

University of Chicago.

November 23, 1904.

To the Athletic Department of the University of Chicago,
and the Faculty Committee on the Men's Commons,

Sirs:-

The Advisory Committee of the Men's Commons begs leave to present the following suggestion: That the training table of the football, base ball and track teams be transferred to the Men's Commons.

We believe that such an arrangement is desirable for the following reasons:-

(1) It would enable the university men to know the members of the teams better, with resulting greater interest in the players.

(2) The players would realize more fully the support of the University, and we believe that the acquaintance and personal contact would ^{increase} ~~insure~~ the devotion of both players and supporters to their common University interests.

(3) Better opportunities ^{would} ~~could~~ be provided for making demonstrations of loyalty and enthusiasm before and after games.

(4) Such an arrangement should make the Commons the centre of student activity. The Commons and Reynolds Club together ought to profit by the arrangement and more fully realize the purpose for which they were established.

(5) Besides an increased patronage, the resources and menu possibilities of the Commons should be increased.

At present, comparatively few opportunities are given to university men for acquaintance with the members of the athletic teams. Since the adoption of almost constant secret practice,

University of Chicago.

November 23, 1904.

To the Athletic Department of the University of Chicago,

and the Faculty Committee on the Men's Games.

Sir:

The Advisory Committee of the Men's Games have leave to present the following suggestion. That the training table of the football, base ball and track teams be transferred to the Men's

Games. We believe that such an arrangement is desirable for the following reasons:-

(1) It would enable the University men to know the men-bers of the teams better, with resulting greater interest in the

players.

(2) The players would realize more fully the support of the University, and we believe that the acquaintance and personal contact would ^{increase} the devotion of both players and supporters to their common University interests.

(3) Better opportunities ^{would} be provided for making

demonstrations of loyalty and enthusiasm before and after games.

(4) Such an arrangement should make the Games the center

of student activity. The Games and Reynolds Club together

ought to profit by the arrangement and more fully realize the pur-

pose for which they were established.

(5) Besides an increased patronage, the resources and

many possibilities of the Games should be increased.

At present, comparatively few opportunities are given to

University men for acquaintance with the members of the athletic

teams. Since the adoption of almost constant secret practice,

this condition has been particularly bad.

The strong feeling throughout the University that there are not enough opportunities for university men to know the men representing them on their ~~XXXX~~ athletic teams has been very clearly shown by the recent action of the student councils in petitioning for fewer secret practices. We believe that the arrangement provided for in our suggestion would meet this situation.

Respectfully submitted,

R. M. Strong.

Wm. M. Burns.

Leon T. Lewis

Wm. A. Blair.

Carleton J. Lynde.

this condition has been particularly bad.
The strong feeling throughout the University that there
are not enough opportunities for university men to know the
representing men on their known athletic teams has been very
clearly shown by the recent action of the student council in
petitioning for lower school practices. We believe that the arrange-
ment provided for in our suggestion would meet this situation.
Respectfully submitted,

R. M. Strong
Hon. M. M. Jones
John A. Jones
Wm. G. Jones
Charles F. Jones

Minutes of Advisory Committee, Autumn Quarter, 1904.

--- o ---

On Wednesday evening, November 2nd, Professor George E. Vincent as representative of the Faculty Committee of the Commons, addressed the members of the Commons at the dinner hour, giving the results of his investigations of the systems at Harvard and Yale, and explaining the problems confronting the Commons here.

Mr. E. M. Kerwin having resigned as President of the Commons Committee, Nominations were called for on Thursday, November 3rd. Dr. R. M. Strong was the only nominee, and was elected on November 4th.

Regular meetings of the Committee have been held commencing Monday, November 7th. The meetings have been held each Monday evening at the dinner hour, the members of the Committee dining together and transacting the business of the Committee at that time. Mr. Boylen, the Steward of the Commons, consults with the Committee at these meetings and such complaints and suggestions as the Committee has seen fit to bring to the attention of the management of the Commons have been made to him personally.

On Monday, November 14th, a dinner mass meeting was held in honor of the work of the football team at Ann Arbor on the preceding Saturday. This was one of the most successful mass meetings ever held at the University.

A letter, copy of which is attached, was approved by the Committee and transmitted to the Athletic Department and the Faculty Committee of the Commons for consideration. No action on the part of either of these two bodies has been reported to this Committee.

On Wednesday evening, November 2nd, Professor George F. Vincent as representative of the Faculty Committee of the Commons, addressed the members of the Commons at the dinner hour, giving the results of his investigations of the system at Harvard and Yale, and explaining the proposals concerning the Commons here.

Mr. E. W. Kierin having resigned as President of the Commons

the election, which took place on Thursday, November 3rd, Dr.

F. M. Strong was the only nominee, and was elected on November 4th.

Regular meetings of the Committee have been held commencing

Monday, November 7th. The meetings have been held each Monday evening

at the dinner hour, the members of the Committee dining together and

transacting the business of the Committee at that time. Mr. Boylan,

the Steward of the Commons, consults with the Committee at these meetings

and such complaints and suggestions as the Committee has seen fit to bring

to the attention of the management of the Commons have been made to him

personally.

On Monday, November 14th, a dinner hour meeting was held in

honour of the work of the football team at Ann Arbor on the preceding Sat-

urday. This was one of the most successful and interesting ever held at

the University.

A letter, copy of which is attached, was approved by the Com-

mittee and transmitted to the Athletic Department and the Faculty Com-

mittee of the Commons for consideration. No action on the part of

either of these two bodies has been reported to this Committee.

Two reports to President Harper was submitted by the President and December 5th of the Advisory Committee of date November 7th, and a report was made to the Commons diners on Wednesday, January 11th, 1905, both of which reports are to be found among the reports of the Presidents of the Advisory Committee.

At the meeting of the diners in the Commons held January 11th, 1905, the following Resolution was passed:-

"Resolved: That Section III of the Recommendation adopted January 20, 1904 (this Recommendation as adopted constituting the Constitution of the University Commons for Men) be amended to read as follows:-

"III. Members of this committee shall be holders of tickets in the Commons and shall be nominated and elected by the holders of tickets in the Commons.

"1. Nominations for president, secretary, and the three other members of the advisory committee shall be made on the evening of the second Wednesday of each alternate Quarter, commencing with the Winter Quarter of 1905. The names of the nominees shall be posted in Hutchinson Hall.

"2. The election shall take place on the evening of the Wednesday next following the nominations. The election shall be by ballot. The candidates receiving the largest number of votes for president and secretary respectively, and the three highest on the poll for committeemen, shall be declared elected, and shall serve for six months and until their successors are chosen.

"3. The committee may at any time call a special election to fill vacancies caused by the resignation of members of the committee or by their inability to serve."

At this meeting the following nominations for officers and members of the committee for the ensuing six months were made:-

For President:-

R. M. Strong.
W. F. Keller.

For Secretary:-

C. J. Lynde.
H. B. Shaw.

For Members of the Committee:-

A. E. Bestor.
W. R. Blair.
W. M. Burns.
J. H. Larson.

The names of the candidates having been duly posted as required by the Constitution, an election by ballot was held Wednesday evening,

Two reports to President Harper were submitted by the President
and December 28th
of the Advisory Committee of date November 7th, and a report was made to
the Commons dinner on Wednesday, January 11th, 1905, both of which reports
are to be found among the reports of the President of the Advisory Com-

mittee.

At the meeting of the dinner in the Commons held January 11th,

1905, the following Resolution was passed:-

"Resolved: That Section III of the Recommendation adopted Jan-
uary 30, 1904 (this Recommendation as adopted constituting the Commis-
sion of the University Council, for the purpose of making a study of the
University of the State of New York, and the University of the State of New
York, and shall be nominated and elected by the holders of tickets in
the Commons.
1. Nominations for president, secretary, and the three other mem-
bers of the advisory committee shall be made on the evening of the second
Wednesday of each alternate Quarter, commencing with the Winter Quarter
of 1905. The names of the nominees shall be posted in Hutton Hall.
2. The election shall take place on the evening of the Wednesday
next following the nominations. The election shall be by ballot. The
candidates receiving the largest number of votes for president and secre-
tary respectively, and the three highest on the roll for committee-
men shall be declared elected, and shall serve for six months and until their
successors are chosen.
3. The committee may at any time call a special election to fill
vacancies caused by the resignation of members of the committee or by
their inability to serve."

