

T4A
Heckman

The University of Chicago
Office of the Counsel and Business Manager

ROOM 1204, 134 SOUTH LASALLE ST.
TELEPHONE FRANKLIN 214

February 25, 1916.

President Harry Pratt Judson,
The University of Chicago.

My dear President:

I am returning with this Dr. Burton's letter, together with the information asked for, so far as I have it here.

1. The portion of the University quadrangle subject to the reversionary right of the American Baptist Education Society is the west half of the main campus and the north half of the east half.

2. The block between Greenwood and Ellis Avenues and 58th and 59th Streets, together with the south half of the block lying between Greenwood and Ellis Avenues, 57th and 58th Streets were conveyed to the Society on June 1, 1890 for an expressed consideration of \$132,500; that would be just half of the total amount of land covered by this deed. The ground was certainly worth no more than that. That price would be about \$73.00 per front foot. \$50.00 would have been nearer the actual cash value at that time, I think. Probably \$200,000 would be a fair estimate.

3. The reversionary clause is as follows:

"Upon the express condition, however, that the said premises shall, for the period or term of 100 years from the date hereof, be used exclusively by the said party of the second part for educational purposes, as the site of a college or university and upon the further express condition that the said party of the second part shall at no time alienate or mortgage the said premises for any debt or other purpose without the consent of the said party of the first part, and upon the further express condition that the requirements, as set forth in the charter of the said party of the second part, that the President and two-

February 20, 1916.

President Harry Pratt Judson,
The University of Chicago.

My dear President:

I am returning with this Dr. Burton's letter, together with the information asked for, so far as I have it here. 1. The portion of the University quadrangle subject to the reversionary right of the American Baptist Education Society is the west half of the main campus and the north half of the east half.

2. The block between Greenwood and Ellis Avenues and 38th and 39th Streets, together with the south half of the block lying between Greenwood and Ellis Avenues, 37th and 38th Streets were conveyed to the Society on June 1, 1890 for an expressed consideration of \$150,000; that would be just half of the total amount of land covered by this deed. The ground was certainly worth no more than that. That price would be about \$25.00 per front foot. \$50.00 would have been nearer the actual cash value at that time. I think. Probably \$200,000 would be a fair estimate.

3. The reversionary clause is as follows:

"Upon the express condition, however, that the said premises shall, for the period of term of 100 years from the date hereof, be used exclusively by the said party of the second part for educational purposes, as the case of a college or university and upon the further express condition that the said party of the second part shall at no time alienate or mortgage the said premises for any debt or other purpose without the consent of the said party of the first part, and upon the further express condition that the reversioners, as set forth in the charter of the said party of the second part, that the President and two-

87
No. 2. Pres. H.P.J.

thirds of the Board of Trustees of the same shall be members of regular Baptist churches, shall be at all times complied with, and in the event of the breach of any of these conditions, the title to the said premises shall revert to the said party of the first part or its successor."

4. About \$200.00 a front foot or \$720,000.

5. The buildings now on blocks 2, 3 and 7, including vacated alleys and streets adjoining with cost values as follows:

Tower group	\$413,920.67
Hull group	325,000.00
Ryerson group	343,908.47
Kent	202,270.19
Hitchcock	150,499.08
Snell	53,586.41
Cobb	221,956.03
Divinity dormitories	172,805.72
Classics	259,078.52
Haskell	103,017.49
W 1/2 Harper	407,753.30
	<u>\$2,653,795.88</u>

6. I have no means of knowing. Possibly an inspection of the subscription list might be the basis of an approximation. Dr. Goodspeed probably has the form of the subscription used, which might have a bearing.

Very truly yours,

Enc,

W. Goodspeed

No. 2. Pres. H.P.J.

thirds of the Board of Trustees of the same shall be members of regular Baptist churches, shall be at all times complied with, and in the event of the breach of any of these conditions, the title to the said premises shall revert to the said party of the first part or its successors."

4. About \$200.00 a front foot or \$720,000.
5. The buildings now on blocks 2, 3 and 7, including vacated alleys and streets adjoining with cost values as follows:

\$412,900.07	Tower Group
222,000.00	Hill Group
241,902.47	Hudson Group
202,270.19	Kent
120,492.02	Hickok
22,222.41	Snell
221,222.02	Cobb
172,202.72	Twining domestic
222,072.22	Clanton
102,017.42	Haskell
422,722.20	W 1/2 Harper
22,222.22	

6. I have no means of knowing. Possibly an inspection of the subscription list might be the basis of an approximation. Dr. Goodspeed probably has the form of the subscription used, which might have a bearing.

Very truly yours,

Enc.

T4B

(STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL)

March 1, 1916.

Report by Mr. Burton of conversation between President H. P. Judson and Mr. E. D. Burton with reference to the possible release of the land of the University of Chicago from the reversionary rights held by the American Baptist Education Society.

I. On the occasion of a luncheon at the University Club, given to Doctors Lyon and Padelford, Friday, January 21, 1916, Mr. Judson spoke voluntarily in high praise of what the Board of Education has done in the Iowa situation, and at the close of the meeting said to me that he had a suggestion or two to make respecting the work of the Board and should be glad to have me call at his office.

