Washington, D. C., April 16, 1895.

Dear Sir:—

Desiring to interest you in the effort making to secure the establishment of a National Post-Graduate University at Washington, I have mailed to you Senate documents which deal with that subject, and now take the liberty of asking your careful attention to that subject; not doubting your present familiarity with the facts, that the general proposition originated with the founders of the Republic, and that it has been urged at various times by many of our most illustrious citizens.

Briefly summarized, the leading objects to be gained are these:

1. Such facilities, full and complete, for graduates of the colleges and universities of the country desiring to make post-graduate studies of the most thorough and exhaustive character, as, being now unavailable in the United States, are eagerly sought, and with but partial success in the Old World.

2. More especially facilities of every sort for original work in the various fields of investigation, many of which facilities, in the form of libraries, museums, laboratories, observatories, and the like, are now here and available in a large degree, to say nothing of the hundreds of learned men here gathered, whose services could be utilized to a considerable extent with but little cost; a pre-eminence in such original work, not only for our own country but for the world, being the great end of the University of the United States.
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VI.— Reasons for a renewal of the effort for a National University at this time:
1. The need not only remains, but increases with the years.
2. Since this need can only be met by the nation and can be met by it only at once, it should be the duty of the appointed time.
3. No other important educational measure is now likely to interfere with its consideration by Congress.
4. There is now a marked appreciation of the higher education, as shown by unprecedented benefactions in that behalf. A beginning now on the part of the National Government would be certain to attract large donations from private sources for the endowment of fellowships, professorships, faculties, and departments.
5. The present offers an opportunity for both great political parties to share equally in the honor of establishing it.
6. Present action would enable the Government to make the inauguration of the University an appropriate part of the Columbian celebration in 1890.
7. The growing power of the United States among the nations suggests the corresponding present need of such forces and influences at the seat of Government as shall be worthy to impress and lead the world.

VII.— The proposition of to-day in this:
To urge upon Congress the early establishment of a National University of the highest type—
Whose form of constitution shall secure it against partisan control of every sort—a thing not difficult, as shown by the acknowledged success of State universities and of general scientific institutions controlled by the General Government;
Whose internal management shall be with its professional members;
Whose conditions of admission shall relate to character and competency only;
Whose applicants aiming at degrees shall have received the bachelor’s degree already;
Whose system of scholarships shall be calculated to reward industry and elevate the educational standards of the country;
Whose fellowships shall be duly endowed and open to the world;
Whose professorate shall be so constituted as to secure it the highest possible character and efficiency;
Whose colleges of letters, science, and philosophy shall be centers for the grouping of high professional schools of every class;
Whose beginnings shall be with such means as leave the great undertaking, shall encourage liberal endowments from other than governmental sources, and thus early make of it the leading University of the world.

VIII.— The conditions of success are these:
1. A thorough awakening on the part of all active friends of the proposition.
2. Readiness on the part of all to co-operate in the present undertaking, without regard to minor differences.
3. Systematic organization, with a view to the most effective service.
4. Full unity of plan and purpose, with concentration of forces under a common leadership.

SUMMARY OF CONTENTS.

I.— A great and true University the leading cent of American Education.
II.— The offices of a great University are these:
1. To supplement existing institutions by supplying full courses of post-graduate instruction in every department of learning.
2. By its central faculty and cluster of professional schools of highest grade, to represent at all times the sum of human knowledge.
3. To lead in the upbuilding of new professions by its applications of science.
4. To lead in the world in the work of research and investigation.

III.— Reasons why the Government should establish a University:
1. Neither existing institutions nor the great denominational universities in prospect can meet the demand. The nation only is equal to the founding of such a University as the nation needs.
2. The nation needs the influence of a National University upon the Government.
3. The American system of education can only be made complete by the crowning university it lacks as a source of co-ordinating influence, inspiration, and elevating power.
4. A National University would more strongly than any other attract men of genius from every quarter of the world to its professorships and fellowships, thus increasing the cultured intellectual force of both institution and country.
5. A National University would more strongly than any other attract men of genius from every quarter of the world to its professorships and fellowships, thus increasing the cultured intellectual force of both institution and country.
6. A National University would especially attract students of high character from many lands, whose return after years of contact with free institutions would promote the cause of liberal government everywhere.
7. The founding of a National University would be, therefore, a most fitting thing for a great nation ambitious to lead the world in civilization.

IV.— Reasons for founding such University at Washington:
1. Washington was designated by Father of His Country in his bequest of property in aid of its endowment.
2. Washington is the only efficient and convenient spot where the Government has both exclusive and perpetual jurisdiction.
3. There are in the Government departments and connected therewith vast amounts of material that could be made auxiliary and which, being now partially utilized, are an enormous capital running to waste.
4. There are hands of experts in the department whose services could be more or less utilized with mutual advantage.
5. Such a University there would exert a great influence upon the National Government itself, in every branch and department.

V.— Summary of the notable efforts hitherto made in this behalf:
1. By General Washington at the close of the Revolution, and again soon after the location of the seat of government.
2. By members of the Constitutional Convention, including General Washington and Messrs. Adams, Pinckney, Wilson, Johnson Rutledge, and Franklin.
3. By the following Presidents of the United States, namely:
   George Washington, in—
   His inaugural address;
   His letter to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia;
   His letter to Governor Brooks, of Virginia;
   His letter to Thomas Jefferson;
   His two letters to Alexander Hamilton;
   His last message to Congress;
   His dying request, leaving what, if duly husbanded, would now
   have amounted to nearly four and a half millions of dollars.
   John Adams, inaugural address, March, 1797.
   Thomas Jefferson, message of December, 1806.
   James Madison:
   Message of December, 1810.
   Message of March, 1817.
   Last annual message.
   James Monroe, message of March, 1828.
   John Quincy Adams, first annual message.
   Ulysses S. Grant, annual message of December, 1875.
   Rutherford B. Hayes:
   Annual message of December, 1877.
   Annual message of December, 1878.
4. Efforts to the same end by the founders of the Columbian Institute
   and the Columbian College, in the hope of their becoming at
   length the much-desired National University, to wit, the efforts of
   Drs. Meigs, Cutbush, Williams, and Sewall and of Judge William
   Cranch.
5. The interest manifested in more recent times by distinguished
   statesmen, including—
   Chief Justice Salmon P. Chase.
   General W. T. Sherman.
   Senator Charles Sumner.
   Senator Timothy O. Howe.
   Senator A. H. Garfield.
   Senator Justin S. Morrill.
   Senator Carl Schurz.
   Senator Stanley Matthews.
   Senator L. Q. C. Lamar.
   Senator James R. Doolittle.
   Senator Matthew H. Carpenter.
   Senator John James Ingalls.
   Senator George F. Edmunds.
   Also many members of the House of Representatives, such as Sam-
   uel Shellabarger, George F. Hoar, and James A. Garfield.
6. The interest shown by leading educators throughout the coun-
   try, including the presidents of colleges and universities—e.g.,
   President Hill, of Harvard University.
   President Barnard of Columbia College.
   President White, of Cornell University.
   President Winchell, of Syracuse University.
   President Haven, of Michigan University.
   President Pickard, of Iowa University.
   President Chadbourne, of Wisconsin University.

President Gregory, of Illinois University.
President Head, of Missouri University.
President Holley, of Transylvania University.
President Bowman, of Kentucky University.
President Boyd, of Louisiana University.
President Welling, of the Columbian University.
7. Support of the proposition by State Superintendents of Public In-
   struction in nearly every one of the States.
8. Support of the proposition by eminent scientists, especially—
   Professor Louis Agassiz, of Harvard University.
   Professor Joseph Henry, of the Smithsonian Institution.
   Professor Asa Gray, of Harvard University.
   Professor Benjamin Pierce, former Superintendent of Coast Survey.
   Professor Spencer P. Baird, former Sec'y of Smithsonian Institution.
   Professor H. V. Hayden, United States Geologist.
   Professor John W. Powell, Director of the U. S. Geological Survey.
   Professor E. L. Youmans, of The Popular-Science Monthly.
   Prof. J. Lawrence Smith, pres't Am. Assn. Advancement of Science.
   Professor N. S. Shaler, of Harvard University.
   Admiral Sands, former Superintendent of National Observatory.
   Lieut. W. F. Maury, former Superintendent of the Coast Survey.
   Dr. S. P. Langley, present Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution.
   Dr. Simon Newcomb, Superintendent of the Nautical Almanac.
   Prof. James C. Watson, astronomer, Mich. and Wis. State Univ.
   Prof. T. C. Mendenhall, present Superintendent of the Coast Survey.
9. Its earnest support by eminent writers on educational and na-
   tional themes, such as—
   Dr. Benjamin Rush, signer of the Declaration of Independence.
   Samuel Blodget, author of the first American work on political eco-
   nomy, a work the copyright of which was donated by him as a mod-
   est supplement to the endowment bequeathed by Washington.
   Joel Barlow, U. S. Minister to France under Jefferson's admin.
   Dr. Charles B. Caldwell, of Transylvania University.
   General John Eaton, late Commissioner of Education.
   Dr. William T. Harris, now Commissioner of Education.
   Dr. Andrew D. White, late President of Cornell University.
   Professor Hindale, of Michigan University.
   Dr. William A. Mowry, editor of Education.
   Rev. Dr. George B. Boardman, of Philadelphia.
   Dr. J. C. Pumphrey, of New York.
   Dr. James C. Welling, president of Columbian University.
   Dr. Clark Ridpath, of Indiana.
   Hon. Arthur MacArthur, Associate Justice of Supreme Court D. C.
   Professor E. W. Powell, of New York.
   Dr. G. Brown Goode, of the Smithsonian Institution.
   Professor Herbert B. Adams, of Johns Hopkins University.
10. By that great body of educators, the National Educational Asso-
    ciation, which in three successive annual meetings unanimously
    endorsed the proposition to found a National University, which
    approved the bill introduced in Congress in 1878, and whose per-
    manent committee is still in the field.
11. By the general committee of three hundred of the Pan Republic
    Congress organization of the United States, at its late meeting in
    Independence Hall, and by the Human Freedom League.
Personal,

4 Iowa Circle, Washington, D. C. October 16, 1895

Dear Sir:—

In view of your deep interest in the National University enterprise, your right to know what has been done and is doing, and my desire for your advice on some points, I write this letter to acquaint you more fully with what has been accomplished since the adjournment of Congress, with the work now in progress, and with what plans are formed for the immediate future, in order that we may present the strongest possible front when the time shall have come for action in Congress.

