the question of eligibility to vote at a primary. It should be rigidly guarded so that neither party can flood the primaries of the other party. To my mind the test is the having voted the party ticket at the last preceding national convention that is either for presidential electors or for member of congress. The parties, as a matter of fact, are national parties formed on national issues, and whoever acts with a party on such issues is entitled to a voice in all party primaries. An exception of course might be made in favor of one who is abstaining his vote for the first time.

Other matters seem to me of altogether secondary importance. If we can secure an added protection of the primary poles on the one hand, and the nomination of all candidates within the state by direct primary vote on the other hand, we shall take a long step in advance.

I may add that personally I am extremely skeptical about the advisability of a nomination by a mere plurality. The analogy of a primary election and the final public election is not sound. The purpose of the final election is to designate a person who may hold a public office. The purpose of the primary election is to designate a candidate who will be a good candidate of the party for the election. The two things are quite different. I am strongly inclined to believe that nomination by a
The question of eligibility to vote as a Primary candidate should be formally managed so that neither party can exploit the provisions of the other party. To maintain the two major parties, the primary vote of the last resort is the last resort. If the primary vote does not fall into the last resort, it must not be used. The matter of party membership as a matter of party commitment and the matter of party affiliation are of a different nature.

In the absence of a party, any member of a committee, or a party affiliate, may vote for a person who is a member of a committee, or a party affiliate, to maintain or to affiliate to.

The first time the matter seems to me at the start of the primary vote, it goes without saying that the matter of the primary vote may be conclusive. I do not see a case for preventing the primary vote from being conclusive. I do not see a case for preventing the primary vote from being conclusive.

I say that the extraordinary I am extremely explicit. I support the possibility of a nomination by a mere portion.

The selection of a primary vote and the primary vote as a primary vote are the purpose of the last resort. To so designate the primary vote and the primary vote as an extraordinary I am extremely explicit. I say that the extraordinary I am extremely explicit.
plurality will result very frequently in the nomination of a candidate whom a majority of the party— in many cases even a large majority of the party may strongly disapprove. However, that point does not seem to me so important as the others.

Apologizing for taking your time, I am

Very truly yours,
Pluralist will react very negatively to the nomination of a candidate who is a majority of the party in most cases. Even a large majority of the party can strongly outweigh. However, that point does not seem to me so important as the others.

I am very grateful for taking your time. I am

Apologies for taking your time. I am
Chicago, Ill., November 9, 1907.

Mr. Harry Pratt Judson,
President University of Chicago,
Chicago, Ill.

My dear Prof. Judson:—

I am in receipt of your letter of November 4th, relating to the Direct Primary Bill, and am, indeed, glad to have your views. I note what you say about the Percentage Primary Bill. My first choice, as I have stated on the floor of the Senate, is for a percentage plurality bill, in which the candidate receiving the highest number of votes, provided it exceeds, say, 25 or 35 per cent, shall be the nominee; otherwise, the nominee to be chosen by a Convention. Prior to the passage of the Oglesby Bill by the House, I suggested that the simplest and most satisfactory way, to my mind, to deal with the direct primary question, was to amend the law which the Supreme Court has just held invalid, by correcting the features which the Court held to be unconstitutional. I pointed out how these corrections could readily be made. I proposed, further, that the law be amended to eliminate the feature of instructed delegates, and to provide for a direct popular vote, which should nominate the candidate having the highest number of votes received more than a definite percentage, — say 25 or 35 per cent; otherwise, the nomination to be made by the Convention.
My dear Mr. Adams:

I am in receipt of your letter of November 6th and am pleased to say that I was able to return your letter of November 13th. I am sorry to learn that you have been ill for some time but I am grateful to hear that you are now feeling better.

The recent events have added to the pressures of the moment and I hope that you will soon be able to resume your normal activities. I am confident that you will be able to continue to contribute to the causes that are close to your heart.

I hope that you will continue to keep me informed of your plans and activities. I am always at your disposal to assist in any way that I can.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Office of the Governor

MT. VERNON, ILL.

November 9, 1920

Washington, D.C.

Mr. Franklin D. Roosevelt

Attorney General

Dear Mr. Roosevelt,

I am pleased to receive your letter of November 7th. I understand that you are in the process of preparing for the election and I wish you every success.

