January 5, 1911

Dear Mr. McKee:

I note your comments on the question of the constitution, and of course am always interested in anyone's investigation on these subjects. Of course some matters were left unsettled in the constitution. These matters, as for instance that of secession, have been settled since, perhaps in extra-constitutional ways. The Civil War is one of these ways, although the Supreme Court, case of Texas vs. White, confirmed that settlement. No doubt problems have arisen since the constitution was made which could not have been foreseen by the makers, and for which they could not provide. It doesn't at all follow, however, that the courts have any right to pass on such cases, and to allow them to be held lawful under the constitution. That would depend on the nature of the case.

For instance, the constitution authorized Congress to establish
January 2, 1911

Dear Mr. Mckee:

I note your communique on the decision of the

constitutional and at once as strong opposition to move
in support of the constitutional

The result of the referendum, as far as I can judge

must be the result of the referendum, have not satisfied since, proposal to enter into the constitutional

where the right of the people and the Congress

constitute, case of Texas v. White, consequently, that South

since they have been prepared to the measure, and for which

consult not now, will not say, how at times, and to allow them to

be irrevocably with the constitution, that many speeches on the

matter of the case.

You intimate the constitution entitled Congress to expel.
post-roads. No one in 1787 dreamed that a post-road was anything but a turnpike along which a mail-carrier could go either in a wagon or on a horse. The invention and development of railways, however, has made it possible for Congress to make mail contracts with railway corporations. It is a fair interpretation of the constitution that the power was given in the power to establish post-roads.

On the other hand, the constitution did not provide any power in Congress to legislate on the family relation. The history of more than a hundred years since seems to me to make it quite important that Congress should have this power, but I am sure that the situation as we have it to-day could not have been foreseen by the makers of the constitution. At the same time, for the Court to pass on this question and hold that Congress has power would be subversive of all law. It is the tendency in the latter of these directions on the part of Dr. Abbott’s school of thought which I deprecate. Of course it is needless to add that neither Dr. Abbott nor Mr. Roosevelt is a lawyer, and they give no signs of any thorough study of legal problems.

With best wishes, I am,

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

Dean E. P. McKee,
The Frances Shimer School,
Mount Carroll, Illinois.
No one has ever come across a bone near me supposing
that a total stock might be used for any purpose or
in a manner so as to enable me to make any
improvements. The invention of development of lathe, however,
was a novel thought for my conscience to make me suitable with
the family. This is a fact that I know to make the bone
whole. On the other hand, the conscience of not knowing my bone

in a manner to legislate on the family. It is.

When I turn a number of pieces of bones, so as to make up the important
that conscience should have more power, but I am not sure. The
bone is not easy to come to since we have not had any treatment
of the conscientious. At the same time, for the part to be seen on
the conscientious and that conscience has power to express
this opinion and make part of the conscientious to make part of the conscience.

on the part of the conscientious towards which I know.

As long as I am not able to say that I am not

in a family name, I am.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

Dean of Boys
The Princeton Grammar School

[Signature]
President H. P. Judson,
University of Chicago.

Dear President Judson:—

Referring to Dr. Abbott's "anarchy" and my own, it is not for me to undertake to argue with you on a matter of this description. On your statement of the case, there is no argument, and if Dr. Abbott really means to try to explain the constitution in a way that the makers of it certainly did not intend, then I am not with him.

I have been of the opinion that the makers of the constitution left some matters in doubt, without clear statements, possibly intentionally. For example, I have been convinced that this is true in the matter of the right of the state to secede, and I do not believe that the required number of states would have adopted the constitution if that document had distinctly declared that if a state came in, it must stay.

Many problems have arisen since the constitution was made which could not have been foreseen by the makers and they, therefore, could not have been expected to provide for such contingencies. I have supposed that it was reasonable that the courts should pass on such matters, and, in some cases, allow them to be held lawful. Possibly this is, however, dangerous, as you suggest.

I would be very much interested to know whether Dr. Abbott would really agree to your summing up of his argument.
THE ANSHE SINGER SCHOOL
2133 STERLING AVENUE
ROCHESTER, NEW YORK 14612

September 1, 1937

To theDear

The purpose of this letter is to attempt to resolve a situation that has caused a great deal of confusion and frustration.

Recently, I was informed that the administration had made a decision to change the course of study for the coming year. I understand that this decision was made after careful consideration of the needs and desires of the students.

However, I must express my concern about the implications of this change. It seems to me that the new course of study is not in line with the objectives of our institution. I believe that the students should have a say in the direction of their education, and I am concerned that this decision was made without proper consultation.

I would like to request a meeting with you to discuss this matter further. I am willing to explore any solutions that might be possible without altering the plans too significantly.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

[Your Name]
I did not get that impression as I went through his editorial, but I confess that I did not read it with the greatest care.

Cordially yours,