At this meeting the following nominations for officers and mem-

bers of the committee for the ensuing six months were made:-

For President:-

R. M. Brown
W. A. Kellie

For Secretary:-

C. J. Hyde
H. A. Shaw

For members of the Committee:-

A. E. Benson
E. F. Blair
W. M. Brown
J. H. Johnson

The names of the candidates having been duly posted as required

by the Constitution, an election by ballot was held Wednesday evening,

The University Commons

HUTCHINSON HALL, *January 18, 1905.*

ELECTION OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

President

R. M. STRONG 71

W. F. KELLER 93

Secretary

C. J. LYNDE 101

H. B. SHAW 61

Members of Committee

Vote for three of the following, drawing a line through the name of the man for whom you do not wish to vote:

A. E. BESTOR 146

W. R. BLAIR 144

W. M. BURNS 142

J. H. LARSON 58

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
CHICAGO, ILL., JANUARY 18, 1902

SECTION OF
THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

President
R. M. STONG
W. F. KILLER

Secretary
C. J. KILPATRICK
H. J. SHAW

Members of Committee
When for any of the following, drawing a line
through the name of the man for whom you
do not wish to vote:

A. B. HESTON
W. B. KILLER
W. M. BURNS
J. M. JACSON

January 18, 1905, which resulted in the election of the following
officers and members of the Committee:-

President - W. F. Keller. (93 votes)

Secretary - C. J. Lynde. (101 votes)

Members of the Advisory Committee - A. E. Bestor. (146 votes)
W. R. Blair (144 votes)
W. M. Burns. (142 votes)

Leon T. Lewis

Secretary, Autumn Quarter, 1904.

Minutes

Autumn Quarter, 1904

January 12, 1905, which resulted in the election of the following

officers and members of the Committee:-

President - W. F. Keller. (98 votes)

Secretary - C. J. Lynde. (101 votes)

Members of the Advisory Committee - A. F. Foster. (100 votes)
W. F. Keller. (100 votes)
W. F. Keller. (100 votes)

Secretary, Autumn Quarter, 1904.

January 23, 1905

President Charles R. Van Hise,
The University of Wisconsin,
Madison, Wisconsin.

Adm. letter
My dear President Angell:

It was with great regret that I learned from Messrs. Capps and Raycroft, our representatives to the conference on Saturday, that the meeting resulted in apparently a greater tangle instead of in a settlement. As I understood the case from them, the chief obstacle in the way of a settlement was the fact that the representatives of Michigan and Wisconsin took the ground that not only the case of the grandstand collapse in 1902, but also other differences outstanding between the three institutions, specifically the settlement of the intercollegiate schedules for the coming year, and an alleged claim in equity for reimbursement for a contribution, made in accordance with a contract duly signed into between Michigan and Chicago in 1898, to the cost of erecting an extra grandstand upon our athletic field, for a particular game, in which it is stated that Wisconsin at a later time shared, necessarily entered into the question to be settled at this meeting. The delegates of Chicago, on the other hand, took the position that they were not empowered to consider any questions but that which was proposed in the call for the meeting and *that there*

January 23, 1903

President Charles R. Van Hise,
The University of Wisconsin,
Madison, Wisconsin.

My dear President Angell:

It was with great regret that I learned from Messrs. Gappa and Raycroft, our representatives to the conference on Saturday, that the meeting resulted in apparently a greater tangle instead of in a settlement. As I understood the case from them, the chief obstacle in the way of a settlement was the fact that the representatives of Michigan and Wisconsin took the ground that not only the case of the Grandstand collapse in 1902, but also other differences outstanding between the three institutions, specifically the settlement of the intercollegiate schedules for the coming year, and an alleged claim in equity for reimbursement for a contribution, made in accordance with a contract duly signed into between Michigan and Chicago in 1898, to the cost of erecting an extra Grandstand upon our athletic field, for a particular game, in which it is stated that Wisconsin at a later time shared, necessarily entered into the question to be settled at this meeting. The delegates of Chicago, on the other hand, took the position that they were not empowered to consider any questions but that which was proposed in the call for the meeting and

other questions had never been proposed for discussion at this meeting by either you or President Angell in your correspondence with me concerning arrangements for arbitration or conference. Further in view of the specific purpose of this meeting as defined in the call, our representatives were not prepared with any information whatever as to this earlier claim of 1898, except that there was such a claim; and since this claim proceeded from Michigan and Wisconsin, and no statement had ever been submitted either to our Athletic Board or to those two delegates or to me, setting forth the basis of this claim and furnishing us with the documents needed for its consideration, our delegates were unable to take up the case then and there as they were urged to do by their colleagues in the conference. In fact, they were rather severely reproached for coming to the meeting without full power and information on these two subjects which had never been referred to in the correspondence between the representatives of Wisconsin and Chicago during the two years over which this correspondence extended, and had only once been suggested as having a bearing upon the settlement of the accident case, viz. by Judge Lane in an opinion of which you sent a copy to Mr. Heckman a year ago. But no further move was taken by Michigan in this connection, nor was the suggestion renewed in the more recent correspondence.

other questions had never been proposed for discussion at this meeting by either you or President Angell in your correspondence with me concerning arrangements for arbitration or conference. Further in view of the specific purpose of this meeting as defined in the call, our representatives were not prepared with any information whatever as to this earlier claim of 1898, except that there was such a claim; and since this claim proceeded from Michigan and Wisconsin, and no statement had ever been submitted either to our Athletic Board or to those two delegates or to me, setting forth the basis of this claim and furnishing us with the documents needed for its consideration, our delegates were unable to take up the case then and there as they were urged to do by their colleagues in the conference. In fact, they were rather severely reproached for coming to the meeting without full power and information on these two subjects which had never been referred to in the correspondence between the representatives of Wisconsin and Chicago during the two years over which this correspondence extended, and had only once been suggested as having a bearing upon the settlement of the accident case, viz. by Judge Lane in an opinion of which you sent a copy to Mr. Hechman a year ago. But no further move was taken by Michigan in this connection, nor was the suggestion renewed in the more recent correspondence.

I confess that I sympathize with the position taken by our delegates in declining under the circumstances to enlarge the scope of the conference and in feeling that these new considerations were alien to the specific matter of the accident case for the settlement of which the conference was calling and that if such additional subjects were to have been brought before this meeting by your desire or President Angell's, I should have been notified of the change in plan. Our delegates are strongly of the opinion that no change in plan was in fact contemplated by you, for only the athletic managers of Michigan and Wisconsin, who were present as guests, and not as delegates proper, were furnished with the necessary information as to the incident of 1898, and that not in documentary form nor in such shape as to offer any basis for an adequate consideration of the facts or the equity of the case. At this meeting it was, and had to be, an intangible claim, and our delegates felt that the delegates of Michigan and Wisconsin were led to insist upon an adjournment, not simply through the limitations under which our delegates labored, but in order that they themselves might have time to get up this case to be later considered concurrently with the original accident case.

I may add, in this connection, that Messrs. Capps and

I confess that I sympathize with the position taken by our delegates in declining under the circumstances to enlarge the scope of the conference and in feeling that these new considerations were alien to the specific matter of the accident case for the settlement of which the conference was calling and that if such additional subjects were to have been brought before this meeting by your desire or President Angell's, I should have been notified of the change in plan. Our delegates are strongly of the opinion that no change in plan was in fact contemplated by you, for only the athletic managers of Michigan and Wisconsin, who were present as guests, and not as delegates proper, were furnished with the necessary information as to the incident of 1898, and that not in documentary form nor in such shape as to offer any basis for an adequate consideration of the facts or the equity of the case. At this meeting it was, and had to be, an intangible claim, and our delegates felt that the delegates of Michigan and Wisconsin were led to insist upon an adjournment, not simply through the limitations under which our delegates labored, but in order that they themselves might have time to get up this case to be later considered concurrently with the original accident case.

I may add, in this connection, that Messrs. Gaps and

Raycroft had of their own motion invited and urged Messrs. Baird and Kilpatrick two weeks ago, when the matter was casually mentioned to them at an informal meeting, to see that a formal statement of this earlier case was submitted to our Athletic Board, promising for the Board that the question would be considered fully and fairly. But it was not at that time proposed or suggested by Messrs. Baird and Kilpatrick that the two cases should come up at the proposed conference, nor were any steps taken by them to bring up the matter there, so far as Chicago was concerned.

