government renders vastly greater service than it does to the citizen of ordinary means.

Would it not be better for men of wealth to begin their course of public service by at least performing their public duties, and not only distribute their income in beneficial endowments, but pay their honest debts? The most important of these debts is their debt to this liberal, generous and enlightened Republic, to which they owe everything they possess?
Results FRIDAY, DECEMBER 25

BATES—Dr. Morley D. Bates, at the Free Presbyterian Hospital, Dec. 24, 1914, husband of Edith V. Bates.

Funeral notice later.

BILLING, Albert (which Ltd.), beloved wife of John Brandt, at her parents' residence, 1336 S. Throop st.

Funeral Saturday, Dec. 26, at 9 a.m. in All Saints, Adelbert.

BURNS—Hannah Conway, Dec. 23, 1914, widow of late William J. Burns, mother of Robert, Margaret and Mary Burns.

Funeral from residence, 836 Newport av., Saturday, Dec. 26, at 9:30 a.m., to Mount Carmel Church, by auto to Cavalry. Private.


Funeral from residence, 836 Newport av., Saturday, Dec. 26, at 9:30 a.m., to Mount Carmel Church, by auto to Cavalry. Private.

CHRISTIANSEN—Jaeck, Dec. 20, 1914, in his 65th year, beloved husband of Reemanna (nee Mortensen), fond grandfather ofasting Aeck. Son of the late N. C. and E. Jaeck, man Christiansen and Mrs. Otto Kramp.

Funeral from daughter's residence, Mrs. Thomas Haeck, 1325 N. Crawford av., Friday, Dec. 25, at 1 p.m., by carriage to church of St. Louis. Gone to his grandchildren.

DILLEY—Arthur E., Dec. 24, 1914, age 25 years, beloved husband of Gertrude (nee Diener), son of John and Rachael, brother of John, Edith, Clara, George, Bertha, Elizabeth and Margaret.

Funeral at late residence, 6591 S. Racine av., Sunday, Dec. 27, at 2:30 p.m., auto to Mt. Hope.

DUNN—John, Dec. 21, 1914, aged 65 years, 3 months and 4 days, beloved husband of Louisa (nee Heiden), beloved father of William, Alfred, Amelia, Arbogast, Charles, and George Dreier, brother of Fred and Frank Dreier, son of Mrs. J. Krueger and Ph. Blum.

Funeral Saturday, Dec. 26, at 2 p.m., by carriage to St. Louis.

EHRLICH—Nathan, Dec. 22, 1914, aged 76 years, of 3116 Seminary av., beloved husband of late Bette Ehrlich, fond father of Sophie, Bernhard A., Benjamin J. and Fred Ehrlich, Mrs. M. Kahn and Mrs. I. Pleischaker of Joplin, Mo.

Funeral Friday, Dec. 25, 2 p.m., from Loom Brothers' chapel, 145 N. Clark st.; auto to New Light.

FESSENDEN—Charles N., Dec. 28, beloved husband of Katharine Green Fessenden, father of Charles and Frank Fessenden.

Funeral private. No flowers.

FIES—Minnie, beloved wife of the late Joseph Fies, May McCann, Mrs. A. Olesen, Veronica, Charles Fies, Herman, Nora and the late Minnie.

Funeral Saturday, Dec. 26, 9:30 a.m., from late residence, 3006 W. 12th st., to St. Agatha's Church, high mass, carriages to cemetery.

GANNON—Alice M., Dec. 23, 1914, at her residence, 1103 Chatham st., beloved daughter of John and the late Mary Ann Gannon (nee M'Farlane).—Allam C., beloved husband of Maria (nee Costello), father of Frank, John and Howard, Frances, Mrs. A. J. Sullivan.

Funeral Sunday at 9 a.m. from late residence, 3070 W. 12th st., to Our Lady of Sorrows Church, by auto to Calvary.