I am concerned about the state of the country and the need for strong leadership in these difficult times. I believe that your experience and your dedication to public service make you an ideal candidate for the office of President of the United States.

I am looking forward to your visit to our state and I am confident that your message will be well received.

Yours truly,

[Signature]
I think it is now the consensus of opinion that this would have been the wisest course to follow. When, however, the House passed the Oglesby Bill by two-thirds majority, and secured the necessary majority by making a compromise with the Democrats, I became firmly convinced that it was not practicable to put through a law such as I suggested, and that it was necessary to accept the Oglesby Bill, substantially as passed by the House, or nothing. I still feel that it is extremely doubtful whether we shall secure any primary legislation, unless it be substantially the Oglesby Bill as passed by the House.

I agree with you that the Oglesby Bill contains some defects, although I believe that, for a direct plurality bill, it is as fair and just as any direct plurality bill that has ever been drawn.

We are confronted in the Legislature with a number of conditions which, perhaps, are not fully understood by the general public. The Democrats are solidly for a plurality primary law, and are opposed to a percentage plurality law. The greater number of the members from the southern half of the State are committed to a straight plurality law and are unwilling to accept a percentage plurality plan as a compromise. In many of these communities, nominations have been made for many years, by consent, along the line of the plurality nomination. In view of this condition, and the fact that there are many members who are committed to the direct plurality proposition, it is my opinion that the only way to secure effective legislation is to go to the straight plurality plan and then work gradually backward by amendment, to remove the defects which may be developed in this system. I believe that the working of such a system will develop defects, and I believe that such defects, as they
I think it is now the common sense of opinion that the time

have been the sweet seasons of October. Never, however, the House

needs the Greek bills to two-fifths majority, and second the

necessary majority to make a compromise with the Democrats.

because I am myself a moderate, and that it was necessary to secure the

Greeley bill, not temporarily as necessary for the House to operate,

I think it is true that it was necessary to secure a majority for

and minority legislation, unless it be temporarily the Greek

bill as necessary for the House.

I agree with you that the Greeley bill containing none of

cease, although I believe that for a great principle, will be as

vast if not large as any other philosophy will not have been


We are committed to the legislature with a number of con-

strong which, because, are not fully understood by the people.

The Democrats are commit to a philosophy primary law, and the so-

have to become a philosophy primary law, the greater number of the men

promise the continuance of the Greek bill, are the majority to secure a philosophy

primary law that say, the majority to secure a philosophy

philosophy primary law, and the continuance of the Greek bill,

the private continuance. In view of these commitments, nominations

have been made for many years, by a majority from the time of the

private continuance. In view of the continuance, my the fact that

there are many members, who are committed to the Greek bill,

proposition it is my opinion that the only way to secure effective

representation to be to the strength of an interest, to where the facts may be

generated in this manner. I believe that the working of many a wa-

tory all, developed filaments, and I believe they make character, as they
arise, can be studied and corrected by amendment.

As to the features of the bill which the Senate struck out, relating to the selection of party committeemen, I am firmly committed to the idea of having party committeemen selected by popular vote. I believe that it is in the line of progress, and is the just and fair thing. I do not believe that any political leaders who may, for the time being, be in control of the party machinery, have the right to perpetuate themselves in power by the present round-about system through the control of delegates to Conventions. I believe that reform in the political parties demands the direct selection of party leaders by the electors.

As to the selection of presidential electors, I think it is purely perfunctory, and I am not concerned particularly as to their selection. As to delegates to the National Convention, however, I believe it is of the utmost importance that the electors of the party should select the delegates. My criticism of the action of Speaker Cannon and those who were associated with him, in attempting to strike out of the Oglesby Bill the selection of delegates to the National Convention, was two-fold. First, I believe that the people are entitled to select these delegates, and that the selection should be in the most direct manner, — that is, by popular vote; in the second place, I criticized the amendment because it merely strikes out of the Oglesby Bill the features relating to the selection of National delegates, and substitutes in place thereof, nothing. It substitutes no lawfully conducted plan for the selection of national delegates. It leaves their selection wholly to the whim of the political leaders. If Speaker Cannon's ideas are to prevail, it means that the delegates to the National Convention from Illinois
As to the selection of the bill which the Senate adopted, I am firmly com-
mitted to the selection of party committees, as in the past.