May I suggest, further, that if this conference is to have another meeting, it would be well to have its membership somewhat more strictly defined? While Chicago was represented by two delegates, as agreed, there were present, besides their two regular members, Michigan's and Wisconsin's Athletic managers, Messrs. Baird and Donner, and Mr. Donner's predecessor, Mr. Kilpatrick, and in addition Mr. McNab, Chicago counsel for Michigan and Wisconsin in the accident case. At our suggestion, but with his own approval, the chairman, Judge Lane, requested the last named to withdraw; but Chicago's delegates did not care to ask that the other three gentlemen should withdraw, though their presence was irregular. Of course there was no objection to their presence on personal grounds. If Michigan and Wisconsin

Raycroft had of their own motion invited and urged Messrs. Baird and Kilpatrick two weeks ago, when the matter was casually mentioned to them at an informal meeting, to see that a formal statement of this earlier case was submitted to our Athletic Board, promising for the Board that the question would be considered fully and fairly. But it was not at that time proposed or suggested by Messrs. Baird and Kilpatrick that the two cases should come up at the proposed conference, nor were any steps taken by them to bring up the matter there, so far as Chicago was concerned.

May I suggest, further, that if this conference is to have another meeting, it would be well to have its membership somewhat more strictly defined? While Chicago was represented by two delegates, as agreed, there were present, besides their two regular members, Michigan's and Wisconsin's Athletic managers, Messrs. Baird and Donner, and Mr. Donner's predecessor, Mr. Kilpatrick, and in addition Mr. McNeil, Chicago counsel for Michigan and Wisconsin in the accident case. At our suggestion, but with his own approval, the chairman, Judge Lane, requested the last named to withdraw; but Chicago's delegates did not care to ask that the other three gentlemen should withdraw, though their presence was irregular. Of course there was no objection to their presence on personal grounds. If Michigan and Wisconsin

desire that the number of delegates be increased, Chicago will be glad to conform; however, we should much prefer that the deliberations of these meetings should be conducted in the academic spirit as far as possible, and should be characterized by the same harmonious relations that have always existed between the members of our faculties.

My understanding of the present situation is this: The delegates of Michigan and Wisconsin refuse to consider the accident case separately on its merits, and would not even formulate a tentative basis for a settlement of it, and insisted upon considering concurrently the contract of 1898, which they claim was unfair to Michigan. They proposed to adjourn until Friday next for the settlement of these two cases and the arrangement of the schedules. The Chicago delegates dissented. The result was a tie vote, each party agreeing to cast but one vote. The chairman, Judge Lane, however, considers that he broke the tie by casting his vote for the affirmative. Our delegates, however, hold that this particular conference has come to an end in view of the fact that the Michigan and Wisconsin delegates would not consider this case apart from the other case above mentioned.

At a period meeting of the Board of Physical Culture and Athletics held to-day, the position of our delegates in

...that the number of delegates be increased. Chicago will
be glad to conform; however, we should much prefer that the
delegates of these states should be selected in the
same spirit as far as possible, and should be distributed

by the same harmonious relations that have always existed

between the members of our faculties.

My understanding of the present situation is this: The
delegates of Michigan and Wisconsin refuse to consider the
accident case separately on its merits, and would not even
formulate a tentative basis for a settlement of it, and insisted
upon considering concurrently the contract of 1898, which they
claim was unfair to Michigan. They proposed to adjourn until
Friday next for the settlement of these two cases and the
arrangement of the schedules. The Chicago delegates dissented.
The result was a tie vote, each party agreeing to cast but one
vote. The chairman, Judge Lane, however, considers that he
broke the tie by casting his vote for the affirmative. Our dele-
gates, however, hold that this particular conference has come
to an end in view of the fact that the Michigan and Wisconsin
delegates would not consider this case apart from the other case
above mentioned.

At a period meeting of the Board of Physical Culture
and Athletics held to-day, the position of our delegates in

the conference was approved. And further, the Board requested me to reiterate the assurances made by our delegates that we shall give correct consideration to all other matters of dispute or grievance which the Board of either institution shall see fit to lay before our Board, either now or in the future. And if you and President Angell ~~desire~~ desire that a conference shall be called which shall be empowered to consider and settle the 1898 grandstand case, concurrently with or in any relation to the accident case of 1902, we shall be glad to send delegates. We ask only that we be furnished beforehand with information covering the details of the case.

In order that you may be fully advised as to the position that the University of Chicago takes in the injury cases, and as to the history of the case in detail, I enclose a copy of a statement of it prepared by our representatives to the conference. They have not been assisted by counsel in this work, but have drawn up the statement of facts and stated the basis of our position wholly by themselves, in order that it might be as free as possible from technical questions of law or procedure. It is possible that it required supplementing in some points, but it is as complete in outline as our files permitted.

Yours very truly,

W R Harper

the conference was approved. And further, the Board requested me to reiterate the assurances made by our delegates that we shall give correct consideration to all other matters of dispute or grievance which the Board of either institution shall see fit to lay before our Board, either now or in the future. And if you and President Angell desire that a conference shall be called which shall be empowered to consider and settle the 1898 Grandstand case, concurrently with or in any relation to the accident case of 1902, we shall be glad to send delegates. We ask only that we be furnished beforehand with information covering the details of the case.

In order that you may be fully advised as to the position that the University of Chicago takes in the injury cases, and as to the history of the case in detail, I enclose a copy of a statement of it prepared by our representatives to the conference. They have not been assisted by counsel in this work, but have drawn up the statement of facts and stated the basis of our position wholly by themselves, in order that it might be as free as possible from technical questions of law or procedure. It is possible that it required supplementing in some points, but it is as complete in outline as our files permitted.

Yours very truly,

W. R. Harper

Adm. Office
Hayden
January 23, 1905

President C.R. Van Hise,
University of Wisconsin,
Madison, Wisconsin.

My dear President Van Hise:

It was with great regret that I learned from Messrs. Capps and Raycroft, our representatives to the conference on Saturday, that the meeting resulted in apparently a greater tangle instead of in a settlement. As I understand the case from them, the chief obstacle in the way of a settlement was the fact that the representatives of Michigan and Wisconsin took the ground that not only the case of the grandstand collapse in 1902, but also other differences outstanding between the three institutions, specifically the settlement of the intercollegiate schedules for the coming year, and an alleged claim in equity for reimbursement for a contribution, made in accordance with a contract duly entered into between Michigan and Chicago in 1898, to the cost of erecting an extra grandstand upon our athletic field, for a particular game, in which cost it is stated that Wisconsin at a later time shared, necessarily entered into the question to be settled at this meeting. The delegates of Chicago, on the other hand, took the position that they were not empowered to consider any questions but that which was proposed in the call for the meeting, and

that these

January 23, 1903

President C.R. Van Hise,
University of Wisconsin,
Madison, Wisconsin.

My dear President Van Hise:

It was with great regret that I learned from Messrs. Gappa and Haycroft, our representatives to the conference on Saturday, that the meeting resulted in apparently a greater tangle instead of in a settlement. As I understand the case from them, the chief obstacle in the way of a settlement was the fact that the representatives of Michigan and Wisconsin took the ground that not only the case of the grandstand collapse in 1902, but also other differences outstanding between the three institutions, specifically the settlement of the intercollegiate schedules for the coming year, and an alleged claim in equity for reimbursement for a contribution made in accordance with a contract duly entered into between Michigan and Chicago in 1898, to the cost of erecting an extra grandstand upon our athletic field, for a particular game, in which cost it is stated that Wisconsin at a later time shared, necessarily entered into the question to be settled at this meeting. The delegates of Chicago, on the other hand, took the position that they were not empowered to consider any questions but that which was proposed in the call for the meeting, and

that these other questions had never been proposed for discussion at this meeting by either you or President ^{Vanderpool} Angell in your correspondence with me concerning arrangements for arbitration or conference. Further, in view of the specific purpose of this meeting as defined in the call, our representatives were not prepared with any information whatever as to this earlier claim of 1898, except that there was such a claim; and since this claim proceeded from Michigan and Wisconsin, and no statement has ever been submitted either to our Athletic Board or to these two delegates or to me, setting forth the basis of this claim and furnishing us with the documents needed for its consideration, our delegates were unable to take up the case then and there as they were urged to do by their colleagues in the conference. In fact, they were rather severely reproached for coming to the meeting without full power and information on these two ~~subjects~~ - which had never been even referred to in the correspondence between the representatives of Wisconsin and Chicago during the two years over which this correspondence extended, and had only once been suggested as having a bearing upon the settlement of the accident case, viz. by Judge Lane in an opinion of which President Angell sent a copy to Mr. Heckman a year ago. But no further move was taken by Michigan in this connection, nor was the suggestion renewed in the more recent correspondence.