When I came again to Washington, in 1891, for a renewal of the struggle for a National University, it was my thought to form a strong National "Association" for the promotion of the enterprise; but after a wide correspondence with leading men, including yourself, if I mistake not, the conclusion was finally negative, in view of the unwieldiness of such a body, with its sub-associations, and the inference it would authorize of a protracted siege. On the other hand it was feared that an early Conference, with its risks of small attendance, and lack of preparation through insufficient
Dear Sir—

In view of your recent interest in the subject

...
exchange of views by previous correspondence, and with the consequent danger of hasty action, would be most unfortunate.

Accordingly, after the conclusion of the World's Fair, which interrupted everything for so long a time, and the failure of the Senate Committee to carry their Bill, as they had expected to do, during the last session, I advised with friends with whom I had long ago discussed the alternative forms of general action, and determined upon the formation of a National Committee, to include one hundred or more distinguished men from many walks; especially statesmen found to be in sympathy with the broad and far-reaching views of President Washington and so many of his illustrious successors; the heads of colleges and universities, as well as of the various national bureaus and organizations that would be consulted by Members of Congress; and the heads of popular educational departments in the several States. Such National Committee would need to meet but seldom and would have an efficient working body composed of its own members, conveniently located for prompt practical service. This body, known, perhaps, as the Executive Council would be formed of seven to fifteen men of high character who would hold meetings as often as required, and, with the help of active members
of the Committee generally, devise and execute all necessary measures, — would be, in fact, the directing and moving power in the university enterprise, at this national centre.

Thereupon, I opened an extensive correspondence with the heads of all the colleges and universities of the country, excepting those understood to be at once denominational and too deeply interested in their own enterprises at Washington to be available; with the State Superintendents of Education; with the heads of all scientific and literary organizations likely to have influence with Members of Congress from their several States; finally with many statesmen, not in office, and with men of affairs of national reputation; sending to each and all a set of the Senate documents dealing with this subject.

The result of all these labors appears, in part, from the accompanying "Partial List"; but only in part, for in some instances persons of great importance to our cause were won only by a succession of letters in discussion of the subject; and "in part", again, because nearly every day brings some important recruit, with questions as to how outside help can be most effectively rendered.
Besides these efforts in the way of forming a strong Committee, I have lately sent out communications to all State Superintendents and College Presidents who have joined us, to incite them to immediate action in the way of reaching their Members of Congress, while still at home, and inducing others to do the same; holding themselves in readiness for such further action as our Committee may recommend. I am also preparing a circular letter to such Presidents and State Superintendents as have not yet joined our standard; meaning, if possible, to win them to our cause.

The next step will be the formation of the "Executive Council", in order that it may at once assume its proper functions; determining whether it will be wise to hold the early meeting of which we have talked; providing for the formulation of the National Committee's appeal, or other appeals, to Congress; making the most careful and thorough revision of the Bill to be introduced; and devising some way of creating a reasonable Promotion Fund, out of which may be paid all expenses necessary to the most vigorous prosecution of the work on every line. If such committee were wisely formed at once, and, say, of men like Chief Justice Fuller,
to better understand the scope of the project and its implications. In conclusion, I have identified several key elements that require further exploration and analysis. These elements include:

1. Market trends and competitive landscape
2. Customer needs and preferences
3. Technological advancements
4. Regulatory frameworks

I believe these elements are crucial for the success of the project. As such, I recommend that we allocate resources and time to thoroughly investigate these areas.

Thank you for your attention to these points. If you have any questions, please feel free to ask.
Ex-Senator Edmunds, Dr. William Pepper, Hon. Andrew D. White, Ex-Gov. John Lee Carroll, Gen. Horace Porter, Dr. William R. Smith, Ex-Senators A. H. Garland and Eppa Hunton, Gen. John Eaton, Dr. J. Brown Goode, Dr. Gardiner G. Hubbard, Hon. John A. Kasson, and the Chairman of the National Committee (all of them at Washington, or within easy reach, while representing all great divisions of the country) something would be done and both the Country and Congress would give attention.

Please favor me with your own views on any matter involved, especially telling me what you think of a Council thus constituted and whether the naming of it to the members of the National Committee, as I now do, for their approval, which is hereby requested, would not be a proper way of creating it.

I remain faithfully and cordially yours,

[Signature]

Chairman, National University Committee.

To: President W. H. Harper, LL. D.,
University of Chicago.
Dear [Name],

Thank you for your interest in the position of Executive Committee Chair. Your credentials and experience are impressive, and I am confident that you would be an excellent fit for this role.

I have reviewed the position description and believe that your background in [field] makes you a strong candidate. Your [specific qualifications or experiences] align perfectly with the requirements listed.

Please feel free to contact me with any questions you may have.

Thank you for your interest in this opportunity. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely,

[Your Name]
The president of the United States
was Washington, D.C.
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Edwin F. Bales
February 15, 1896.

Pres't W. R. Harper, Ph.D.,
Chicago University,
Chicago, Ill.

My dear Sir:-

A Bill has been introduced into both the Senate and the House of Representatives for the establishment of the University of the United States, to be supported and controlled by the government. The said Bill has been read twice in both Houses and referred to appropriate committees. There are some indications that these committees may report favorably. It is not so probable that the Bill will become a law during this session.

There are a great many citizens and educators who do not think the establishment of such a National University would be wise, and feel that it is important that some one should at the present stage of the measure give reasons why the Bill should not become a law, and the proposed University, a fact. We have secured the promise of a Hearing from both the Committee of the Senate and the Committee of the House. The exact date of the Hearing has not been fixed, but is likely to be within a week or two. We would like to know your personal conviction with reference to the measure, and if you feel disposed to send some word that might be used with the Committees; or if you would authorise us to simply say that you are not in favor of the measure, it would be helpful, and we would be very much obliged.

Yours sincerely,

Samuel L. Beiler.
Vice-Chancellor.

Dr. J. L. E. Curry is outspoken against proposed Bill.
October 5, 1936

Dear Mr. Harper, Ph.D.

Chicago University

Chicago, Ill.

My dear Sir:

A bill has been introduced into both the Senate and the House of Reps. to re-establish the University of the University of the United States to be supported and controlled by the Government. The said bill has been read twice in both house and referred to appropriate committees.

There are some indications that these committees may report favorable. It is not so probable that the bill will become a law during this session.

There are a great many critics who believe that re-establishment of such a National University would be wise, and feel that it is important that some one promote at the proper stage of the measure.

The reason why the bill should not become a law, and the proposed University, is not.

We have become the owner of a university from both the advantages and the disadvantages of the Senate.

The exact date of the Senate and the Committee of the House, and the Committee of the Senate, but as I am not here, I am unable to give you the precise date.

We are not in favor of the measure, and we would very much appreciate it if you would approve it.

Very much obliged.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Vice-Consul
Arguments vs. A National University.

1. It is a grave question whether the General Government of the United States has the constitutional right to enter the field of general education. The training of soldiers and sailors, and the care of the wards of the Nation (Indians, etc.), admittedly belong to the government. Mr. Pepper, at the hearing on this Bill before the Committee on Education, asked, “Since this matter has been agitated for a hundred years, why has the University of the United States not been organized before?” He did not answer. The measure has been defeated again and again on constitutional grounds.

Efforts were made to incorporate in the constitution, among the powers of the General Government, the power to organize the University of the United States, but this was again and again defeated. Such efforts would not have been made had there not been grave doubts as to the power of the General Government under the constitution.

Practically, also, general education has been turned over to the States. This has been the recognized theory of the country. In harmony with this, the General Government has given large grants of land to the different States for educational purposes, and even for the founding of State Universities. From this standpoint, it can be seen that the existence of State Universities offers no argument for a National University.

The need of such an institution was much greater fifty to one hundred years ago than now. General education lagged away behind. Private beneficence was not sufficient to establish a great university. Now this condition is changed; great universities exist, and greater ones are being created. There is no need to establish a National University in the face of this question of constitutional right.

2. The financial condition of the country at present makes the organization of the University of the United States a serious question. The Bill, No. 2906, only calls for $15,000 before July 1, 1897, and $25,000 for the year ending July 1, 1898. This, however, is only the entering wedge; such a movement will soon call for millions from the Treasury of the Government. The Senate Bill, it is true, sets apart the income from the sale of public lands. But this is money, and there is no assurance that the claims of the University will be limited to these sources.

Mr. Pepper, of Pennsylvania University, said at the hearing before the Committee on Education, “Because of the immense facilities at Washington, a National University will require little money.” He must have been speaking figuratively. He has been asking for a large amount for Pennsylvania University as a necessity.