In this connection, I am not opposed to the use of party committees, but in the past I
vote. I believe that it is in the line of progress, and in the past,
I have not been one to oppose party committee work. The
past time paper, I am not opposed to the party committee, but in
the light of experience, I am not opposed to the party committee as a
system of selecting committees to handle the measure, because
there is a better in the party system the tendency to

as to the selection of the bill committee, I think it is
important. Republican and I am not opposed to the party
committees. It is to the selection of the committee that
the selection of the committee is the most important
point in the whole selection of the committee. In

Republicanism, as to the selection of the party committee, as a
system of selecting the committee, I am not opposed to the
party committee. It is to the selection of the committee that
the selection of the committee is the most important.

In the House and Senate, I am not opposed to the
party committee. It is to the selection of the committee that
the selection of the committee is the most important.
will be selected, two from each Congressional District by the Congressional Committeemen, and the delegates at large by the State Committeemen; or it will mean that there will be "soap-box" primaries held without the sanction of law and without the protection of law, for the selection of delegates to Congressional Conventions, and for the selection of delegates to a State Convention, which Conventions will have no other duty to perform than that of selecting national delegates. In such extra legal primaries, the political leaders can control as they see fit, because very few voters will take sufficient interest to go to the primaries, and even if voters do take an interest, they would be unable to select such delegates as would choose the national delegates whom the people would want. It seems to me ridiculous to select, say, 50 delegates to a Congressional Convention, whose only duty is to meet in Convention and select two delegates to a National Convention. Why not have the people vote for the two delegates to the National Convention direct, in stead of voting for the 50 delegates to the Congressional Convention?

The political leaders would be able to dictate absolutely who should be the national delegates, - first, because they would control the "soap-box" primaries and could elect such delegates as they pleased, and would be able to count upon the absence of the great majority of the electors of the party from the polls; second, of the delegates elected, there would be very little inducement to attend the Convention, because no candidates would be nominated and the sole work to be performed would be the selection of two national delegates. But a handful of delegates would do all the work, and they would do just what the political leaders had beforehand decided should be done.
will be defeated. Two from each Congressional District by the Congress.

Congressman as it will mean that there will be "mask-pox" influenza.

without the sanction of law and without the prohibition of law,

for the selection of delegates to a State Convention at the State Convention.
Similarly, if the only function of the State Convention was to select the national delegates at large, it seems to me equally ridiculous for the people of the State to go to the polls, either at a regular primary or at a "soap-box" primary, and select some 1,500 delegates, whose sole function is to meet in Convention and select a few national delegates at large. Why not have the people of the State act directly in selecting the delegates at large? Moreover, even if the 1,500 delegates were selected, not more than a handful would pay their expenses to go to Springfield to attend the Convention. There would be no attraction at the State Convention, such as there is now, when important officers are to be nominated. The result would be that the small handful of delegates who did attend would meet to carry out the dictates of the political leaders arranged in advance.

I think, therefore, that the Senate amendments are vicious, because the Oglesby Bill proposes to do away with Conventions entirely, and if that be the policy, then the only way of selecting national delegates is by the vote of the people at the Primary. The Senate amendments provide no means whatever for the selection of national delegates, and I am equally opposed to their selection by the party committeemen or by Conventions, the delegates of which are elected in a round-about way to a Convention which has no duty to perform which would attract full attendance.

I trust I may have an opportunity some time to discuss this question with you in person, but the above will give you some indication as to my views on this subject.
similarity to the only function of the state connection was

to reach the national legislature at home. I know to be a
distinction for the people of the state to go to the polls.

And so far as regards Wyoming or a "good-fox" party, I am not
convinced of the possibilities of 1,000 volunteers, whose sole
mission is to meet in convention and select a few
volunteer delegates to the national legislature, not
wishing to have the people

vote them in. These men will select the legislature of the
state, and I do not know how they will select the

legislature.
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then it might be spent on the affairs of the political


party as a whole. And we must make our the best of the inevitable


losses in session.


I think, therefore, that the Senate is a menace to the


people because the Senate is a menace to the people with connection


entre.


I think it is the Senate that is the problem, not the only way of selecting


men.