I confess that I sympathize with the position taken by

I confess that I sympathize with the position taken by correspondence. connection, nor was the suggestion renewed in the more recent a year ago. But no further move was taken by Michigan in this an opinion of which President Angell sent a copy to Mr. Heckman upon the settlement of the accident case, viz. by Judge Lane in extended, and had only once been suggested as having a bearing Chicago during the two years over which this correspondence the correspondence between the representatives of Wisconsin and these two ~~representatives~~ which had never been even referred to in coming to the meeting without full power and information on conference. In fact, they were rather severely reproached for and there as they were urged to do by their colleagues in the arbitration, our delegates were unable to take up the case then claim and furnishing us with the documents needed for its consideration these two delegates or to me, setting forth the basis of this ment has ever been submitted either to our Athletic Board or to this claim proceeded from Michigan and Wisconsin, and no statement of 1898, except that there was such a claim; and since prepared with any information whatever as to this earlier meeting as defined in the call, our representatives were not conference. Further, in view of the specific purpose of this expenditure with me concerning arrangements for arbitration or at this meeting by either you or President Angell in your correspondence that these other questions had never been proposed for discussion

our delegates in declining under the circumstances to enlarge the scope of the conference and in feeling that these new considerations are alien to the specific matter of the accident case for the settlement of which the conference was called: and that if such additional subjects were to have been brought before this meeting by your desire or President Angell's, I should have been notified of the change in plan. Our delegates are strongly of the opinion that no change in plan was in fact contemplated by you, for only the athletic managers of Michigan and Wisconsin who were present as guests, and not as delegates proper, were furnished with the necessary information as to the incident of 1898, and that not in documentary form nor in such shape as to offer any basis for an adequate consideration of the facts or the equity of the case. At this meeting it was, and had to be, an intangible claim, and our delegates felt that the delegates of Michigan and Wisconsin were led to insist upon an adjournment, not simply through the limitations under which our delegates labored, but in order that they themselves might have time to get up this case to be later considered concurrently with the original accident case.

I may add, in this connection, that Messrs. Capps and Raycroft had of their own motion invited and urged Messrs. Baird and Kilpatrick two weeks ago, when the matter was casually mentioned to them at an informal meeting, to see that a formal

our delegates in declining under the circumstances to enlarge the scope of the conference and in feeling that these new considerations are alien to the specific matter of the accident case for the settlement of which the conference was called; and that if such additional subjects were to have been brought before this meeting by your desire or President Angell's, I should have been notified of the change in plan. Our delegates are strongly of the opinion that no change in plan was in fact contemplated by you, for only the athletic managers of Michigan and Wisconsin who were present as guests, and not as delegates proper, were furnished with the necessary information as to the incident of 1898, and that not in documentary form nor in such shape as to offer any basis for an adequate consideration of the facts or the equity of the case. At this meeting it was, and had to be, an intangible claim, and our delegates felt that the delegates of Michigan and Wisconsin were led to insist upon an adjournment, not simply through the limitations under which our delegates labored, but in order that they themselves might have time to get up this case to be later considered concurrently with the original accident case.

I may add, in this connection, that Messrs. Gaps and Raycroft had of their own motion invited and urged Messrs. Baird and Kilpatrick two weeks ago, when the matter was casually mentioned to them at an informal meeting, to see that a formal

statement of this earlier case was submitted to our Athletic Board, promising for the Board that the question would be considered more fully and fairly. But it was not at that time proposed or suggested by Messrs. Baird and Kilpatrick that the two cases should come up at the proposed conference, nor were any steps taken by them to bring up the matter there, so far as Chicago was concerned.

May I suggest, further, that if this conference is to have another meeting, it would be well to have its membership somewhat more strictly defined? While Chicago was represented by two delegates, as agreed, there were present, besides their two regular members, Michigan's and Wisconsin's Athletic Managers, Messrs. Baird and Downer, and Mr. Downer's predecessor. Mr. Kilpatrick, and in addition Mr. McNab, Chicago counsel for Michigan and Wisconsin in the accident case. At our suggestion, but with his own approval, our chairman, Judge Lane, requested the last named to withdraw; but Chicago's delegates did not care to ask that the other three gentlemen should withdraw, although their presence was irregular. Of course there was no objection to their presence on personal grounds. If Michigan and Wisconsin desire that the number of delegates be increased, Chicago will be glad to conform; however, we should much prefer that the deliberations of these meetings should be conducted in the academic spirit as far as possible, and should be characterized by the same harmonious relations that have always existed

statement of this earlier case was submitted to our Athletic Board, promising for the Board that the question would be considered more fully and fairly. But it was not at that time proposed or suggested by Messrs. Baird and Kilpatrick that the two cases should come up at the proposed conference, nor were any steps taken by them to bring up the matter there, so far as Chicago was concerned.

May I suggest, further, that if this conference is to have another meeting, it would be well to have its membership somewhat more strictly defined? While Chicago was represented by two delegates, as agreed, there were present, besides their two regular members, Michigan's and Wisconsin's Athletic Managers, Messrs. Baird and Downer, and Mr. Downer's predecessor, Mr. Kilpatrick, and in addition Mr. McNab, Chicago counsel for Michigan and Wisconsin in the accident case. At our suggestion, but with his own approval, our chairman, Judge Lane, requested the last named to withdraw; but Chicago's delegates did not care to ask that the other three gentlemen should withdraw, although their presence was irregular. Of course there was no objection to their presence on personal grounds. If Michigan and Wisconsin desire that the number of delegates be increased, Chicago will be glad to conform; however, we should much prefer that the deliberations of these meetings should be conducted in the academic spirit as far as possible, and should be characterized by the same harmonious relations that have always existed

between the members of our faculties.

My understanding of the present situation is this: The delegates of Michigan and Wisconsin refused to consider the accident case separately on its merits, and would not even formulate a tentative basis for a settlement of it, and insisted upon considering concurrently the contract of 1898, which they claim was unfair to Michigan. They proposed to adjourn until Friday next for the settlement of these two cases and the arrangement of the schedules. The Chicago delegates dissented. The result was a tie vote, each party agreeing to cast but one vote. The chairman, Judge Lane, considers that he broke the tie by casting his vote for the affirmative. Our delegates, however, held that this particular conference has come to an end in view of the fact that the Michigan and Wisconsin delegates would not consider this case apart from the other case above mentioned.

At a special meeting of the Board of Physical Culture and Athletics held to-day, the position of our delegates in the conference was approved. And further, the Board requested me to reiterate the assurances made by our delegates that we shall give correct consideration to all other matters of dispute or grievance which the Board of either institution shall see fit to lay before our Board, either now or in the future. And you and President Angell desire that a conference shall be called

between the members of our faculties.

My understanding of the present situation is this: The

delegates of Michigan and Wisconsin refused to consider the

accident case separately on its merits, and would not even

formulate a tentative basis for a settlement of it, and insisted

upon considering concurrently the contract of 1898, which they

claim was unfair to Michigan. The proposed to adjourn until

Friday next for the settlement of these two cases and the

arrangement of the schedules. The Chicago delegates dissented.

The result was a tie vote, each party agreeing to cast by one

vote. The chairman, Judge Lane, considers that he broke the

tie by casting his vote for the affirmative. Our delegates,

however, hold that this particular conference has come to an

end in view of the fact that the Michigan and Wisconsin dele-

gates would not consider this case apart from the other case

above mentioned.

At a special meeting of the Board of Physical Culture and

Athletics held to-day, the position of our delegates in the

conference was approved. And further, the Board requested

me to reiterate the assurances made by our delegates that we

shall give correct consideration to all other matters of dispute

or grievance which the Board of either institution shall see

fit to lay before our Board, either now or in the future. And

you and President Angell desire that a conference shall be called

which shall be empowered to consider and settle the 1898 grandstand case, concurrently with or in relation to the accident case of 1902, we shall be glad to send delegates. We ask only that we be furnished beforehand with information covering the details of the case.