MORAN—John, beloved husband of Annie Moran (nee O'Malley), father of Mrs. Mary O'Rourke, Thomas Moran, Katherine Moran, Mrs. Ab- rine Robertson and the late Mrs. Mary Guiry.

Funeral Sunday at 9 a.m. from his residence, 5229 Princeton av., to St. Ann's Church, by auto to Calvary.

O'NEILL—Elizabeth, aged 27, fond daughter of William and Catherine O'Neill, sister of Daniel and Mrs. Mary Knoen, niece of Mrs. Thomas Masterson and Mrs. G. E. Brewer of 5922 Park av.

Funeral Saturday, Dec. 26, at 9:30 a.m., from residence of the aunt, Mrs. Thomas Masterson, 5922 Park av., to Our Lady of Sorrows Church, by auto to Mount Carmel.

ROBINSON—William, beloved husband of Lizzie (nee Callahan), son of Mrs. Mary Magner and the late John Magner.

Funeral Saturday, Dec. 26, 9 a.m. from late residence, 3211 S. Paulina st., to Our Lady of Good Counsel Church, by auto to Calvary, to be celebrated; by auto to Mount Olive, member of Inter Ocean Council.

ROBINSON—Samuel W., Dec. 23, at 411 E. 60th st., beloved husband of Emma L., father of Frank.

Funeral from his late residence, 2 p.m., Saturday, Dec. 26, Xena and Wilkinson, Ohio, papers please.

RUDL—Lawrence, beloved husband of Marie, fond father of Ruth and George, passed away into a peaceful rest Tuesday, Dec. 25.

Funeral services to take place Sunday, Dec. 27, from his residence, 1192 W. Erie st., at 1:30 p.m. by automobiles to Mount Olive.

REID—William John, Dec. 23, aged 58 years, beloved husband of Sarah Stuppy, brother of Mrs. J. Russell.

Funeral Friday, Dec. 25, at 2 p.m., from late residence, 523 N. Springfield av., by auto to Forest Home.

ROSEBAU—Sophie, widow of the late Morris Thebaum, beloved mother of Mrs. Edward L. Glaser, Mrs. Maurice W. Kozminski, Mrs. Daniel N. Eisendoth and Mrs. Harvey S. Austrian; passed to eternal rest Dec. 23, 1914.

Funeral from late residence, 3211 Michigan av., Friday, Dec. 25, 1914, at 10 a.m., by automobiles to Rozee.

SCHNEIDER—Herman, beloved husband of Anna Schneider, fond son of Minnie Schneider, brother of Carl, Louis, Fred and Anna Schneider.

Funeral Friday, Dec. 25, at 2 p.m., from the late residence, 3415 W. Madison av., by auto to Concordia.

June 30, 1921

Dr. Harry Pratt Judson
President, University of Chicago
Chicago, Illinois

My dear Dr. Judson:

Enclosed please find a letter from Mr. James A. Emery, counsel for the League of Industrial Rights at Washington. I think his letter is very fair and conservative. My own opinion is that in going out of our way to give this course of lectures, the university is, in a way, endorsing the administration of Ex-Secretary of Labor Wilson. Whether on account of his fault or because he was overridden, certainly the department during the war was used as a club to force unionism upon the entire country.

Believe me,

Sincerely yours,

Thomas E. Donnelley

TED/WMN
Mr. Donnelley:

Yours of the 30th of June with enclosures is received. I think the statement about Wilson which you enclose is quite near the truth in the matter. We will present the subject no doubt, more or less biased by the trade union point of view. At the same time Marshall thinks he will be especially careful not to be too extreme, and he has in mind arranging another course of lectures from a different point of view if Mr. Wilson comes. His idea is that students in economics ought to hear the subject discussed authoritatively from the different sides. They will hear these sides anyway, but since they are inadequate and unscientifically. Marshall has in mind a very definite plan to cover the whole ground and give the students a chance to hear the best that can be said on both sides of the subject.

Very truly yours,

Mr. T. E. Donnelley,
731 Plymouth Court,
Chicago.
June 28th, 1921.