It is the Senate that is the problem of the people at the moment. The


Senate is a menace to the people because whatever the Senate


or the national legislature may do, it cannot do what the Senate


can do. It may make many speeches and tell the people,


I cannot say we have an opportunity some time to discuss this


decision with you, but I'm sure you will give you some help.


see our views on this subject.
I believe that primary reform is essential, and that it must come either through a percentage plurality system, which is my first choice, or through a straight plurality system, such as the Oglesby Bill, which is my second choice. Inasmuch as I believe that the percentage plurality plan is not at present feasible in this State, I am firmly committed to a law based on the straight plurality idea.

Awaiting your further advices, I remain,

Yours very truly,

W. Clyde Jones

WCJ-00
(P)
I believe that further reforms in existing and that of
many other African countries have affected political
my first choice of strong and political patience, even so
the offensive will, which in my second choice. However, as I believe
that the Afrikaner political plan to not at present succeed in
the name of my political commitment to a firm stand on the political
integrity issue.

Awaiting your further guidance. I remain

Yours very truly,

[signature]
who ought not to have a vote in them; 3) to secure the possibility of independent voting at local elections.

views. Thanking difficulty of answering these reply and with confidence that political men will be worthy of the matter, I am the right to seat and unseat delegates. It is at least necessary yearly and it is worth while for the legislature to enter into this question further than to secure fair methods in such way as the party may prefer. If a political party prefers to use the convention method, it should have the privilege of doing so. If it prefers to use direct vote, it should have the privilege of doing. The State may well control to the extent of seeing that there is no fraud.

After all the main question to me appears to be the favor of the 9th inst. It seems to me that the only satisfaction of securing the vital things and not endangering satisfactory solution of the plurality vote at the primary election is to be found in the second primary at which choice may be made from the highest two on the list. The only certain thing indicated by a plurality is that the majority of the voters prefer someone else. Moreover, the purpose of a nomination at a primary is to secure an election. Unless, therefore, the nomination is in general accord with party sentiment, the election is endangered. Of course the objection of 

ence comes any way. I cannot regard that as conclusive.

If the matter is worth regulating at all it is worth regulating in the best possible way.

So far as the national delegates are concerned, I am sure that to a certain extent I sympathize with your
November 16th, 1907

Senator W. Clyde Jones

To the Trust & Trust Building Chicago

My dear Senator Jones:

I am interested in your proposition that the primary subject as containing in your letter of the 27th inst. It seems to me that the only satisfaction could be found in the primary vote at the primary election to be held in the second primary meeting which could be made from the highest two on the ticket. The only certain place indicated by a plurality vote is that the majority of the votes for the second primary to the nomination at a primary to become an election. Unless there are the nomination to become a primary with barry sentiment, the election is

unfähige. Of course the operation of the state vote by vote, I cannot agree that as convention.

If the matter be worth mentioning, it would be worth

regulating in the preposterous way.

So far as the national governors are concerned, I

sympathize with your
not to have a vote in them; ($$) to secure the
ability of independent voting at local elections.

The difficulty however is here: the national
convention that political parties have the control of
legislative matters has the right to seat and unseat
delegates. It is at least a fair question, whether it is
worth while for the legislature to enter into this
question further than to secure fair methods in such way
as the party may prefer. If a political party prefers
to use the convention method, it should have the privi-
lege of so doing. If it prefers to use direct vote, it
should have the privilege of so doing. The State may
well control to the extent of seeing that there is no fraud.

After all the main question to me appears to be the
necessity of securing the vital things and not endangering
them by contest over matters of less importance. It
seems to me under correction that the vital things now
for us are 1) to secure a direct primary vote properly
 guarded for all our state and local officers; 2) to protect
these primaries from being swamped by the votes of those
who ought not to have a vote in them; 3) to secure the
possibility of independent voting at local elections.

Thanking you for your courteous reply and with
confidence that in any event our district will be worthily
represented in the matter, I am

Very truly yours,
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November 6th, 1907.

My dear President James:

Your favor of the 5th inst. is received. I appreciate highly the compliment of your invitation and see no reason why it should not be accepted. My understanding is that the address will be about thirty minutes long. If you have a suggestion as to subject I shall be gratified. Naturally, I suppose, it will be connected in some way with the historical event which the date commemorates. I shall be obliged to return by the night train.

Yordially yours,

President E. J. James,

University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, Ill.
Urbana-Champaign, Illinois
November 5, 1907

President Harry Pratt Judson
University of Chicago
Chicago, Illinois

My dear President Judson,

The University of Illinois holds four or five general assemblies of students and professors during the year. One of these assemblies occurs on Illinois Day, December 3, the anniversary of the final admission of Illinois as a state.