In order that you may be fully advised as to the position that the University of Chicago takes in the injury cases, and as to the history of the case in detail, I inclose a copy of a statement of it prepared by our representatives to the conference. They have not been assisted by counsel in this work, but have drawn up the statement of facts and stated the basis of our position wholly by themselves, in order that it might be as free as possible from technical questions of law or procedure. It is possible that it requires supplementing in some points, but it is as complete in outline as our files permitted.

Yours very truly,

W. R. Harper

which shall be empowered to consider and settle the 1898 Grandstand case, concurrently with or in relation to the accident case of 1902, we shall be glad to send delegates. We ask only that we be furnished beforehand with information covering the details of the case.

In order that you may be fully advised as to the position that the University of Chicago takes in the injury cases, and as to the history of the case in detail, I inclose a copy of a statement of it prepared by our representatives to the conference. They have not been assisted by counsel in this work, but have drawn up the statement of facts and stated the basis of our position wholly by themselves, in order that it might be as free as possible from technical questions of law or procedure. It is possible that it requires supplementing in some points, but it is as complete in outline as our files permitted.

Yours very truly,

W. R. Harper

January 23, 1905

Autobio

President James B. Angell,
The University of Michigan,
Ann Arbor, Michigan.

My dear President Angell:

It was with great regret that I learned from Messrs. Capps and Raycroft, our representatives to the conference on Saturday, that the meeting resulted in apparently a greater tangle instead of in a settlement. As I understood the case from them, the chief obstacle in the way of a settlement was the fact that the representatives of Michigan and Wisconsin took the ground that not only the case of the grandstand collapse in 1902, but also other differences outstanding between the three institutions, specifically the settlement of the intercollegiate schedules for the coming year, and an alleged claim in equity for reimbursement for a contribution, made in accordance with a contract duly signed into between Michigan and Chicago in 1898, to the cost of erecting an extra grandstand upon our athletic field, for a particular game, in which it is stated that Wisconsin at a later time shared, necessarily entered into the question to be settled at this meeting. The delegates of Chicago, on the other hand, took the position that they were not empowered to consider any questions but that which was proposed in the call for the meeting and *that there*

January 23, 1902

President James B. Angell,
The University of Michigan,
Ann Arbor, Michigan.

My dear President Angell:

It was with great regret that I learned from Messrs. Gappa and Rycroft, our representatives to the conference on Saturday, that the meeting resulted in apparently a greater tangle instead of in a settlement. As I understood the case from them, the chief obstacle in the way of a settlement was the fact that the representatives of Michigan and Wisconsin took the ground that not only the case of the Grandstand collapse in 1902, but also other differences outstanding between the three institutions, specifically the settlement of the intercollegiate schedules for the coming year, and an alleged claim in equity for reimbursement for a contribution, made in accordance with a contract duly signed into between Michigan and Chicago in 1898, to the cost of erecting an extra grandstand upon our athletic field, for a particular game, in which it is stated that Wisconsin at a later time shared, necessarily entered into the question to be settled at this meeting. The delegates of Chicago, on the other hand, took the position that they were not empowered to consider any questions but that which was proposed in the call for the meeting

and

other questions had never been proposed for discussion at this meeting by either you or President Van Hise in your correspondence with me concerning arrangements for arbitration or conference. Further in view of the specific purpose of this meeting as defined in the call, our representatives were not prepared with any information whatever as to this earlier claim of 1898, except that there was such a claim; and since this claim proceeded from Michigan and Wisconsin, and no statement had ever been submitted either to our Athletic Board or to those two delegates or to me, setting forth the basis of this claim and furnishing us with the documents needed for its consideration, our delegates were unable to take up the case then and there as they were urged to do by their colleagues in the conference. In fact, they were rather severely reproached for coming to the meeting without full power and information on these two subjects which had never been referred to in the correspondence between the representatives of Wisconsin and Chicago during the two years over which this correspondence extended, and had only once been suggested as having a bearing upon the settlement of the accident case, viz. by Judge Lane in an opinion of which you sent a copy to Mr. Heckman a year ago. But no further move was taken by Michigan in this connection, nor was the suggestion renewed in the more recent correspondence.

other questions had never been proposed for discussion at this meeting by either you or President Van Hise in your correspondence with me concerning arrangements for arbitration or conference. Further in view of the specific purpose of this meeting as defined in the call, our representatives were not prepared with any information whatever as to this earlier claim of 1898, except that there was such a claim; and since this claim proceeded from Michigan and Wisconsin, and no statement had ever been submitted either to our Athletic Board or to those two delegates or to me, setting forth the basis of this claim and furnishing us with the documents needed for its consideration, our delegates were unable to take up the case then and there as they were urged to do by their colleagues in the conference. In fact, they were rather severely reproached for coming to the meeting without full power and information on these two subjects which had never been referred to in the correspondence between the representatives of Wisconsin and Chicago during the two years over which this correspondence extended, and had only once been suggested as having a bearing upon the settlement of the accident case, viz. by Judge Lane in an opinion of which you sent a copy to Mr. Heckman a year ago. But no further move was taken by Michigan in this connection, nor was the suggestion renewed in the more recent correspondence.

I confess that I sympathize with the position taken by our delegates in declining under the circumstances to enlarge the scope of the conference and in feeling that these new considerations were alien to the specific matter of the accident case for the settlement of which the conference was calling and that if such additional subjects were to have been brought before this meeting by your desire or President Van Hise's, I should have been notified of the change in plan. Our delegates are strongly of the opinion that no change in plan was in fact contemplated by you, for only the athletic managers of Michigan and Wisconsin, who were present as guests, and not as delegates proper, were furnished with the necessary information as to the incident of 1898, and that not in documentary form nor in such shape as to offer any basis for an adequate consideration of the facts or the equity of the case. At this meeting it was, and had to be, an intangible claim, and our delegates felt that the delegates of Michigan and Wisconsin were led to insist upon an adjournment, not simply through the limitations under which our delegates labored, but in order that they themselves might have time to get up this case to be later considered concurrently with the original accident case.

I may add, in this connection, that Messrs. Capps and

I may add, in this connection, that Messrs. Gaps and
with the original accident case.
time to get up this case to be later considered concurrently
delegates labored, but in order that they themselves might have
adjournment, not simply through the limitations under which our
delegates of Michigan and Wisconsin were led to insist upon an
had to be, an intangible claim, and our delegates felt that the
facts or the equity of the case. At this meeting it was, and
shape as to offer any basis for an adequate consideration of the
incident of 1898, and that not in documentary form nor in such
proper, were furnished with the necessary information as to the
and Wisconsin, who were present as guests, and not as delegates
contemplated by you, for only the athletic managers of Michigan
are strongly of the opinion that no change in plan was in fact
should have been notified of the change in plan. Our delegates
before this meeting by your desire or President Van Hise's, I
and that if such additional subjects were to have been brought
case for the settlement of which the conference was calling
considerations were alien to the specific matter of the accident
the scope of the conference and in feeling that these new con-
our delegates in declining under the circumstances to enlarge
I confess that I sympathize with the position taken by

Raycroft had of their own motion invited and urged Messrs. Baird and Kilpatrick two weeks ago, when the matter was casually mentioned to them at an informal meeting, to see that a formal statement of this earlier case was submitted to our Athletic Board, promising for the Board that the question would be considered fully and fairly. But it was not at that time proposed or suggested by Messrs. Baird and Kilpatrick that the two cases should come up at the proposed conference, nor were any steps taken by them to bring up the matter there, so far as Chicago was concerned.

May I suggest, further, that if this conference is to have another meeting, it would be well to have its membership somewhat more strictly defined? While Chicago was represented by two delegates, as agreed, there were present, besides their two regular members, Michigan's and Wisconsin's Athletic managers, Messrs. Baird and Donner, and Mr. Donner's predecessor, Mr. Kilpatrick, and in addition Mr. McNab, Chicago counsel for Michigan and Wisconsin in the accident case. At our suggestion, but with his own approval, the chairman, Judge Lane, requested the last named to withdraw; but Chicago's delegates did not care to ask that the other three gentlemen should withdraw, though their presence was irregular. Of course there was no objection to their presence on personal grounds. If Michigan and Wisconsin

Raycroft had of their own motion invited and urged Messrs. Baird and Kilpatrick two weeks ago, when the matter was casually mentioned to them at an informal meeting, to see that a formal statement of this earlier case was submitted to our Athletic Board, promising for the Board that the question would be considered fairly and fairly. But it was not at that time proposed or suggested by Messrs. Baird and Kilpatrick that the two cases should come up at the proposed conference, nor were any steps taken by them to bring up the matter there, so far as Chicago was concerned.