Mr. Thos. E. Donnelley,
The Lakeside Press,
731 Plymouth Court,
Chicago, Ill.

My dear Mr. Donnelley:

Returning from an extended absence, I found your inquiry of the 22nd.

It is difficult to estimate ex-Secretary of Labor Wilson. He is a fanatical believer in organized labor, but it should be said to his credit that he mellowed during his official term, and had he been stronger physically and mentally he would undoubtedly have been fairer than he was. He could not, however, if he wished, overcome the momentum of a department organized as the instrumentality of union labor in government. Before the war and throughout most of it the Department never gave an inch that Organized labor did not gain, and unquestionably it was an instrumentality of propaganda and organization. Its chief field representatives, and especially the Employment Service, were frankly as much the missionaries and organizers of the Federation as if they had been its paid representatives. Personally, in his addresses, he decidedly changed his point of view and became more liberal, in speech at least, toward unorganized men and open shop employers, while he was surrounded by men who took their orders from the A. F. of L. Building.

Personally, he failed rapidly in health, his wife died of a lingering illness and his family troubles seriously upset him and undoubtedly colored his official action. If he is permitted to lecture as the avowed representative of organized labor in public office, he can present its case and his relation to it interestingly and well, but it would be a serious mistake to permit him to address any audience as an impartial student of the trade union movement or as a mere official observer and critic of its political or economic relations.

I do not recall his precise position respecting the Adamson Act, but I have little doubt that he was in sympathy with the Railway Brotherhoods, for all around him were. But it would be farcical to consider him in public office as other than the selected representative of organized labor in the Cabinet. He used


The war, I mean, was a gradual process that led to the modern era. The technologies of the war and even before the war were developed to aid in the expansion of human knowledge and understanding. The development of communication technologies, such as telegraphy and photography, revolutionized how we perceived the world.

As we entered the 20th century, the world was becoming more interconnected. The two world wars, especially the First World War, were characterized by technological innovations such as airplanes and tanks. These developments not only changed warfare but also impacted civilian life, leading to a more globalized society.

In the post-war period, the concept of international relations began to take shape. The League of Nations, which was created after World War I, was an attempt to prevent future wars through collective security. However, its effectiveness was limited, and the outbreak of World War II was inevitable.

The impact of these wars on society was profound. The loss of life and the destruction of infrastructure were catastrophic. The survivors were left to rebuild, a process that often involved massive efforts from global allies. The experiences of these wars shaped the worldviews and policies that would dominate global politics in the years to come.

In conclusion, the war and its aftermath were critical moments that transformed the course of human history. The technologies developed during these times laid the foundation for the world we live in today.
the powers of his office to further its interests. He may have
sincerely believed that it was a wise thing to do, but whatever
his motive, he did it.

I enclose herewith copy of an address I made to the
Founders on "The Philosophy of the Closed Shop," and at pages 12-13
therein you will observe an account of the manner in which Mr.
Gompers sharply corrected a statement made by the Secretary of
Labor which indicated his belief that a certain statement of labor
members meant that organized labor would agree to a status quo for
the period of the war and would not undertake to close shops that
were open if employers did not undertake to open shops that were
closed. This is a good illustration of what I mean when I say
that his sense of official responsibility would have modified his
union convictions and attachment if he had been a stronger man.
As a young man and a leader of a miners' union - he was for many
years secretary of the Miners' national organization - he was con-
victed and punished for the violation of an injunction. As Secre-
tary of Labor, he attended conventions of the A. F. of L., in
which he frankly stated that while his Department represented un-
organized as well as organized labor, he knew no way in which the
Government could deal with labor except it be organized, and in
that way he undertook to justify his support of all organized move-
ments.

If the University desires to permit a union man to
interpret the union movement, with the distinct understanding that
he gives a representative union viewpoint, his presence on their
lecture platform is justified. On any other basis, he is not a
safe nor a sound interpreter of the relations of organized labor
to our form of government, or our people.