Mr. Hoyt, who is so active in pushing this Bill, says, in his “Memorial in regard to the National University,” page 19, that the first of all reasons for founding a National University is that, “The task of planting and endowing a true university is herculean, requiring an amount of means not hitherto furnished nor likely to be furnished without the help of the Nation. Great munificence has been practiced here and there in recent years by noble-hearted Americans, whose gifts have far eclipsed the benefactions of all other countries and times; but the endowments thus accorded, besides being insufficient, are ever liable to be in some manner restricted, so as more or less to embarrass the administration of them. On the other hand, the United States—richest, most powerful, and most progressive of all nations—could easily confer such an endowment on an institution of its own founding as to make it very soon foremost in all the world in point of resources and possibilities.” This means that the University of the United States must have a much larger income than Harvard, Columbia, or Chicago University.

Mr. Pepper also said that the facilities are here, and there should be a university to use them. He afterwards said, “In a score of years, there will be a dozen denominational universities in Washington.” Why, then, should the Government expend millions of dollars to erect another?
Mr. White, of Cornell, said, referring to Professor Newcomb as endorsing his statement, "We are now developing better laboratories in this country than any foreign countries possess," which is, of course, being done, under present conditions, without a National University. Why not be content, then, with what the Government is doing; or, if it must do more, why not simply strengthen the work that is being done? If there are to be a dozen universities in Washington within a score of years, there is no danger of the facilities aggregated here lying dormant.

3. There has been, and is to-day, decided fear of legislative control in educational matters. It is claimed that the President and whole Faculty have been changed in State institutions for political reasons. An article in "The Nation," of January 23, 1896, emphasizes this point. Various professors in different universities have denounced for having opinions on the Venezuelan question. They would, doubtless, receive more than denunciation were they under legislative control. Furthermore, legislative control has not been a success in the States. While Michigan University is an admitted success, it is only through fearful trials and adversities. President Adams wrote of it: "It has been injured by unwise legislation far more than it has been augmented by direct appropriation." No scholarly citizen of Ohio would think of boasting of her legislative management of her two oldest universities—Athens and Oxford. Fifty years ago they had some strength compared with other institutions, but they have dwindled into comparative insignificance. The University of Virginia has done good work, but is to-day overshadowed by Johns Hopkins on the North and by Vanderbilt on the West, both the result of private munificence.

Harvard, Yale, and Columbia were once aided by State appropriations, but their real growth and magnificence have only come since they have depended upon voluntary support—the recognized principle underlying university education in this country.

4. The action of foreign governments is no criterion for our government. In those countries they have a union of Church and State. We have not. There the State controls and supports the work of the university, largely as it does the work of the State Church. There the governments under which the universities were founded were monarchies, and the instruction in the universities could be given something of unity. It is a form of paternalism that would not be acceptable in America. Our government is conducted by parties; these parties change; instruction must change with them. Moreover, foreign governments have had trouble with this question. Gladstone desired to create a national university in Ireland. To do this he decided to remove from Dublin University its denominational character. To accomplish this, he proposed to throw out the theological faculty entirely, then to remove from the curriculum studies in moral philosophy or ethics, and also all instruction in modern history, because of the religious questions, as well as governmental questions, that were involved in them. This so offended various parties in Ireland and England that the measure was defeated in Parliament, and Gladstone was compelled to resign.

5. Why should the General Government become a competitor with the churches of America, and with private beneficence, in a field that has been left to them for more than 100 years, and in which millions are now invested? In the first place, it will be a competitor for students with those institutions which are now doing post-graduate work. The Bill offers free scholarships in the ratio of one to each Representative and Delegate in Congress, and two for each Senator, and there is a clause asking for the establishment of fellowships which shall yield partial and full support to young men who are engaged in study. This bid for students will make it a strong competitor with other institutions, even if its work is not so satisfactory. Senator Edmunds said in the hearing referred to, "This University will not be the same as others. It begins where others leave off." He evidently refers to the colleges that are in existence, and must have lost sight of the post-graduate work now being done by Harvard, Yale, Columbia, Chicago, Johns Hopkins, and other universities. It certainly cannot begin where these leave off. Other universities are training specialists. It is the purpose of the American University of Washington, D. C., to cover exactly the same ground proposed by this Bill for the University of the United States. The American University has $1,000,000 subscribed, and will begin building in March, 1896.
It will also be a competitor with existing institutions for gifts. It will, doubtless, cause many to say, "If the Government will do this work of education, I need not give anything toward it." It will cut the nerve of private beneficence. Universities that might otherwise be well endowed, will be left to struggle in poverty. When the Committee asked Mr. White of Cornell whether the establishment of the proposed university would not endanger gifts to such institutions as Harvard or Chicago, he replied that he thought not, but that it would help them, and yet immediately after said that gifts from individuals of large amounts will doubtless come to the University of the United States, and the Bill before the House really puts this proposed University in the position of already asking gifts, thus making it a direct competitor. It proposes to make the Government pay 5% for all time on such gifts made to the University, and thus strengthens its bid for the benevolence of the public. Why should the General Government thus enter into competition with institutions already existing, in which millions have been invested? Would it not be as fair for it to enter into manufacturing?

6. It is proposed in the Bill referred to, that in the University of the United States, "neither sectarian nor partisan preference shall be allowed in any form." In the first place it is doubtful whether this can be carried out. On the other hand it is believed that the control of the National University must be political. Washington urged the creation of a National University from political considerations; Jefferson also urged it for political reasons. In this country, governed by political parties, it has been said the only education the Government ought to undertake is political education. It will be hard, under existing conditions, for anyone in such a university to have any real loyalty or interest in public affairs, without having some partisan preferences. It is difficult to see how anyone in this country can have any religious belief without having some sectarian preferences. Practically, if sectarian preferences are not to be allowed, the University must be thoroughly agnostic or infidel.

In the second place, this clause would so limit the proposed University of the United States that it could not do full university work, and would not deserve the name of university. Certainly there could not be a theological faculty, which is a recognized part of every true university. It could not teach philosophy without discussing theism, atheism, pantheism, or agnosticism with some preferences. How could it teach history, and not touch on religious wars? The Reformation, and not offend Catholics? How could it teach psychology, a great department in universities to-day, without discussing the religious element in human nature? How could it teach ethics, finding a sufficient basis for right and wrong, and leave God out, His moral govern-ment, as well as the questions involved in the divine sovereignty and human freedom? How could it teach political economy, theories of finance, etc., not having any preference for free trade or tariff, gold standard or bimetallism? How could it teach science even, without any implications showing religious preferences? How could it teach biology, and treat of the origin of life, without the Creator? How could it deal with the great theory of evolution without discussing its agnostic and atheistic implications? These questions might go on almost indefinitely. They only show that if there is to be neither sectarian nor partisan preferences in any form you must eliminate all the higher realm of thought and make your university deal with material facts only. It can never rise above the dirt of materialism. Would such an institution be worthy of the name of University of the United States and of the most intellectual and Christian country in the world?

7. The above paragraph shows that the proposed measure is not practical. In the words of Professor Seaver, Superintendent of Public Schools, Boston, it does not give "any promise of usefulness," "and a National University charged with instruction, would not be a good thing." The scheme is not urged by many practical educators, but is being pushed by a theorist. It would be a fresh field for political machinations, and, like the president, and even the faculty, of many State institutions, would be a perpetual lobby for more and more funds from the Treasury of the United States.

8. There are serious objections to the bill itself: First. The grave questions which Mr. White of Cornell raised at the hearing are already in the minds of many. The name "University of the United States" would mean centralization, which is now being objected to by many throughout the country. To others it would mean domination, of which many others are afraid. The domineering spirit already
manifest in some of our State institutions would be increased an hundred-fold in an institution which had behind it the authority of the General Government. It would soon assume to control and direct the educational work of the whole country.

Second. The proposed Board of Regents is chiefly a political body; the President of the United States and nine others appointed by him, and confirmed by the Senate, would be subject to political influence and change. Even if the other five ex-officio members of the Board are not politicians, this makes two-thirds of the Board of Regents political. The choice of twelve educators from as many States to make up the Council would be difficult, for no partisan or sectarian preferences are to be allowed. It would mean that no Church institution could be represented on the Board unless men were chosen who are willing to sacrifice what should be their most sacred principles.

Third. The Governing Board is so made up as to be impracticable. Ex-President White of Cornell, at the hearing, expressed his doubts with reference to this part of the Bill. He has had so much experience that he knows it would be impossible to conduct a university with the governing body made up after this manner. Superintendent of Schools Seaver describes it as “loose.” It certainly is not compact and workable. President Eliot pronounced it “an absurdity.” That the Board made up of men so scattered over the country, so intensely busy with their present duties, so divided by the interests already in their hands, could conduct with necessary unanimity a great university that requires constant supervision in all its details, is simply an impossibility. The State Universities, small in comparison and with limited area, afford no comparison to this. The Smithsonian is not a similar institution for its regents give no attention to details.

Fourth. The dual board—not two houses for the same thing, but one to control the financial administration and the other the educational functions—would not be practical. The two would perpetually clash. Each would think itself of greater importance than the other. The regents would hold the purse strings, refusing to pay for work or professors that did not suit them. The Council would insist upon its right to appoint all instructors, and to direct all educational work. Such arrangements have been tried in various institutions and have always been a source of trouble, and sometimes the cause of disintegration and ruin.

9. The reference to University Square is either intended to deceive, or the authors of the Bill are not acquainted with the locality of the proposed site. This reference would make the impression that the square is all the ground that will be asked for, and not that it is meant to be used as may be deemed advantageous by the Board of Control. It certainly is not the place for a university. The bureau that urges this Bill would not take its office down there onto a little knoll, amid flats, by the river bank, surrounded by unpaved streets and hovels, where stags and miasmas so abound that the Naval Observatory had to move to higher ground. It is hard to believe that this suggestion is not a blind to cover a necessity that will soon arise—the purchase of a site for the university elsewhere.