May I suggest, further, that if this conference is to have another meeting, it would be well to have its membership somewhat more strictly defined? While Chicago was represented by two delegates, as agreed, there were present, besides their two regular members, Michigan's and Wisconsin's Athletic managers, Messrs. Baird and Donner, and Mr. Donner's predecessor, Mr. Kilpatrick, and in addition Mr. McNab, Chicago counsel for Michigan and Wisconsin in the accident case. At our suggestion, but with his own approval, the chairman, Judge Lane, requested the last named to withdraw; but Chicago's delegates did not care to ask that the other three gentlemen should withdraw, though their presence was irregular. Of course there was no objection to their presence on personal grounds. If Michigan and Wisconsin

desire that the number of delegates be increased, Chicago will be glad to conform; however, we should much prefer that the deliberations of these meetings should be conducted in the academic spirit as far as possible, and should be characterized by the same harmonious relations that have always existed between the members of our faculties.

My understanding of the present situation is this: The delegates of Michigan and Wisconsin refuse to consider the accident case separately on its merits, and would not even formulate a tentative basis for a settlement of it, and insisted upon considering concurrently the contract of 1898, which they claim was unfair to Michigan. They proposed to adjourn until Friday next for the settlement of these two cases and the arrangement of the schedules. The Chicago delegates dissented. The result was a tie vote, each party agreeing to cast but one vote. The chairman, Judge Lane, however, considers that he broke the tie by casting his vote for the affirmative. Our delegates, however, hold that this particular conference has come to an end in view of the fact that the Michigan and Wisconsin delegates would not consider this case apart from the other case above mentioned.

At a ~~special~~ meeting of the Board of Physical Culture and Athletics held to-day, the position of our delegates in

desire that the number of delegates be increased. Chicago will be glad to conform; however, we should much prefer that the deliberations of these meetings should be conducted in the academic spirit as far as possible, and should be characterized by the same harmonious relations that have always existed between the members of our faculties.

My understanding of the present situation is this: The delegates of Michigan and Wisconsin refuse to consider the accident case separately on its merits, and would not even formulate a tentative basis for a settlement of it, and insisted upon considering concurrently the contract of 1898, which they claim was unfair to Michigan. They proposed to adjourn until Friday next for the settlement of these two cases and the arrangement of the schedules. The Chicago delegates dissented. The result was a tie vote, each party agreeing to cast but one vote. The chairman, Judge Lane, however, considers that he broke the tie by casting his vote for the affirmative. Our delegates, however, hold that this particular conference has come to an end in view of the fact that the Michigan and Wisconsin delegates would not consider this case apart from the other case above mentioned.

At a ~~period~~ meeting of the Board of Physical Culture and Athletics held to-day, the position of our delegates in

the conference was approved. And further, the Board requested me to reiterate the assurances made by our delegates that we shall give correct consideration to all other matters of dispute or grievance which the Board of either institution shall see fit to lay before our Board, either now or in the future. And if you and President Van Hise desire that a conference shall be called which shall be empowered to consider and settle the 1898 grandstand case, concurrently with or in any relation to the accident case of 1902, we shall be glad to send delegates. We ask only that we be furnished beforehand with information covering the details of the case.

In order that you may be fully advised as to the position that the University of Chicago takes in the injury cases, and as to the history of the case in detail, I enclose a copy of a statement of it prepared by our representatives to the conference. They have not been assisted by counsel in this work, but have drawn up the statement of facts and stated the basis of our position wholly by themselves, in order that it might be as free as possible from technical questions of law or procedure. It is possible that it required supplementing in some points, but it is as complete in outline as our files permitted.

Yours very truly,

W. R. Harper

the conference was approved. And further, the Board requested me to reiterate the assurances made by our delegates that we shall give correct consideration to all other matters of dispute or grievance which the Board of either institution shall see fit to lay before our Board, either now or in the future. And if you and President Van Hise desire that a conference shall be called which shall be empowered to consider and settle the 1898 Grandstand case, concurrently with or in any relation to the accident case of 1902, we shall be glad to send delegates. We ask only that we be furnished beforehand with information covering the details of the case.

In order that you may be fully advised as to the position that the University of Chicago takes in the injury cases, and as to the history of the case in detail, I enclose a copy of a statement of it prepared by our representatives to the conference. They have not been assisted by counsel in this work, but have drawn up the statement of facts and stated the basis of our position wholly by themselves, in order that it might be as free as possible from technical questions of law or procedure. It is possible that it required supplementing in some points, but it is as complete in outline as our files permitted.

Yours very truly,

W. R. Harper

*My Dear Mr. Van
Hise - I am
sending you this
which Mr. Stagg
has sent to me
from the
football
game to
be sent to
Mr. Downer
it is
a letter
from
Chicago
Central
Mr. Stagg*

The University of Chicago

Chicago, Ill., May 2, 1905.

Stagg

My Dear President Harper:-

President Van Hise has evidently misunderstood Graduate Manager Downer in reference to Chicago's attitude in regard to a foot ball date for it does not seem possible that Mr. Downer would misrepresent the situation to him, since we have had a perfect understanding in regard to the matter, both through our correspondence, and also through personal talks which we had with one another on Wednesday, April 26th and Thursday, April 27th. I have written to Mr. Downer telling him of President Van Hise's misunderstanding and have asked him to straighten the matter out.

The present situation is as follows: Chicago has open dates on October 28th and November 4th. Wisconsin has open dates on October 21st and October 28th. Both schedules are in such condition that it is impossible to make any ~~adjustment~~ ^{arrangement} for any other date than October 28th and possibly October 21st. In my talk with Mr. Downer I told him that Chicago would be willing to play Wisconsin on October 21st if we could get Northwestern to change the date for the Chicago-Northwestern game to October 28th. Wisconsin prefers to play Chicago on October 28th, but I do not feel that our team would have a fair chance of winning the Wisconsin game if we played on that date, since in that event we should have games with Iowa on October 7th, Indiana on October 14th, Northwestern on October 21st, and Wisconsin on October 28th, which would make ~~it~~ too hard a schedule for the team to stand. From the Chicago team's standpoint, the arrangement of playing Wisconsin on October 21st and Northwestern on October 28th, is also bad and under other

Chicago, Ill., May 2, 1905.

My Dear President Harper:

President Van Hise has evidently misunderstood Graduate Manager Downer in reference to Chicago's attitude in regard to a foot ball date for it does not seem possible that Mr. Downer would misrepresent the situation to him, since we have had a perfect understanding in regard to the matter, both through our correspondence, and also through personal talks which we had with one another on Wednesday, April 26th and Thursday, April 27th. I have written to Mr. Downer telling him of President Van Hise's misunderstanding and have asked him to straighten the matter out.

The present situation is as follows: Chicago has open dates on October 28th and November 4th. Wisconsin has open dates on October 21st and October 28th. Both schedules are in such condition that it is impossible to make any arrangement for any other date than October 28th and possibly October 21st. In my talk with Mr. Downer I told him that Chicago would be willing to play Wisconsin on October 21st if we could get Northwestern to change the date for the Chicago-Northwestern game to October 28th. Wisconsin prefers to play Chicago on October 28th, but I do not feel that our team would have a fair chance of winning the Wisconsin game if we played on that date, since in that event we should have games with Iowa on October 7th, Indiana on October 14th, Northwestern on October 21st, and Wisconsin on October 28th, which would make it too hard a schedule for the team to stand. From the Chicago team's standpoint, the arrangement of playing Wisconsin on October 21st and Northwestern on October 28th, is also bad and under other

The University of Chicago

2

circumstances I would be unwilling to make even that arrangement since it is throwing a burden on the team which is harder than it ought to stand; but on account of Wisconsin's generous attitude in the bleacher controversy and for the sake of preserving the pleasant relations which we have always had with Wisconsin in foot ball, I have been willing to make the arrangement which I have suggested--of playing Wisconsin on October 21st provided Northwestern is willing to play the Chicago game on October 28th.