I am,

Very truly yours,
Dear Sir:

The enclosed notice seems to justify the growing opinion of Chicago people that the university is a hotbed of socialism and every other "ism", except Americanism.

The recognition referred to by the Tribune, is at once a disgrace to the university, its management and to your men who are sleeping in France.

It is very strange that the men whose non-socialistic money has built up your institution and continues to support it, will permit such a condition to exist.

Had it not been for the accumulation of wealth, your scatter-brained, misfit students would not have the privilege of a college education for thirty cents on the dollar, and Chicago would not be burdened with men of such ilk.

Fortunately, the sober-minded people of America know that socialism is simply an alias for failure, incapacity and incompetence, and it is a natural result that such men would want to profit by the brains and ability of the commonwealth, and wish to divide what they, themselves, could never earn.

God help America if its average citizen...
is ever judged by the standard of a Lovett, a Robbins, a Reitman or a Buck. They are all tarred with the same stick.

In common with other men of my acquaintance, I shall continue to lift up my voice, both at home and abroad, against the University of Chicago, and am glad to know that in some instances, it has borne fruit.

Yours truly,

[Signature]

To H. P. Judson, President,
University of Chicago,
Chicago, Illinois.

Friday, May 16, 1919.
Dear Sir:

The enclosed notice seems to signify that the growing opinion of Chicago people is that a body of socialist students here, and that the newspaper notice has the usual inaccuracies. The recognition referred to by the Tribune, is once in a while by the university, its management and grace by the who are working in your men.

It is far better to have an answer. It is far better in our non-socialist community to support the University and continue to support the institution than to permit such a condition to exist. Had it not been for the agitation of socialists, your letter would have missed college education for the average of a dollar, and Chicago would not be burdened with men of such ilk.

Unfortunately, the sober-minded people of America know that socialism is simply an for failure, incapacity and incompetence, and it is a natural result that men would want to profit by the brains of the Commonwealth, and wish divide what they themselves, could never

Very truly yours,

H.P.J.

Mr. H. Rowland Curtis
315 N. Euclid Ave.
Oak Park, Illinois
Dear Sir,

Your communication of the 16th instant, relating to the payment of the fees on bicycle use, I received yesterday. At the same time, I regret to say that the newspaper notice does not contain an essential point in our history of the bicycle. If it were possible to have this matter considered, it is to be regretted to have been neglected. It is of the utmost importance to have some news of the latest developments in the field of bicycle use, and the opinion to which you refer is a very valid opinion, which I am convinced is shared by many in the field.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]
Dear Mr. Fiske:

Twelve or fifteen years ago the question was raised in the University of Chicago whether the Faculty should take any cognizance of the public utterances of its members. After much discussion a resolution was adopted almost unanimously by the Faculty, expressing its opinion on this point.

That resolution, as I recall it, was the best pronouncement on the subject, which I have ever seen,
and I am wondering if it would be possible for me to get a copy of it.

I ask because I am to attend a meeting where topics of general university interest are to be discussed, and a copy of the question in question would be very helpful.

Please do not trouble too much to arrange for it, and if you should find it and send it to me, will you also let me know whether there would be any objection to its publication or to the reading of it in a public meeting.

Yours very sincerely,

Frank F. Abbott
Chicago, December 15, 1914

My dear Abbott:—

Mr. Fiske has sent me your note of the 3d inst. Herewith I am enclosing a copy of an action by the University Congregation taken in 1899. I trust that this is what you have in mind.

With all best wishes, I am,

Very truly yours,

H.P.J. - L.

Professor Frank Frost Abbott,
119 Fitz Randolph Road,
Princeton, New Jersey.
December 15, 1939

My good Appoite:

Mr. Steger has sent me your note of the

4th. I enclose a copy of an action

by the University Corporation taken in 1933. I trust

that this is what you have in mind.

With all best wishes, I am,

Very truly yours,

H.P. L.

Professor Mark Appoite
151 West Hanover Road
Princeton, New Jersey.