10. There are no limits of any kind in this Bill. When the Government is committed to it, there will be no limit to the amount asked for the purchase of a site, for the erection of buildings, for the purchase of equipments, and for current expenses. There is no limit put upon its work. It may include work that is not above the High School grade. The temptation will be to organize departments below the grade of the ordinary colleges, in order to secure a larger number of students, and do work that is demanded by an unscholarly and practical public.
Pres. William R. Harper, L.L.D.

Univ. of Chicago, Ithaca, New York, Feb. 5, 1897.

Dear Sir:

It is proposed to bring before as many persons as possible on the coming 22nd of Feb., the thought of a National University, and to read portions of Washington's addresses to Congress and the clause of his will relating to the subject, in order, to use Washington's own words, "to set the people ruminating on the importance of the measure, as the most likely means of bringing it to pass".

Washington bequeathed to the nation five hundred shares of stock, then worth twenty-five thousand dollars, for the foundation of a National University. This sum, even at simple interest, would now amount to nearly two hundred thousand dollars; and "It has been estimated that a faithful guardianship of this sacred trust until the present would have yielded a sum exceeding four and one half million dollars". Should not the American people recognize and bring to realization this hope of Washington before the one hundredth anniversary of his death? The need of a central, greater institution of learning is still just as urgent as in the early days of the Republic, but perhaps no more cogent arguments in its favor have been advanced than by Washington himself.

Will you not in your community do what you can to interest the patriotic societies or the institutions of learning with which you have influence, to commemorate Washington's birthday this year by bringing these matters before the people?

If information not accessible to you in the historical works at your command is needed, it will be supplied on application to Mrs. Helen H. Gardiner, care of the Arena, Boston, Mass. or to Mrs. Susanna Phelps Cage, Ithaca, N.Y. The information which will be furnished is embodied in a reprint of portions of an article in the forthcoming March "Arena" by Ex Gov. John W. Hoyt, Chairman of the National University Committee of One Hundred.

Yours sincerely,

Susanna Phelps Cage.
Lena, Flinton A. Hulbert, Jr.
New York, N.Y.

Dear Lena,

I am pleased to receive your letter as many benefits as possible from the University of Wisconsin. I was surprised to hear of the recent controversy over the appointment of a new president. It seems that the people have expressed their opinions on the importance of the president’s role in the university.

I am also aware of the recent announcement of the establishment of a new graduate school. This is a significant development for the university and for the future of education in the region.

I am pleased to hear that the university is expanding its facilities and improving its programs. I hope that this will continue to be the case.

Please let me know if you need any further information.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

[Address]
My Dear Sir:

Hereewith I forward you late University documents of the Senate, and with them a franked envelope, so that duplicates may be sent to some one else.

Despite all the efforts made, it now seems impossible to get our Bill acted on this session. The Chairman of the Senate Committee has been absent during much of the time, and no other member was prepared for aggressive work. Nevertheless, the cause has made gains both in and out of Congress. Senators induced to sign "Views of the Minority" are reconsidering; Senators heretofore doubtful have declared themselves affirmatively; and, now that delays have made public discussion seem desirable, several important magazines have offered space for its advocacy (see "Forum" for January and "Arena" for March). Moreover, various patriotic organizations are arranging to make the National University a feature of the Washington birthday celebrations; co-operation with which plan is earnestly recommended.

Matters must be pushed during the coming special session of Congress, no pains being spared meanwhile to enlist Senators and Members in your own State.

Financially, the cause has seriously suffered, although a half dozen members of the Committee have helped nobly. The sky brightens, however, in that Mrs. Ex-Senator Hearst, of California, has undertaken to salary a secretary for the office, with the understanding that the National Committee should do the rest.

My own time and energies will continue to be freely given, but recent losses have now made it impossible to do more. Accordingly, at a recent meeting of the Executive Council it was decided that, inasmuch as the few who have borne the whole burden thus far are unable to do so longer, the National Committee should fulfill this condition; leaving the great business world outside to be drawn upon for the endowment of chairs, fellowships, etc., as fast as this can be brought about. It is confidently expected, then, that each member will contribute five or ten dollars for this year's further expenses, including office rent, printing, stationery, postage, etc. Remittances will be promptly acknowledged, duly entered in a permanent record, and reported at the end of the season. We must avail ourselves of Mrs. Hearst's liberal offer in order that the work may go forward with new vigor to an early victory.

Please help as you can in every way.

Faithfully yours.
Dear Mr. President:

Your statement about Buckley and The University Association rather took my breath away. When men like Bishop Fallows and Bonney have the matter in charge I should think that it was pretty strong to class it with The National University. Probably you have better sources of information than what appears upon the surface of the documents. Of course it is quite evident that they are trading somewhat on our name. Beyond that I can conjecture nothing. I have agreed to write for them. Fellows has already written. Sanders, also, and they have an extraordinary list of names. Such opportunities are the only ones that we get to earn any money by writing, as all the rest of the product is absorbed by The University.

I shall be glad to hear further from you in elucidation of the matter.

Yours very truly,

[Signature]
My Dear Sir:

With another autumn comes the serious question, What can now be done to re-energize the National University forces everywhere and in the most effective manner reach all Senators and Members of Congress before the opening of the next session?

In my judgment, this can best be done by means of special interviews. But with many members of the Committee this will be impracticable; in which case there should be an earnest written appeal by each to his Representative and Senators. Doubtless you have personal acquaintance with some of those who represent your State, but, whether you have or not, they will give attention to an earnest expression of views by a distinguished constituent on a subject of so much importance.

Bishop John F. Hurst and his allies, evidently intent on holding for their so-called "American" but really Methodist University this field of the national capital, with its $55,000,000 in Government libraries, museums, laboratories, and observatories, are actively opposing our measure, though contrary to the judgment of other and more liberal bishops of the Methodist Church. There is also reason to believe that the presidents of the four "universities" and five small colleges (three of them Methodist) who were induced to declare their opposition, are doing the same. These adverse influences, denominational and local, must be met and neutralized. Popular ignorance of the country's highest educational needs was of itself enough to demand a vigorous campaign, but, in view of this recent active opposition, it is imperative that we redouble our energies, if we would insure, as we must, the actual legal establishment of the University of the United States by July 9th, 1899, the one hundredth anniversary of Washington's bequest in this behalf.

Special effort must be made to secure a change of attitude on the part of those members of the Senate Committee who were induced to sign the minority report. After interviews with each, I concluded that with the exception of Senator Walthall, of Mississippi (who, having himself presented this report, would find it hard to admit its invalidity), these gentlemen, to wit, Senators Jones, of Arkansas, Nelson, of Minnesota, and Turpie, of Indiana, might yet be brought to an affirmative view. Two of them practically admitted that they had given but little thought to the subject, and the other gave proof of his own misconception of our aims by asking, "Haven't we universities enough already?"

Per contra, I am happy to say that interest in our cause is growing in the country at large, and that entirely new forces have been enlisted and are now organizing for collateral work, especially these, namely:

(1) Influential friends of Art, under the leadership of Mr. Franklin W. Smith, of Boston, are organizing for the purpose of building a group of magnificent National Art Galleries on the eastern slope of the National University tract and on grounds contiguous, the whole to become a constituent part of the University of the United States when established.

(2) The patriotic women of the country, who, assuming the early establishment of the University, are forming a strong central committee, with members in all the States, and with the practical intent to raise $250,000
My Dear Sir:

With another announcement come the serious duties. What can now be done.

In the interest of the President of the University to promote the establishment of the University of the United States.

Executive Council.

(Dated)

October 10

Yours truly,

The President of the University.

[Signature]

[Note: The text is not entirely legible due to the quality of the image. However, it appears to be a letter discussing matters related to the establishment of a university in the United States, with references to various committees and officials involved in the process.]
for a George Washington memorial edifice, to be known as Administration Building and to be erected on the summit of the tract set apart by the Father of his Country for University purposes, the corner-stone to be laid in 1899. The women thus engaged are such as they who purchased Mount Vernon and built the Washington Monument, and they seem destined to accomplish their object.

(3) It is also worthy of note that the National Committee is being strengthened by the addition of resolute men, who are giving more active co-operation than we have been favored with hitherto, except among members of the Executive Council.

Finally, let me present for your consideration a few convictions and queries which, in view of the opposition we are to encounter from the sources above referred to, and possibly from other sources, have lately much occupied my thoughts and press upon my attention more and more, namely:

(1) Is it not both desirable and practicable to organize State committees for more systematic work at the very homes of those who are to determine the fate of our measure in Congress; and, if so, which member or members of the National Committee (or others who might become such), if willing to accept the leadership therein, would be best circumstanced for rendering effective service?

When the Morrill Bill for the endowment of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts was pending, much was done in this way. I led the effort myself in Wisconsin, awakening interest by means of addresses, newspaper articles, etc., and forwarding petitions bearing thousands of names.

(2) Is it not desirable that we now make a rally of members of the National Committee and hold in Washington a great public meeting in behalf of our measure, early in the coming session of Congress? In such case, would you advise that the meeting be held before the holidays or immediately after, and could you attend?

Public demonstrations of this sort were carefully considered even before the organization of the present National Committee, but, in view of the prospect of carrying the measure in the Senate without serious opposition or great delay (in which case it would go to the House with such prestige as would probably carry it there), the further consideration of such meetings was postponed by general consent.

(3) May it not be possible, if all members of the Committee will bear it in mind, to induce such conditional offers of considerable sums for the endowment of fellowships, lectureships, professorships, and even departments in the University, when established, as would be an encouragement to Congress? One daily notes the munificence of wealthy men in educational interests, and what nobler object than ours?