I wish to have myself and Chicago entirely cleared of any shadow of thought that we were unwilling to meet Wisconsin half way in the arrangement of a game next fall, because the facts do not bear out such suspicion.

On the 17th of December last I wrote to Charles Kilpatrick who has been manager of athletics at Wisconsin for several years, the following letter: "In case the bleacher controversy is satisfactorily settled would Wisconsin care to play Chicago on November 11th? If not, what date would you suggest for a game? Please address me Mount Clemmons, Mich."

I did not receive any reply to this letter and I presume it was never turned over to Manager Downer when he took up the work of manager of athletics at Wisconsin when Mr. Kilpatrick resigned. In the meantime Michigan and Wisconsin had arranged a date for November 18th, and on the 12th of ~~November~~ ^{February} Chicago arranged a date with Northwestern for October 21st. At the beginning of the correspondence between Mr. Downer and myself late in March, Chicago had arranged only one date, namely, that with Northwestern--but of course it was commonly understood that the Michigan game would take place on Thanksgiving day. Otherwise I left an entirely

The University of Chicago

3

open schedule for arranging the Wisconsin date.

Sometime during the winter Wisconsin had arranged for the Minnesota game on November 4th, which was the date which I had anticipated Wisconsin and Chicago would probably play. Under what is considered the best arrangement of foot ball schedules,-- namely, to have a heavy game not oftener than every other week,-- the arrangements for a Chicago-Wisconsin game were entirely blocked unless the game were played very early in October, because while Chicago had only arranged a game with Northwestern on October 21st and expected to arrange one with Michigan on Thanksgiving day, Wisconsin had already arranged games for November 4th with Minnesota and November 18th with Michigan. In the correspondence which has passed between Mr. Downer and myself the practical difficulty of adjusting the schedules has been strongly recognized and at first there seemed to be no possible adjustment, but on April 4th Mr. Downer made a suggestion of trying to get the Chicago-Northwestern game changed from October 21st to November 4th. *So as to play the Wisconsin Chicago game Oct 21st* This was satisfactory to us and an attempt was made to bring this about but we were not successful. Since then Mr. Downer has suggested that the Chicago-Wisconsin game be played on October 28th, and I ^{have} made a counter suggestion that Chicago try to get the Chicago-Northwestern game changed to October 28th and the Wisconsin-Chicago game arranged for October 21st.

In the early part of this letter I have explained the reason why Chicago prefers this arrangement rather than the one which is suggested by Wisconsin, and it was understood between Mr. Downer and myself that he was to see the Northwestern management

open schedule for arranging the Wisconsin date.

Sometime during the winter Wisconsin had arranged for the

Minnesota game on November 4th, which was the date which I had

anticipated Wisconsin and Chicago would probably play. Under

what is considered the best arrangement of foot ball schedules,--

namely, to have a heavy game not often than every other week--

the arrangements for a Chicago-Wisconsin game were entirely blocked

unless the game were played very early in October, because while

Chicago had only arranged a game with Northwestern on October 21st

and expected to arrange one with Michigan on Thanksgiving day,

Wisconsin had already arranged games for November 4th with Minnesota

and November 18th with Michigan. In the correspondence which has

passed between Mr. Downer and myself the practical difficulty of

adjusting the schedules has been strongly recognized and at first

there seemed to be no possible adjustment, but on April 4th Mr.

Downer made a suggestion of trying to get the Chicago-Northwestern

So as to play the Wisconsin-Chicago game Oct 21st
game changed from October 21st to November 4th. This was satis-

factory to us and an attempt was made to bring this about but we

were not successful. Since then Mr. Downer has suggested that the

Chicago-Wisconsin game be played on October 28th and I made a

counter suggestion that Chicago try to get the Chicago-Northwestern

game changed to October 28th and the Wisconsin-Chicago game

arranged for October 21st.

In the early part of this letter I have explained the

reason why Chicago prefers this arrangement rather than the one

which is suggested by Wisconsin, and it was understood between

Mr. Downer and myself that he was to see the Northwestern management

The University of Chicago

4

and find out whether this adjustment were possible. Since returning from Philadelphia I have telephoned Mr. McCornack, coach of the Northwestern team and he seemed favorable to the change and advised me that he would have Manager Smith confer with me in regard to the matter. I have since written Manager Downer of Wisconsin telling him of my conversation with Mr. McCornack and again asked him whether Wisconsin would be willing to play Chicago on October 21st if Northwestern is willing to change to October 28th.

Trusting that such part of this letter as will satisfactorily explain matters to President Van Hise can be submitted to him, I am,

Sincerely,

A. A. Stagg.

and find out whether this adjustment were possible. Since return-
ing from Philadelphia I have telephoned Mr. McCormack, coach of the
Northwestern team and he seemed favorable to the change and advised
me that he would have Manager Smith confer with me in regard to
the matter. I have since written Manager Downer of Wisconsin
telling him of my conversation with Mr. McCormack and again asked
him whether Wisconsin would be willing to play Chicago on October
21st if Northwestern is willing to change to October 28th.
Trusting that each part of this letter as will satis-
factorily explain matters to President Van Hise can be submitted
to him, I am,

Sincerely,

A. A. Stepp

Badenheim
Jrm.

Chicago July 6 - 1905.

My dear President Harper:-

I desire to present in written form the subject which recently we discussed informally. My family obligations demand my consideration of that which formerly I considered of minor importance. I think that you know enough of my opportunities in earlier life to know that financial considerations have not guided my course. Perhaps you will recall the fact that when I came to the University, I had the opportunity of taking up a similar work at another university at a much larger salary. At different times in the history of my work here, I am confident that I could have secured positions at other universities at an increase of salary, but at no time have I sought for nor courted such opportunities. I do not hesitate to say that at all times I have been absolutely loyal to the University, standing behind the athletic work with my own salary for several years, and turning down scores of opportunities for personal gain which my position makes possible.

My home obligations supported by my recent physical condition have led me to reflect upon the exactions of my work and the financial return, and I feel that I am justified in asking the University for a salary of \$6000.00, part of which could very properly come from the Athletic Fund.

The University of Chicago
Founded by John D. Rockefeller
The Haskell Gymnasium

Chicago July 5 - 1905

My dear President Taylor:-

I have to forward an
written from the subject which recently
was discussed informally. My family obligation
demanded my consideration of that subject formerly
I considered of minor importance. I think that
you know enough of my opportunities in earlier
life to know that financial considerations have
not guided my course. Perhaps you will recall
the fact that when I came to the University
I had the opportunity of taking up a similar
work at another university at a much larger
salary. It differed then in the history of my
work here, I am confident that I could
have secured position at other universities
at an increase of salary, but at no time
have I sought for an elevated grade of position
there. I do not hesitate to say that at all
times I have been absolutely loyal to the
University, standing behind the athletic work
with my own salary for several years
and turning down several of opportunities for
personal gain which my position made
possible.

My home obligations supported by my
recent physical condition have led me to
reflect upon the expectations of my work and
the financial return, but I feel that I am
justified in asking the University for a salary of
\$5000.00, part of which could very properly come from the University.

The University of Chicago
Founded by John D. Rockefeller
The Bartlett Gymnasium

2.

Chicago

The reasons which I feel justify my request are that I am subjected to a nervous wear and tear out of proportion to the financial return, judged by the standard of reward for work which I am doing, to wit:-

(1) The character of my work is of itself extremely wearing nervously & physically.

(2) The special dealings and relations with the candidates for & the players on the teams, with the students, the public, & rival universities are, at the same time that they are often complex and delicate, quite trying.

(3) The worry of carrying on satisfying intercollegiate contests with limited material and the strictest of scholarship eligibility rules is burdensome.

(4) The struggles to secure a fair proportion of athletic material from the high & preparatory schools is a continuous moral as well as nervous strain.

(5) The athletic part of my work is always in the scales and being tested, and was a bettle one if he does not preserve a good balance.

(6) The nature of my work is such that I can not get away from it, because there is a constant University and public pressure bearing down on me.