We should be greatly pleased if you could act as the orator of the day on that occasion. Your address should be at least thirty minutes long, not exceeding forty-five. The exercises occur in the afternoon, and it will be possible for you to take the nine forty train in the morning, from Chicago, and the six ten p.m. train in the evening, from Champaign, if you find it necessary, though we should hope to have the pleasure of your company as long as you may find it possible to stay with us.

Faithfully yours,

Edward F. S. Jour.

P.S. You may, of course, base your own subject. If an accident will be the professor's subject, this department will cover the matter. I am responsible for the subject of the address. I, Edward F. S. Jour.
February 7th, 1908.

Hon. A. J. Beveridge,
My dear Mr. Judson:—

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

I have your letter of January 21st,
My dear Senator Beveridge:—
calling my attention to H. R. 7597. I thank you for
your favor of the 25th
your suggestions in this matter, which I have carefully
of January. I find on my return from a trip east. I
noted.
appreciate the courtesy of your reply and am interested
With best wishes. I am,
to know the status of the Bill. I am by no means com-
mittcd to any one system so far as these appointments
are concerned, but am anxious only that these appoint-
ments should not be made a matter of ordinary politics
as the census is really a part of the scientific work of
the government. If appointment should be made directly on
recommendation of yourself and some more members of Congress,
there would be no difficulty whatever, but as you know and
I know, if ordinary political methods are followed there
will be a considerable portion of mere politicians on the
staff, and that is bound to militate against the success
of the census work.

Thanking you for your courtesy, I am

Very truly yours,
Mr. A. J. Beveridge
United States Senate, Washington, D.C.

My dear Senator Beveridge:

Your favor of the 8th.

I gather from my return from a trip east of your request that an interview be arranged for the purpose of discussing the question of the P.I.I.I. If you do me the kindness to state the time and place at which you are available, I will be pleased to make an appointment on the same subject. It is a matter of great importance to me, as the question of research is a part of the scientific work of the Government. If an appointment were made definitely on the recommendation of your own and some more members of Congress, there would be no difficulty whatever, but as you know and I know, it is astonishingly difficult to make appointments of that character at the present time.

I am, very truly yours,

[Signature]
My dear Mr. Judson:—

I have your letter of January 21st, calling my attention to H. R. 7597. I thank you for your suggestions in this matter, which I have carefully noted.

With best wishes, I am,

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

Mr. H. P. Judson,
University of Chicago,
Chicago, Ill.
President Seth Low,

281 Fourth Ave., New York.

February 8, 1908.

My dear Mr. Low:—

Your favor of the 8th inst. received. I am entirely familiar with the work of the Federation and shall be pleased to be of any service as a member of the Advisory Council.

Very truly yours,

H. P. Judson

By direction of the Executive Committee of The National Civic Federation I have been asked to appoint an Advisory Council to consist of men in sympathy with our work. The purpose of having an Advisory Council is to affiliate with the Federation a body of representative men in different parts of the country who may be called upon to aid the work of the Federation, thus assuring to us, in different localities, local friends to whom appeal may be made for advice and assistance in case of need. If you are unfamiliar with the work of the Federation, you will get a very good idea of its methods and some of its activities from the Annual Meeting Number of "The National Civic Federation Review" which is mailed to you today.

I have the honor to ask if you will permit the use of your name as a member of the Advisory Council.

Respectfully,

President National Civic Federation.
President Seth Low,

201 4th Ave., New York.

My dear Mr. Low:

Your favor of the 8th inst.

recently. I am entirely familiar with the work of the

Reformation and am pleased to be of any service

as a member of the Ahiacon Committee.

Very truly yours,

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

Dear Sir:

By direction of the Executive Committee of The National Civic Federation I have been asked to appoint an Advisory Council to consist of men in sympathy with our work. The purpose of having an Advisory Council is to affiliate with the Federation a body of representative men in different parts of the country who may be called upon to aid the work of the Federation, thus assuring to us, in different localities, local friends to whom appeal may be made for advice and assistance in case of need. If you are unfamiliar with the work of the Federation, you will get a very good idea of its methods and some of its activities from the Annual Meeting Number of "The National Civic Federation Review" which is mailed to you today.

I have the honor to ask if you will permit the use of your name as a member of the Advisory Council.