It should at least seem practicable to interest friends of our measure so far as to secure a fund with which to push the work to an early consummation. Though out of pocket over $300 at date of the last meeting of the Executive Council, nearly a year ago, yet, with the exception of the salary of a clerk, generously provided by Mrs. Ex-Senator Hearst, of California, and $30 in small contributions, I have myself borne the entire expense of the University work, including office rent, printing, stationery, postage, etc. Moreover, because of the increasing demand for documents (some exhausted and others nearly so), it is my necessity to have yet further printing done at personal cost.

Please give me the benefit of your advice upon the several topics embraced in this letter as fully and promptly as you can.

Faithfully and cordially yours,

William R. Harper, Ph. D., D. D.,
President of University of Chicago,
Chicago, Ills.
As we approach the end of the academic year, it is important to reflect on the progress and challenges faced by the University. The past year has been marked by significant achievements, but also by a number of difficulties that require our attention and action.

One of the key issues that we need to address is the need for better communication and coordination within the University. The lack of clear communication can lead to confusion and delays, which in turn can negatively impact our ability to deliver high-quality education and research.

To address this issue, I propose a series of measures that I believe will help to improve communication and coordination. These include:

1. Establishing regular meetings of the University Council to discuss and prioritize key issues.
2. Implementing a new system for the distribution of information to ensure that all members of the University are kept up-to-date.
3. Encouraging open dialogue among faculty, staff, and students to foster a more collaborative environment.
4. Investing in technological tools to enhance communication and collaboration.

I am confident that with these measures in place, we can address the communication challenges facing our University and ensure that we continue to deliver on our mission.

I look forward to your support in bringing these proposals to fruition.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

President of the University of [University Name]
My Dear Sir:

Following up my letter of the 19th inst., I send you in one parcel a set of the recent Senate documents concerning the University of the United States, together with a franked envelope. Please make it a religious duty to look them carefully through again for such fresh and fuller understanding of the situation and such new encouragement as they may afford, and then kindly send them, with an earnest note, to that citizen of your acquaintance, not a member of our Committee, most likely to become an effective co-worker. And if you would be pleased to reach yet other citizens in the same way, you may count on their receiving the documents immediately.

What our cause needs is, that you give to it as much as possible of your best effort during this critical period.

I shall look confidently for early answers to the several queries contained in mine of the 19th, and for the assurance, first, that you will look carefully after your Senators, and, secondly, that the request herein made will have prompt attention. Your chairman is freely giving to this great matter not only his entire time and strength, but also every dollar of money that can be spared from his narrowed resources.

Faithfully yours,

[Handwritten note:]

P.S. Dear President Harper:

Your name has come back to me, since the 19th went out. I should like to add a word. I am assured that you fully appreciate your position, and I am content to leave it for you to determine what you can do to help in this cause. I simply state the case. You can think of it in much more favorable terms.
My Dear Sir:

Following up my letter of the 1st inst., I send you in one parcel a set of the recent Senate committee proceedings concerning the University of the United States. Please make a religious effort to look through them with a pencil and notebook for such topics and matters underling the committee's report.

Kindly send them, with an earnest note to your senator, or other member of Congress, most likely to become an effective co-worker in our cause. You can do your best to resolve some of the problems mentioned in the same way you may have done on your own before the committee's immediate meeting.

Your best efforts are greatly appreciated.

I shall look forward to early answers to the several questions I shall ask you, continuing in mine of the 10th, and for the Senate, think that you will look seriously after your Senate, and secondly, that the Senate will make me with prompt attention. Your own interest is the only one that will be more of the great matter to you, and the entire time and strength, and your own care of the women, that can be spared from this important business.

Yours faithfully,

[Signature]
President William R. Harper,

University of Chicago:

My Dear Sir,—

Since receiving yours of the 9th inst. I have seen Chief Justice Fuller and other members of the Executive Council, the body responsible for the framing of the pending bill, all of whom express surprise that during a membership of some three years in the National Committee, meanwhile feeling that the measure before the Senate is "radically wrong", you should have failed to give us some definite idea of the matters wherein it is wrong -- whether in the provisions for the management of the institution, or in the scope and character of the work to be done by it. I begged you to do this more than two years ago, but you postponed it for a hoped-for interview. The feeling among members of the Council is that you might have dealt with them more frankly in so important a matter.

Still hoping for such harmony and unity as will assure the success of our measure at an early day, I remain

Faithfully and cordially yours,

[Signature]
President William R. Herter,

University of Chicago,

My Dear Sir,-

Since receiving your note of the 24th I have seen Chief Justice
Putter and others members of the Executive Council, the body responsible for
the formation of the beginning of the organization of the National Committee, meanwhile telling
me that the measure before the Senate in "National Merit" you should have
waiting to give me some general ideas of the manner wherein it is worked
whether or to the provision for the management of the information on the
scope and character of the work to be done. If I can proceed you to go this
more clearly two years ago put your best effort for a big policy in that
the leading members of the Council will that you might have access to
still capable of such paramount and utility as will assure the success
of this movement of so early a date. I remain

Permanently and cordially yours,

[Signature]
Dr. William R. Harper,

President The University of Chicago,

Chicago, Ill.

Dear Sir:

I thank you for the suggestion made in your letter of the 4th instant, in relation to the "National University." I have made use of it in my letter to the Secretary of the Interior.

The correspondence of which I sent you a copy on the 26th ultimo came to this Bureau through official channels and for that reason it would perhaps be improper to make any public use of it at this time. Therefore kindly hold the matter in confidence until I get permission from the Department of State to make the matter public.

I send you enclosed a copy of a letter from T. W. Harkins published in the New York Mail and Express August 13, 1897. Perhaps you saw it at the time.

Very respectfully,

(W. M. McHans
Commissioner)

(Enclosure)
I thank you for the suggestion made in your letter of the 4th instant
in relation to the "National University." I have made use of it in an letter to
the Secretary of the Interior.

The correspondence of which I sent you a copy on the 8th inst. came
to the extent that it referred official opinions and for that reason it could not
be larger to make any reply now of it at this time. Therefore kindly hold
the letter in confidence until I get permission from the Department of State
to make the matter public.

I enclose you herewith a copy of a letter from Mr. Harriman printed in
the New York Mail and Herald August 1869. Perhaps you saw it at the time.

Very respectfully,

[Signature]

(Enclosure)
To the Editor of The Mail and Express:

Sir,—Great public interest having been excited by the publication, last Friday, of a telegraphic message from the House of Commons concerning the National University, I beg the privilege of replying briefly in your valuable paper to meet the points involved. The dispatch was to the effect that Sir Arthur Balfour, in response to an inquiry, had said that the English Government would consider the advisability of investigating the agents of the National University of Illinois (Universitas Nationalis Illinoisis), who were offering degrees to worthy but impudent scholars at a guinea apiece. Now, this amazing dispatch is quite incomprehensible to the officials and chancellor of this university, and bears on its face evidence of an egregious error. In the first place, we have no agents in England. Again, would it not be absurd for an institution to offer degrees for less than the cost of the engraved diplomas issued by us?

I at once telegraphed by cable to the American consulate and to the London "Times" our repudiation of all agents who make such offers in England. Again, the name is not ours, though the imitation is calculated to deceive by its close resemblance. Our chartered name is simply National University. We have many graduates all over the world; and no one has ever questioned their worthiness being in many cases presidents and professors of leading colleges. We have systematic courses of instruction, and guard against error by carefully prepared examinations. Possibly the whole matter refers to our efforts to apprehend or silence a man named Horne, or Elliott, who, we have learned from several sources, has been using the name fraudulently and without authority to secure sums of one guinea or more for diplomas or decisions of our council, which, of course, he never renders. I have written a complaint of this man to the American consulate at London, and have received a letter stating that the authorities of Scotland Yard would attend to the matter; but I have not heard that the man has been apprehended. We are determined to protect ourselves from all such so-called agents and their misrepresentations at all hazards, and we shall welcome any investigation that may lead to their conviction. Of course, it is well known that many universities suffer in this way, as it is a comparatively easy method of swindling foreigners. Confident that, with your usual courtesy, you will grant my request, I am,

Respectfully yours,

(signed) P. W. Harkins,
Chancellor the National University.
NATIONAL UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE

OF

ONE HUNDRED,

to

PROMOTE THE ESTABLISHMENT

OF

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE UNITED STATES.
THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL.

[A Council formed of its own members by the National Committee, for the framing of a bill to be offered to Congress and for the more immediate direction of the National University enterprise.]

The Honorable Melville W. Fuller, LL. D., Chief Justice of the United States.

Ex-United States Senator George F. Edmunds, LL. D., of Vermont.

Ex-President William Pepper, M. D., LL. D., University of Pennsylvania.

Hon. Andrew D. White, LL. D., ex-President of Cornell University, ex-United States Minister to Russia, etc., New York.

Ex-Governor John Lee Carroll, LL. D., General President Society of Sons of the Revolution, Maryland.

General Horace Porter, LL. D., President-General Society of Sons of the American Revolution, New York.

Ex-United States Senator Evert H. Hobson, LL. D., Virginia.

Ex-United States Senator A. H. Garland, late Attorney-General of the United States, Arkansas.

Ex-United States Senator J. B. Henderson, LL. D., Missouri and Dist. of Col. Colonel Wilbur R. Smith, Kentucky University.


Hon. Gardner G. Hubbard, LL. D., President National Geographic Society, Regent of Smithsonian Institution, etc., District of Columbia.

Simon Newcomb, LL. D., Director of the Nautical Almanac, District of Columbia.

Hon. John A. Kasson, ex-United States Minister to Austria and Ambassador to Germany, Iowa.

Hon. Oscar S. Straus, ex-United States Minister to Turkey, New York.