For several years there has rarely been an hour, day or night, during residence which I have devoted to personal enjoyment, and Mr Stagg has worked many hundreds of hours helping me,

The University of Chicago
Founded by John D. Rockefeller
The Bartlett Gymnasium

3.

Chicago

without financial reward. The pressure is so great that I never feel free even during my vacation periods, and very few days pass when I do not do some special work for the University.

I feel that it is only fair to myself to recall the fact that in the organization and work of the Department of Physical Culture and Athletics, I have to do with the work which in all large universities falls to the lot of from three to five different men, and which in every case where the work is conducted on a broad plan, costs several thousand dollars more money.

I would not ask for this salary if the financial outlook for the future did not seem to be settled and sufficiently prosperous to provide amply for the payment of it and still leave a sufficient sum to meet the expenses of the Department and to provide for future growth.

I would respectfully ask that I may learn the decision of the University on this matter sometime before the first of August.

Sincerely,

A. Alonzo Stagg.

3

Chicago

My dear Mr. [Name]
I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of August 1st, and in reply to inform you that the same has been forwarded to the proper authorities for their consideration. I am, however, unable to give you a definite answer at this time, as the matter is still under consideration. I will, however, endeavor to give you a reply as soon as possible. I am, very respectfully,
Sincerely,
A. [Name]

THE HUB

Nov. 22, 1905.

Mr. George Lytton,
The Hub,

Jackson Boulevard and State Street,
Chicago.

Dear Sir:-

Your favor of the 21st inst. to Dr. Harper is handed to me. I am trying to save the President from as much detail as possible and so take the liberty of replying without referring it to him.

Mr. Chitwood tells me that the applications for seats were so many that his office was quite overwhelmed in trying to answer them. They were checked up readily and seats assigned so that he felt safe in the delay. The particular seats which you requested he tells me he could not assign as letters were considered in the order in which they were received and many others preceded yours. He tried as far as he could to meet the wishes of applicants. I may add that Mr. Chitwood tells me that your previous letter was not written on your usual letter head paper and he was not aware that special consideration was due. I think the young

Nov. 22, 1905.

Mr. George Lytton,
The Hub,

Jackson Boulevard and State Street,
Chicago.

Dear Sir:-

Your favor of the 21st inst. to Dr. Harper is handed to me. I am trying to save the President from as much detail as possible and so take the liberty of replying without referring it to him.

Mr. Whitwood tells me that the applications for seats were so many that his office was quite overwhelmed in trying to answer them. They were checked up readily and seats assigned so that he felt safe in the delay. The particular seats which you requested he tells me he could not assign as letters were considered in the order in which they were received and many others preceded yours. He tried as far as he could to meet the wishes of applicants. I may add that Mr. Whitwood tells me that your previous letter was not written on your usual letter head paper and he was not aware that special consideration was due. I think the young

man has done his best in the matter. There were numerous applications from people whom we ~~should~~ rejoice to accommodate but which came so late that there is no room for them. The seats sent you are in the best section. If any seats should be given up so that it will be possible to do better by you, I have asked Mr. Chitwood to bear it in mind.

The handling of seats by speculators is something which it has seemed impossible to prevent. They induce a great many people to buy tickets in bunches of two, three, and four and of course our clerks have no means of knowing that such purchases are intended for speculators. The whole thing is exceedingly annoying and I am sorry you have been inconvenienced.

Very truly yours,

H. P. Chandler
Secretary to the President

Nov. 22, 1908.

man has done his best in the matter. There were
numerous applications from people whom we wanted
to accommodate but which came so late that
there is no room for them. The seats sent you are
in the best section. If any seats should be given
up so that it will be possible to do better by you,
I have asked Mr. Chitwood to bear it in mind.
The handling of seats by speculators is some-
thing which it has seemed impossible to prevent.
They induce a great many people to buy tickets in
bunches of two, three, and four and of course our
clerks have no means of knowing that such purchases
are intended for speculators. The whole thing is
exceedingly annoying and I am sorry you have been
inconvenienced.
Very truly yours,
H. F. Chandler
Secretary to the President



JACKSON BOUL., STATE AND QUINCY STS.

Chicago,

Nov. 21, 1905.

Dr. William R. Harper,
President, University of Chicago,
Chicago.

Dear Sir:

Kindly pardon my addressing the following to you. However, I believe the same should be brought to your notice.

More than two weeks ago I addressed a letter to Mr. Chitwood, of the University, asking that eight seats be reserved for me for the Thanksgiving football game. After waiting ten days and receiving no acknowledgment of my letter I phoned Mr. Chitwood's office and was informed they had been too busy to acknowledge my letter but had made reservations for me. The seats were not what I had asked for, but I accepted them and said I would forward my check at once, which I did yesterday.

In view of the fact that I asked for these seats two weeks in advance of the opening of the sale, it does seem strange that I was not able to procure a desirable location. Mr. Henry C. Lytton, my father, having donated quite liberally to the University, feels rather keenly the fact that he is not entitled to any consideration, - all of which is due to the management of this sale of seats for the games.

There have been no two- or three-dollar seats on sale at all at Spaldings. Speculators are handling the seats openly in the city and the elevator boys in the Marquette Building are offering them for sale.



JACKSON HOUSE, STATE AND COUNTY STS.

Nov. 21, 1908.

Chicago

Dr. William H. Harper,
President, University of Chicago,
Chicago.

Dear Sir:

Kindly pardon my addressing the following to you. However, I believe the same should be brought to your notice.

More than two weeks ago I addressed a letter to Mr. Whitwood, of the University, asking that eight seats be reserved for me for the Thanksgiving football game. After waiting ten days and receiving no answer, I wrote again on Nov. 10, asking that I be added to the list and was informed they had been too busy to acknowledge my letter but had made reservations for me. The seats were not what I had asked for, but I accepted them and said I would forward my check at once, which I did yesterday.

In view of the fact that I asked for these seats two weeks in advance of the opening of the sale, it does seem strange that I was not able to procure a desirable location. Mr. Henry C. Lyton, my father, having donated quite liberally to the University, feels rather keenly the fact that he is not entitled to any consideration, - all of which is due to the management of this sale of seats for the games.

There have been no two- or three-dollar seats on sale at all at Springfield. Speculators are handling the seats openly in the city and the elevator boys in the Harpette Building are offering them for sale.

ON, PRES.

GEORGE LYTTON, VICE-PRES.



C. LYTTON, PRES.

UL., STATE AND QUINCY STS.

Chicago,

Harper, Wm. R. 11/21/1905. - 2 -

I feel sure you will pardon me for troubling you at this time,
and that you are not acquainted with the above facts.

Yours very truly,

George Lytton

THE HUB
HENRY C. LYTON, President
JACKSON SQUARE, STATE AND QUINCY STS.

Chicago

Harper, Mr. R. 11/11/1906. - 2 -

I feel sure you will pardon me for troubling you at this time,
and that you are not acquainted with the above facts.
Yours very truly,

George Lyton

THE HUB
HENRY C. LYTTON, PRES.
JACKSON BOUL., STATE AND QUINCY STS.

Chicago,

Nov. 25, 1905.

7

Athletic

Dr. H. P. Judson,
University of Chicago,
City.

Dear Sir:

Your favor of the 22d instant received today and I wish to express to you my thanks for your personal attention in the matter of which I wrote to Dr. Harper. My seats have arrived today and from what I learn I must be fortunate indeed. However, it seems difficult to realize that I was not able to obtain seats a little lower down (my wife being fearful of being as high up as the 20th row) when my letter was written on the 6th of this month. I shall start after seats for the next Thanksgiving game some time in the month of the coming July or August and fool some of these speculators.

Once again thanking you for your trouble, I remain

Very truly yours,

George Lytton



JACKSON BOUL., STATE AND QUINCY STS.

Nov. 25, 1905.

Chicago,

Dr. H. P. Jackson,

University of Chicago,

City.

Dear Sir:

Your favor of the 22d instant received today and I wish to express to you my thanks for your personal attention in the matter of which I wrote to Dr. Harper. My seats have arrived today and from what I learn I must be fortunate indeed. However, it seems difficult to realize that I was not able to obtain seats a little lower down (my wife being fearful of being as high up as the 20th row) when my letter was written on the 6th of this month. I shall start after seats for the next Thanksgiving game some time in the month of the coming July or August and look some of these specialists.

Once again thanking you for your trouble, I remain

Very truly yours,

George Lytton