Respectfully,  

[Signature]  

President National Civic Federation.
Dear Sir,

In the continuation of the executive committee of the National Civic Federation, I have been asked to extend an invitation to the Executive Committee to meet in order to review the position of the Federation. The purpose of this meeting is to examine the Federal and Provincial representations of the Federation and to consider the position of the Executive Committee in the light of recent developments.

I am confident that the interest and enthusiasm of all members of the Executive Committee will be enlisted in the meeting, and that a most satisfactory conclusion will be reached.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Executive Committee
most important way. But for the United States to enter the
field as a competitor in work of instruction done in graduate
schools hardly seems necessary or becoming.

3. The University Council is put substantially in the
name of the state universities. No doubt the state universities
should have a large and important representation. It is well to
Hon. A. J. Beveridge,
notice, however, that with few exceptions the state universities
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.
are not largely engaged in work of the character in question. For
My dear Sir:
instances, an article published in New York August 30th, 1907,
will be found a timely attention devoted to a bill now pending
before the Senate for the organization of a National University
at Washington. I am much interested in the plan of a National
University and hope that sometime on a suitable basis may be
established. Some facts in the pending bill, however, I beg to
bring to your attention. The institution makes no recognition of this

1. The bill provides for a graduate school leading to the
degree of Doctor of Philosophy. This parallels the work now done
in many existing institutions both on state and private foundation,
and this makes the United States competitors with them in work
of this character. If the University of the United States should
provide simply for research work it would fill a great need. There
cannot be too much work of this character, and all the work done
by state and private institutions would thus be supplemented in

March 16, 1908
a most important way. But for the United States to enter the field as a competitor in work of instruction done in graduate schools hardly seems necessary or becoming.

2. The University Council is put substantially in the hands of the state universities. No doubt the state universities should have a large and important representation. It is well to notice, however, that with few exceptions the state universities are not largely engaged in work of the character in question. For instance, in "Science" published in New York August 30th, 1907, will be found a table showing the number of Doctorates of Philosophy conferred by American universities in the ten years ending with June of that year. The total number is 2715. Of this number 2415 were given by institutions on private foundation and 300 by state universities. Yet the University of the United States in providing for a graduate institution makes no recognition of this important fact.

It seems to me that in the light of these considerations as well as others which might be brought to your attention, this bill will be considered very carefully before it is enacted into a law.

Very truly yours,
THE AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES CLUB
OF LONDON

May 9th, 1908.

My dear Mr. Knowles:

Before leaving for an engagement in Oklahoma, President Judson expressed himself favorably concerning the American Universities Club of London, and instructed me to communicate to you his acceptance of honorary membership and his willingness that his name should be placed on the list of honorary members.

My dear Sir,

Sincerely yours,

D. A. Robertson
Secretary to the President

By the Friendship of Nations formerly an expression, now an actuality, the Anglo-Saxon Races particularly, are knit together intellectually, socially and politically.

American visitors to England no longer feel in a foreign land and many know this country as intimately as they do their native State. Foreshadowed by the Oxford Bequest of the Rt. Hon. the late Cecil Rhodes and by the development of the

American Universities - mental and physical - English-speaking University has now found a common footing and a sympathetic brotherhood which will ever increase.

May 19, 1908.

Answered MAY 18 1908

David A. Robertson
Secretary to the President

Chiago, Illinois

U.S.A.
May 12, 1909

My dear Mr. Knowles,

Before leaving for an extended trip in Oklahoma, I wish to express my sincerest thanks for theAmerican University Club of London, and respectfully to request you to accept on my behalf the following telegram:

"Mr. George G. Knowles, The American University Club of London, Carlton House, Regent Street, London, S.W.

Sincerely yours,

D.A. Robertson
Secretary to the President.

Secretary to the President.

Please place on the list of Honorary Members.

Sincerely yours,

D.A. Robertson
Secretary to the President.
May 9th, 1908.

Answered May 18, 1908.

David A. Robertson,
Secretary to the President.

The President University of Chicago,
Chicago, Illinois,
U.S.A.

My dear Sir,

May I trespass upon your time by the recital of a few facts in connection with the aims and purposes of the above Club.

By the Friendship of Nations formerly an expression, now an actuality, the Anglo-Saxon Races particularly, are knit together intellectually, socially and politically.