G. Brown Goode, LL. D., Assistant Secretary of Smithsonian Institution, in charge of the National Museum.

Ex-Governor John W. Hitt, M. D., LL. D., Chairman of National University Committee.

AUTHORIZED LIST OF MEMBERS.

The Honorable Melville W. Fuller, Chief Justice of the United States.

Lieutenant-General J. M. Schofield, late Commander-in-chief of the Army.

Major-General Nelson A. Miles, Commander-in-chief of the Army.

George M. Sternburg, M. D., LL. D., Surgeon-General, U. S. A.

Ex-United States Senator George F. Edmunds, of Vermont.

Ex-United States Senator Eppa Hunton, of Virginia.

Ex-United States Senator A. H. Garland, of Arkansas.

Ex-United States Senator James R. Doolittle, of Wisconsin.

Ex-United States Senator Carl Schurz, of New York.

Ex-United States Senator John J. Ingalls, of Kansas.

Ex-United States Senator Patrick Walsh, of Georgia.

Ex-United States Senator W. D. Washburn, of Minnesota.

Ex-United States Senator Joseph M. Carey, of Wyoming.

Ex-United States Senator Joseph N. Dolph, of Oregon.

Ex-United States Senator J. B. Henderson, Missouri and District of Col.

Hon. Andrew D. White, LL. D., of New York, late U. S. Minister to Russia.

Hon. John A. Kasson, LL. D., of Iowa, late United States Minister to Austria and Germany.

Hon. Oscar S. Straus, of New York, late United States Minister to Turkey.

Hon. Wayne MacVay, LL. D., United States Ambassador to Italy.

President B. L. Whitman, D. D., Columbia University, District of Columbia.

President Daniel C. Gilman, LL. D., Johns Hopkins University, Maryland.

Ex-Provost William Pepper, M. D., LL. D., University of Pennsylvania.

President Edward W. Asbury, Ph. D., LL. D., Pennsylvania State College.


President Charles De Garmo, Ph. D., Swarthmore College, Pennsylvania.

Ex-President Edwin H. Magill, LL. D., Swarthmore College, Pennsylvania.

President A. H. Potterhoff, LL. D., Girard College, Pennsylvania.


President Theophilus B. Roth, D. D., Thiel College, Pennsylvania.

President Thomas L. Seip, D. D., Muhlenberg College, Pennsylvania.

President Ebelhert D. Warfield, LL. D., Lafayette College, Pennsylvania.

Chancellor W. J. Holland, Ph. D., LL. D., Western University of Penn.

President F. L. Patton, D. D., LL. D., Princeton University, New Jersey.

Chancellor H. M. McCracken, D. D., LL. D., Univ. of the City of New York.


President Horace T. Fuller, Ph. D., Worcester Polytechnic Institute, Massachusetts.


President E. Benjamin Andrews, LL. D., Brown University, Rhode Island.

President A. W. Harris, Sc. D., Maine State College.

President Nathaniel Butler, D. D., Colby University, Maine.

President Ezra Brainerd, LL. D., Middlebury College, Vermont.
President J. G. Schurman, S. D., LL. D., Cornell University, New York.
Director R. H. Thurston, Sibley College, Cornell University, New York.
President David D. Cochran, Polytechnic Institute, New York.
President John Hudson Peck, LL. D., Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, N. Y.
President Harrison E. Webster, LL. D., Union College, New York.
President David J. Hill, LL. D., University of Rochester, New York.
President Arthur E. Main, A. M., D. D., Alfred University, New York.
President P. B. Reynolds, LL. D., West Virginia University.
President D. Powell, A. M., Ph. D., West Virginia College.
President J. C. Rankin, D. D., LL. D., Howard University, D. C.
President Lyon G. Tyler, Ph. D., William and Mary College, Virginia.
President H. B. Frisell, D. D., Hampton Institute, Virginia.
President J. M. McCurdy, Ph. D., Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical Col.
President George T. Winston, LL. D., University of North Carolina.
President Charles F. Messer, Ph. D., Shaw University, North Carolina.
President J. Woodrow, Ph. D., LL. D., South Carolina College.
President Horace Burnstead, D. D., Atlanta University, Georgia.
President Richard C. Jones, LL. D., University of Alabama.
President William Le Roy Brown, Ph. D., Alabama Polytechnic Institute.
President W. N. Nicholson, LL. D., Louisiana State University.
Ex-President D. F. Boyd, LL. D., Louisiana State University.
President Oscar Aewort, LL. D., Straight University, Louisiana.
President Edward C. Mitchell, LL. D., Leland University, Louisiana.
Chancellor R. B. Fulton, LL. D., University of Mississippi.
General Stephen D. Lee, LL. D., President Mississippi State Agricultural Col.
President Charles W. Dabney, Ph. D., LL. D., University of Tennessee.
Chancellor W. H. Payne, LL. D., University of Nashville, Tennessee.
President Erastus M. Cravath, D. D., Fisk University, Tennessee.
President J. Braden, D. D., Central Tennessee College.
Chancellor Nathan Green, LL. D., Cumberland University, Tennessee.
Chancellor George W. Sweeney, D. D., etc., S. W. Proeb. University, Tenn.
President Charles V. Thwing, D. D., LL. D., Mayville College, Tennessee.
President R. Lawton Wiggins, M. A., etc., University of the South, Tennessee.
President Charles L. Loes, A. M., LL. D., Kentucky University.
Colonel Willirr R. Smith, President Commercial College of Kentucky Univ.
President S. Ryland, D. B., Bellah College, Kentucky.
Chancellor L. H. Blanton, D. D., Central University, Kentucky.
President William A. Oberhains, Ph. D., Ogden College, Kentucky.
President J. H. Canfield, A. M., LL. D., Ohio State University.
Ex-President William H. Scott, M. A., LL. D., Ohio State University.
President W. O. Thompson, D. D., etc., Miami University, Ohio.
President L. Bookwalter, LL. D., Western College, Ohio.
President A. A. Ott, D. D., Wittenberg College, Ohio.
President Clyde Stailey, Ph. D., LL. D., Case School of Applied Science, Ohio.
President Jesse Johnson, Ph. D., Muskingum College, Ohio.
President J. A. Peters, A. M., D. D., Heidelberg University, Ohio.
President John W. Simpson, LL. D., Marietta College, Ohio.
President B. V. Zollars, LL. D., Hiram College, Ohio.
President C. C. Stratton, LL. D., Portland University, Oregon.
President Mark W. Harrington, LL. D., University of Washington.
President Martin Kellogg, LL. D., University of California.
President David Starr Jordan, LL. D., Leland Stanford University, Cal.

[Some thirty other names of Presidents to be added in next edition.]

Hon. Frank A. Hill, Secretary of State Board of Education, Massachusetts.
Hon. J. W. Beal, ex-Secretary of State Board of Education, Mass.
Hon. Charles B. Thompson, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Ky.
Hon. John R. Kirk, State Superintendent of Schools, Missouri.

Hon. E. B. Reynolds, ex-State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Pa.
Hon. John C. Schaeffer, State Superintendent of Schools, Iowa.
Hon. Thomas P. Stockwell, State Commissioner of Schools, Rhode Island.
Hon. E. B. Prettyman, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Md.
Hon. Virgil L. Lewis, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Virginia.
Hon. John E. Massey, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, West Virginia.

Hon. E. T. Bates, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, North Dakota.
Hon. C. W. Bean, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, N. C.
Hon. John C. Scarborough, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, N. C.

Hon. A. M. Fink, ex-Superintendent of Public Instruction, N. C.
Hon. Frederic Gowen, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, N. H.
Hon. Mason S. Stone, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Vermont.
Hon. Cortez Salmon, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, S. Dakota.
Hon. Henry Sabin, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Minn.
Hon. W. W. Pendleton, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Delaware.
Hon. C. C. Tindall, Secretary State Board of Education, Delaware.

Hon. A. R. Poland, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, New Jersey.
Hon. J. W. Ewing, ex-State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Arkansas.
Hon. Josiah Shinn, ex-Superintendent of Public Instruction, Arkansas.
Hon. Samuel T. Black, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, California.
Hon. J. W. Anderson, ex-State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Cal.

Hon. Henry R. Tatlock, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Kansas.

Hon. E. J. Stanley, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Kansas.
Hon. R. N. White, ex-State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Nebraska.
Hon. C. A. Godby, ex-State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Indiana.
Hon. David M. Geeting, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Indiana.

Hon. Henry J. Wines, ex-Superintendent of Schools, Indiana.

Hon. J. F. Netherton, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Arizona.
Hon. E. G. Gilbreath, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Tennessee.
Hon. S. G. Gilbreath, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Alabama.
Hon. John O. Turner, State Superintendent of Schools, Utah.
Hon. T. B. Lewis, Territorial Commissioner of Schools, Utah.

Hon. C. A. Foreman, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Idaho.
Hon. H. C. Cutting, Superintendent of Public Instruction for Nevada.

Hon. Amado Chavez, Superintendent of Public Instruction for New Mexico.
Hon. A. J. Peavy, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Colorado.
Hon. E. Reed, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Wyoming.
Hon. G. E. Glenn, State School Commissioner for Georgia.
Hon. Salton Richards, late State Superintendent, District of Columbia.

Hon. John Eaton, LL. D., for many years United States Commissioner of Education.

General George R. Davis, Director-General World's Columbian Exposition.
Andrew J. Hickey, Ph. D., formerly Superintendent of Education, N. Y.

Marshall Field, Esq., Chicago.
Col. William O. McDowell, Chairman Pan American Committee, etc., N. Y.
Mr. Justice C. Strawbridge, Philadelphia.
Mr. Justice C. Strawbridge, Philadelphia.
John Henry Barrows, D. D., LL. D., President of late World's Congress of Religions, Chicago.

Edward Everett Hale, D. D., LL. D., Massachusetts.


Henry Villard, Esq., New York City.
O. Vincent Collin, Governor of Connecticut.
President Samuel H. Shipley, Philadelphia.

N. H. Winchell, Ph. D., State Geologist for Minnesota.

George Dana Boardman, D. D., LL. D., Philadelphia.
Edward S. Corliss, Philadelphia.
Lester F. Ward, LL. D., Washington, D. C.
Charles Sprague Smith, Ph. D., Columbia College, New York.

Hon. H. McCormick, Governor of Washington.
Hon. Newton Bate, LL. D., former State Superintendent of Public Instruction for Illinois; also ex-President of Knox College.

J. M. Gregory, LL. D., former President State University of Illinois.
Hon. John J. Jones, Governor of Nebraska.

Herbert B. Adams, Ph. D., of Johns Hopkins, Sec'y of Am. Hist Association.

Henry Baldwin, LL. D., Custodian of American History.

William A. Mowry, Ph. D., ex-Superintendent of Public Instruction, late Editor of Education, etc.

M. Schele de Vero, LL. D., late of University of Virginia.
ADDITIONS AUTHORIZED SINCE THE FOREGOING LIST OF MEMBERS WAS PRINTED.

The Honorable Benjamin Harrison, LL. D., ex-President of the United States.
The Honorable William F. Vilas, LL. D., ex-U. S. Senator, ex-Postmaster General, etc., Wisconsin.
Chancellor Amos Judson Upson, LL. D., University of the State of New York.
G. Norman Leiber, LL. D., Judge Advocate-General, War Department, U. S. A.
W J. McRae, Ph. D., Ethologist in Charge, Bureau of American Ethnology, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D. C.
Captain P. H. Cooper, U. S. N., Superintendent United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland.
Chas. E. West, LL. D., Superintendent American Ethnological Society.
J. Q. A. Ward, Ph. D., President National Sculpture Society.
Frank H. Casson, LL. D., Editor of Education, Boston, Massachusetts.
Franklin W. Smith, Ph. D., President National Galleries Co., Washington, D. C.
Chairman Dabney H. Maury, Southern Historical Society, Richmond, Virginia.
President William Wirt Howe, American Bar Association, New Orleans, La.
President Henry M. Whitney, M. D., etc., American Pharmaceutical Association, Baltimore, Maryland.
President Bloomfield J. Miller, Actuarial Society of America, Newark, N. J.
President Henry C. Adams, Ph. D., American Economic Association, University of Michigan.
President Edward Orton, Ph. D., LL. D., Geological Society of America.
President Alexander Graham Bell, M. D., LL. D., National Geographic Society, etc., Washington, D. C.
President Charles J. Bell, American Security and Trust Co., Washington, D. C.
Mr. Henry F. Blount, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Erastus T. Ford, New York City.
Mr. Lafayette C. Loomis, Washington, D. C.

President (Ch. Fac.) P. B. Barringer, LL. D., University of Virginia.
President M. H. Backham, D. D., LL. D., University of Vermont.
President H. W. McKnight, D. D., LL. D., Pennsylvania College.
President C. Johann, Ph. D., Elizabethtown, Illinois.
President Oreilo Cone, LL. D., Buchtel College, Ohio.
President L. L. Hobbs, LL. D., Guilford College, North Carolina.
President C. Leo Mees, LL. D., Rose Polytechnic Institute, Indiana.
President J. Martin Littlejohn, Ph. D., D. D., Amity College, Iowa.
Chancellor G. R. Duncan, LL. D., Cotner University, Nebraska.
President Samuel W. Beardman, D. D., LL. D., Maryville College, Tennessee.
President Samuel B. Morse, A. M., D. D., California College.
President Charles F. Tawing, D. D., Western Reserve University, Ohio.
President William H. Black, A. M., D. D., Missouri Valley College, Missouri.
President Th. N. Mohn, Ph. D., St. Olaf College, Minnesota.
President John E. Bradley, Ph. D., LL. D., Illinois College.
President J. H. Ford, LL. D., Rollins College, Florida.
President M. L. Ward, Ph. D., Ottawa University, Kansas.
President T. J. Sanders, A. M., Ph. D., Otterbein University, Ohio.
President John H. Finley, A. M., Ph. D., Knox College, Illinois.
President J. H. Breese, Ph. D., Northern Illinois College.
President W. H. Beardshear, LL. D., Iowa State College.
President S. T. Mitchell, A. M., LL. D., Wilberforce University, Ohio.
President Addison Clark, LL. D., Add-Ran University, Texas.
President John L. Buchanan, M. A., LL. D., Arkansas Industrial University.
President S. S. Woolwine, Ph. D., South Kentucky College.
President J. D. Dreher, A. M., Ph. D., Roanoke College, Virginia.
President George A. Harter, M. A., Ph. D., Delaware College, Delaware.
President H. A. Gobin, D. D., De Pauw University, Indiana.
President Thomas Fell, Ph. D., LL. D., St. John's College, Maryland.
President Oscar J. Craig, A. M., Ph. D., University of Montana.
President J. L. Dickens, Ph. D., LL. D., Bethel College, Tennessee.
President Harrison Randolph, LL. D., College of Charleston, South Carolina.
President N. J. Merriam, Ph. D., Fairmount College, Kansas.
President E. P. Craighead, LL. D., Central College, Missouri.
President George C. Chase, D. D., LL. D., Bates College, Maine.
President Chester A. Place, A. M., D. D., Southwest Kansas College.
President Franklin B. Gault, M. S., University of Idaho.
President Rufus C. Flagg, D. D., Ripon College, Wisconsin.
President J. G. Rodger, Ph. D., Benzaonia College, Michigan.
President D. C. Thomas, A. M., Ph. D., Adrian College, Michigan.
President George M. Herrick, D. Lit., Washburn College, Kansas.
President S. T. Mitchell, A. M., LL. D., Wilberforce University, Ohio.
President J. W. Bissell, D. D., Upper Iowa University, Iowa.
President Richard McIlvaine, D. D., Hampden-Sidney College, Virginia.
President Arthur B. Chaffee, A. M., D. D., Central University, Iowa.
President J. Sanders, A. M., Ph. D., Otterbein University, Ohio.
President J. F. Forbes, A. M., Ph. D., John B. Stetson University, Florida.
President Samuel Plantz, Ph. D., D. D., Lawrence University, Wisconsin.
President James H. Baker, LL. D., University of Colorado.
My Dear Sir:

You will be pleased to learn that the movement for the University of the United States is still gaining ground and bids fair to find consummation during the present Congress. The greatest present need is the practical cooperation of men of fortune willing to offer conditionally such endowments of departments, chairs, lectureships, or fellowships in the University as will encourage Congress to action. Senator Morrill, of Vermont, said to me recently: "Names such as you have by the hundred are to be valued, but one gift of $100,000 would do more to move Congress than a multitude of great names."

If you have a wealthy friend or know a citizen of fortune who, contemplating some noble deed, is not familiar with this enterprise, pray fill his mind with the nobleness of our cause and with its present needs. Help him to understand that a notable service to it now would be supreme in the estimation of those struggling for an early realization of the plans of Washington, so ably supported by the most illustrious of his compatriots and by a long line of distinguished Americans to the present hour. Make him clearly understand that the University, when established in the midst of the Government’s surpassing facilities here, furnished at a cost of over thirty millions, would do a work exclusive of and wholly beyond that of the college, and can injure no American institution, real or projected; that its supreme object will not be not only that of instructing college and university graduates exhaustively in such important subjects as are but partially dealt with in even the foremost of our institutions, and in some subjects which find no place in them at all, but also and pre-eminently that of inducting them into the work of research and investigation in every department of science and learning, to the end of new discoveries in the realm of nature and of right conclusions on all questions of social, national, and international concern. Help him to see that such a crowning institution is essential to the completeness of our American System of Education; to the public welfare, in so far as it depends not only on the more rapid advancement of knowledge, but also on the cultivation of a patriotic sentiment among the people; and finally to that leading part which the American Republic should assume and maintain in the work of human progress. Point out to him the inestimable gain that would come of such an institution in every field of intellectual activity; and, if not superior to even the loftiest of human ambitions, show him that it will bring to the giver such distinction at home and abroad as could perhaps no other single act; that it will link his name forever with that of the first great endower, the Father of his Country.

Last of all, tell him that now is the time that should not be allowed to pass, since July 9, 1899, will mark the one hundredth anniversary of Washington’s bequest in this behalf.

Faithfully yours,

Chairman of National University Committee.
June 5th

Mr. Dear Sir:

You will be pleased to learn that the work and the task of finding a new location for the University of the
United States is still being pressed, and that it is not too late to find a location.

The President has meekly agreed to the President's request for a site. We are aware of the existence of a committee
that has been appointed to select a site, and we are aware of the report that has been made.

We are aware that you have a wealth of knowledge of the sites of fortune, and that you have
some experience in the selection of sites. We wish to use your knowledge and experience.

We understand that a number of sites are under consideration, and we are aware that you have
visited these sites. We appreciate your efforts in this matter, and we are grateful for your help.

The President has ordered me to write this letter, and I am authorized to do so. We appreciate
your assistance in this matter, and we are grateful for your cooperation.

Yours faithfully,

Chairman of the National University Committee,
My Dear Sir:

Although some time has passed since my last communication with members of the National Committee, I have been none the less active in all directions and in the use of every available means of strengthening the National University cause, both in Congress and in the country at large.