American visitors to England no longer feel in a foreign land and many know this country as intimately as they do their native State. Foreshadowed by the Oxford Bequest of the Rt. Hon. the late Cecil Rhodes and by the development of the various International Contests - mental and physical - English-speaking University Men have found a common footing and a sympathetic brotherhood which will ever increase.
There is no common meeting place for American University Men visiting England, and this fact is being constantly deplored throughout the year by those travelling either on business or pleasure.

By the inclusion of British American possessions, a triple alliance is formed and more than one object gained in firmly cementing the cordial relations of University Men of Anglo-Saxon blood.

With this end in view, The American Universities Club of London has been formed. The movement has met with hearty response and encouragement. The Rhodes Scholars at Oxford are forming a committee amongst themselves and we are asking for the co-operation of Graduates and Undergraduates of North American Universities and Colleges and more particularly yourself, as a representative of the intellectual and social life.

We would therefore respectfully ask you to accept an Honorary Membership of The American Universities Club of London and in addition thereto, permission to place your name upon the Committee of Honorary Members.

We are simultaneously extending this invitation to the Presidents of the Universities named below, who would be fellow members with you on such Honorary Committee.

We trust your views may be in accord with the aims of the Club and that you will kindly accept the invitation herewith
There is no common meeting place for American University Men and American University Women. Therefore, American University Men and Women have a common interest in the protection of the American University and the protection of the American University Women. The protection of the American University Women is a matter of serious concern to both American University Men and American University Women.

The American University Women's Association is an organization of American University Women who meet to discuss and work on problems of mutual interest. The Association is open to any American University Woman who desires to participate.

The American University Women's Association is an organization of American University Women who meet to discuss and work on problems of mutual interest. The Association is open to any American University Woman who desires to participate.

The American University Women's Association is an organization of American University Women who meet to discuss and work on problems of mutual interest. The Association is open to any American University Woman who desires to participate.

The American University Women's Association is an organization of American University Women who meet to discuss and work on problems of mutual interest. The Association is open to any American University Woman who desires to participate.

The American University Women's Association is an organization of American University Women who meet to discuss and work on problems of mutual interest. The Association is open to any American University Woman who desires to participate.

The American University Women's Association is an organization of American University Women who meet to discuss and work on problems of mutual interest. The Association is open to any American University Woman who desires to participate.

The American University Women's Association is an organization of American University Women who meet to discuss and work on problems of mutual interest. The Association is open to any American University Woman who desires to participate.

The American University Women's Association is an organization of American University Women who meet to discuss and work on problems of mutual interest. The Association is open to any American University Woman who desires to participate.

The American University Women's Association is an organization of American University Women who meet to discuss and work on problems of mutual interest. The Association is open to any American University Woman who desires to participate.

The American University Women's Association is an organization of American University Women who meet to discuss and work on problems of mutual interest. The Association is open to any American University Woman who desires to participate.

The American University Women's Association is an organization of American University Women who meet to discuss and work on problems of mutual interest. The Association is open to any American University Woman who desires to participate.

The American University Women's Association is an organization of American University Women who meet to discuss and work on problems of mutual interest. The Association is open to any American University Woman who desires to participate.

The American University Women's Association is an organization of American University Women who meet to discuss and work on problems of mutual interest. The Association is open to any American University Woman who desires to participate.

The American University Women's Association is an organization of American University Women who meet to discuss and work on problems of mutual interest. The Association is open to any American University Woman who desires to participate.

The American University Women's Association is an organization of American University Women who meet to discuss and work on problems of mutual interest. The Association is open to any American University Woman who desires to participate.
Thanking you in anticipation, I beg to remain,

Yours faithfully,

Geo. Knowles.

For the Organising Committee. Yale'92

Invitations forwarded for memberships of Committee of Honorary Members to the presidents of the following institutions:

Harvard University.
Yale University.
Columbia University.
Princeton University.
University of Pennsylvania.
John's Hopkins University.
University of Virginia.
The United States Military Academy.
The United States Naval Academy.
Chicago University.
Cornell University.
Vanderbilt University.
Tulane University of Louisiana.
McMaster University. North West Territory. Canada.
Mount Allison University. New Brunswick. Canada.
McGill College and University, Montreal. Canada.
University Laval, Quebec. Canada.
Prince of Wales's College. Prince Edward Island.
Ottowa University. Ottowa. Canada.