Hitherto Senator Wellington, Chairman of the Standing Committee to establish the University of the United States, has been ill or absent so much of the time that he has not succeeded in getting action on our bill, but he now declares his purpose to give it vigorous attention henceforward. The strong men of the Senate are with us, and even they who signed the minority report in 1896 have agreed to favor the measure should the appropriation section be omitted, a thing which may be found necessary in the present condition of the country, unless opposing Senators can be induced to regard the few thousand dollars asked for as simply a means of enabling the regents to meet, organize, and inaugurate plans for the future.

The George Washington Memorial Association of women, organized for the specific purpose of raising $250,000 for a first University building, has enlisted many other patriotic organizations and is moving so zealously as to give assurance of success. While responsible for its own acts and those of its members, it has the confidence and earnest God-speed of the National Committee.

The Daughters of the American Revolution have also a National University Committee, lately increased to thirteen, whose purpose is to promote the ends of our National Committee by such means as they can devise.

Please give particular attention to my appeal for conditional endowments; making sure, if possible, that it reaches the hand of some liberal person of fortune, with your own hearty endorsement, and sending me the name and address, that I may forward the Senate documents.

Three endowments of $100,000 each may be said to have been promised already. Remember also that for the past year, rather than make a second request for help, I have borne the entire expense of the campaign, less my secretary's salary for a brief period, and that now there is special need of more means for pushing the work. Small contributions sent to Mr. John Joy Edson, Treasurer of the National University Committee, Washington, D. C., would bring needed relief. (Mr. Edson is President of the Washington Loan and Trust Co.)

Above all, make at once the strongest possible appeal by letter to your Senators for their hearty support of the pending bill.

Very truly and cordially yours,

Chairman National University Committee.

Pres't Wm. R. Harper; LL. D.,
Univ'y of Chicago.
Mr. Best Jr.

After the some time has passed since my last communication with members of the National Committee, I have been able to find out the true situation in the admission of women to the National University.

Elaborate plans for the establishment of the National Committee have been under consideration for some time. It has been decided to proceed with the plan for the establishment of the National Committee.

The goal of the National Committee is to provide a means of promoting women's participation in the National University.

Committee.

The objectives of the National Committee are to:

1. Provide a means of promoting women's participation in the National University.
2. Ensure that women are represented proportionately.
3. Support the establishment of National University.

These objectives have been the focus of the National Committee's efforts.

Very truly yours,

Chairman, National Committee.
My Dear Sir:

You will be pleased to learn that the movement for the University of the United States is still gaining ground and bids fair to find consummation during the present Congress. The greatest present need is the practical co-operation of men of fortune willing to offer conditionally such endowments of departments, chairs, lectureships, or fellowships in the University as will encourage Congress to action. Senator Morrill, of Vermont, said to me recently: "Names such as you have by the hundred are to be valued, but one gift of $100,000 would do more to move Congress than a multitude of great names."

If you have a wealthy friend or know a citizen of fortune who, contemplating some noble deed, is not familiar with this enterprise, pray fill his mind with the nobleness of our cause and with its present needs. Help him to understand that a notable service to it now would be supreme in the estimation of those struggling for an early realization of the plans of Washington, so ably supported by the most illustrious of his compatriots and by a long line of distinguished Americans to the present hour. Make him clearly understand that the University, when established in the midst of the Government's surpassing facilities here, furnished at a cost of over thirty millions, would do a work exclusive of and wholly beyond that of the college, and can injure no American institution, real or projected; that its supreme object will be not only that of instructing college and university graduates exhaustively in such important subjects as are but partially dealt with in even the foremost of our institutions, and in some subjects which find no place in them at all, but also and pre-eminently that of inducing them into the work of research and investigation in every department of science and learning, to the end of new discoveries in the realm of nature and of right conclusions on all questions of social, national, and international concern. Help him to see that such a crowning institution is essential to the completeness of our American System of Education; to the public welfare, in so far as it depends not only on the more rapid advancement of knowledge, but also on the cultivation of a patriotic sentiment among the people; and finally to that leading part which the American Republic should assume and maintain in the work of human progress. Point out to him the inestimable gain that would come of such an institution in every field of intellectual activity; and, if not superior to the loftiest of human ambitions, show him that it will bring to the giver such distinction at home and abroad as could perhaps no other single act; that it will link his name forever with that of the first great endower, the Father of his Country.

Last of all, tell him that now is the time that should not be allowed to pass, since July 9, 1899, will mark the one hundredth anniversary of Washington's bequest in this behalf.

Faithfully yours,

[Signature]

Chairman of National University Committee.
My dear Sir:

You will be pleased to learn that the movement for the University of the United States is still gaining ground and that the time is now ripe to find a permanent home.

United States is about to enter a new and critical period. The present Congress, the greatest opportunity of our generation to attain a higher position in the world and to cooperate in the advancement of science, is looking to the University to provide an institution that will not only support the great American people but also to the progress of the nation.

The University, when completed, will be a model educational institution, a center of learning, and a source of inspiration. It will not only provide the best possible education for the students but also offer an opportunity for all Americans to contribute to the advancement of knowledge and to the betterment of society.

I am pleased to see how the project of the University is gaining momentum and how the support of individuals and organizations is increasing. The University is not only a symbol of progress but also a reflection of the values and ideals that we hold dear.

Yours sincerely,

Chairman of the National University Committee.
Pres. Wm. R. Harper, D. D., LL. D.,
Chicago University:

My dear President Harper:

Having satisfied myself that the action concerning the proposed National University recently taken by the National Council of Education originated in your quarter, I feel a sense of relief, since I have unbounded confidence in your loyalty to the general idea and find myself able to give very careful and most impartial consideration to the question whether the cause would not rather than lose by the enlistment of a new army with a new banner and so lead as to draw into its ranks the university men so long opposed that they find it difficult to surrender at last and come into what they may regard as the old-time invader's camp.

As you will see by the pending bill, it was my own idea as well as yours to have the educational affairs of the University practically in the hands of leading university men.

Whether we work on different lines and under lead of many committees or of one, let us see that we are all one in the purpose to build here a true university in the highest and best sense, forgetting self and all mere local and denominational ambitions.

The enemy is weakening and our cause is steadily advancing. Let us see that our guns all point the same way.

Viewing matters in this broad and most liberal manner, does it not appear that gain would be made by so shaping the bill to be considered next winter, or by substituting another for it if better and more sure of success, that we may push it through at least one house during this Congress?

Please deal with me frankly. You will find me always hospitable and as broad as the great field we occupy -- with no personal end to promote and the early success of our cause alone at heart.

Faithfully and cordially yours,

John W. Hoyt
Dear President Harper:

Having participated myself in the National Council of University of the United States, I have found a number of matters of great importance to arise from the establishment of the university. I feel a sense of regret, since I have understood that the establishment of the university is necessary and important, and it is my duty to express my views on the subject. I am convinced that the establishment of the university will add to the welfare of the country and will contribute to the advancement of a new world with a new spirit and a new age. It is my hope that the university will serve as an instrument for the advancement of knowledge and for the promotion of the welfare of the community. I am convinced that the university will be a great force for good, and I hope that it will prosper and flourish.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
President William R. Harper,
University of Chicago,
Chicago, Ill.

Jan. 4, 1899.

Dear Dr. Harper:

On returning from my trip to New Orleans, where I had a most enjoyable time, I found your kind letter of the 28th. The following points, among others, are those that it seems to me might well be assigned for investigation in advance of the meeting of the Committee on National University:

1. The legal and constitutional aspects of the matter.
2. The exact character and parliamentary status of pending measures before Congress.
3. The amount, character, and present state of any funds bequeathed to the United States in the past, for the purpose of a National University.
4. The action of the Presidents of Agricultural Colleges at their meeting in December, calling upon Congress to open courses in connection with the Agricultural Department at Washington, that are practically post-graduate courses in theoretical and applied agriculture.
5. A summary of the existing educational agencies in Washington that would be affected by the scheme, or that might be federated with it.
6. The number, variety, extent, and character of the scientific
Dear Mr. Harper,

On receiving your letter to New Orleans, where I have a
more eloquent tone, Ilearn your kind letter of the 20th. The lot
of trouble, much anxiety, in those days it seems to me might well
be noted for the introduction to some of the meetings of the Com-
mittee on Agricultural Instruction.

The proposal and constitution of the Department of the Water
in the state agriculture and the permanent station of the present
were perfect.

The amount of the present arrangement with the Agricultural Department of Wisconsin
is to determine the practical value of the amount of the

Letter to Mr. Harper.

6. A committee of the existing agricultural societies in Wisconsin
should make an effort to the purpose of that object is to

The number of cattle, oxen, and steers at the meeting of the committee
and technical departments of governmental work that might properly be included in any scheme for a National University organization.

Yours sincerely,
any executive apparatus of Government work that might properly be included in my scope for a National Union with administration.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
Dec. 6, 1899.

President W. R. Harper,
University of Chicago,
Chicago, Ill.

Dear Dr. Harper:

It has seemed to me wise to inform the United States Senate of the action of our committee on a national university, and I have, therefore, taken the liberty of transmitting to Senator Wellington, chairman of the committee having the matter in charge, a statement of the action taken by our committee at the Washington meeting.

I trust that you are giving attention to the details of the reference to our sub-committee. I have given a good deal of thought to the matter, and should think it wise to visit Washington and confer with various representatives of the Smithsonian Institution and other scientific departments, before our February meeting. What do you say to this?

Yours very truly,
I have pleasure to inform the United States Senate of the exact of one committee of the National Academy, and I have therefore made the report of the committee, in order to obtain the approval of the National Academy.

I now submit the above report for your consideration. I have given a long and careful consideration to the report of the committee, and I am prepared to present it to the National Academy, and I am confident that the recommendations of the committee will receive the approval of the Academy.

Respectfully yours,

[Signature]