II. Being much pressed for time and Mr. Judson being out of the city during a portion of the next ten days, I did not call on him with reference to this matter till about ten days later. When I called upon him on or about January 31st and recalled what he had said at the University Club, he stated that in his judgment the Board of Managers of the American Baptist Education Society was overlooking an important asset, namely, the reversionary rights which the Society holds to the original campus of the University of Chicago. I said, "You don't think that the Society has any idea of attempting to realize on these assets, do you?", to which he replied, "The assets are real and have a cash value." I was then in doubt and am still in doubt whether he meant these remarks to be taken altogether seriously. Whether so or not, he went on to say that from the point of view of the University it was an intolerable situation that anybody should hold reversionary rights to the land on which its buildings stood, that he himself

felt it as a very undesirable situation, and that he knew that the release of the land from these reversionary rights by the issuance of a quitclaim deed by the Society would be very gratifying to the founder of the University. He added further that of course it would be pleasant if the Society would, simply out of recognition of the undesirability of the University's situation, release the property without consideration. In my reply I referred to an occasion some two years ago when, being in New York, I had responded to a request from Mr. Gates to call on him in his office, and had found both Mr. Gates and Mr. Judson there. Mr. Gates had then made to me, as the Chairman of the Board of Managers of the Society, the suggestion that the Society should give its consent to an amendment to the Charter of the University by which it should no longer be obligatory upon the University to select its President from the members of the Baptist denomination, or its Trustees, to the extent of two-thirds of the whole number, from that denomination. He urged this upon the ground of justice, saying that it was not right that the Baptist denomination should, because of gifts to the University almost insignificant in amount as compared with those of Mr. Rockefeller and non-Baptists, retain the control over the University given to it by the charter. I replied at that time that I could not favor his suggestion, because in my judgment a contract was entered into in 1889 between Mr. Rockefeller and other donors to the founding fund of the University and that the abrogation of that contract without the express consent of those donors would be an inequitable transaction. I stated that in my judgment the amount of the contributions of the two contracting parties made no difference, that

felt it as a very undesirable situation, and that he knew that the release of the land from these reversionary rights by the issuance of a quitclaim deed by the Society would be very gratifying to the founder of the University. He added further that of course it would be pleasant if the Society would simply out of recognition of the undesirability of the University's situation, release the property without consideration. In my reply I referred to an occasion some two years ago when, being in New York, I had responded to a request from Mr. Gates to call on him in his office, and had found both Mr. Gates and Mr. Judson there. Mr. Gates had then made to me, as the Chairman of the Board of Managers of the Society, the suggestion that the Society should give its consent to an amendment to the Charter of the University by which it should no longer be obligatory upon the University to select its President from the members of the Baptist denomination, or its Trustees, to the extent of two-thirds of the whole number, from that denomination. He urged this upon the ground of justice, saying that it was not right that the Baptist denomination should, because of gifts to the University almost insignificant in amount as compared with those of Mr. Rockefeller and non-Baptists, retain the control over the University given to it by the Charter. I replied at that time that I could not favor his suggestion, because in my judgment a contract was entered into in 1889 between Mr. Rockefeller and other donors to the founding fund of the University and that the abrogation of that contract without the express consent of those donors would be an inequitable transaction. I stated that in my judgment the amount of the contributions of the two contracting parties made no difference, that

a man who went in as one-tenth partner in an enterprise was entitled to have his rights protected as fully as the man who put in nine-tenths. Mr. Gates dissented from this view, and Mr. Judson evidently agreed with him, though taking a less active part in the conversation. I stated further that I did not believe in the rights of the dead and that I could perfectly recognize that a generation or two later those then living might have the right to do what in their judgment was best with respect to this charter, but that I did not think that sufficient time had elapsed to make such a proceeding equitable. Mr. Gates stated that of course the matter could not and ought not to be carried through without the fullest possible discussion, nor without the free consent of the denomination, but that it would be a very handsome thing, an act of obvious righteousness, if the denomination would of its own will take the step which he suggested. At the time, I felt so strongly the inequity and the inexpediency of the step proposed that I never even brought it to the attention of the Board of Managers, though I spoke of it to one or two individuals.

To return to the conversation in Mr. Judson's office in Chicago, held, as above stated, on or about January 31st, 1916, I referred to this previous conversation in New York and stated that I had never felt, and did not now feel, that a change of the charter was practicable, but that the present proposition to leave the charter unchanged and grant a quitclaim deed releasing the land from the reversionary rights held by the Education Society, was another matter and impressed me very differently from the other proposal. I stated further that if it were to be done at all, I

should very much prefer that it should not be done upon a commercial basis, that the denomination should take the step without the stipulation of compensation.

In reply, Mr. Judson said that when he was Acting President of the University, Judge Baldwin had asked him what he thought about the continuance of the Baptist clauses in the charter; that he had replied that he did not believe that the University ought ever to pass out from under the control of the Baptists; that his chief reason for this was that he desired it to remain always under Christian control - what denomination controlled it, was not so important, but if it was to be under Christian control it would practically have to be under one denomination, and being under the Baptists, there would be no reason to change it to another; but that in his judgment the clause respecting the President ought to be changed and it would be sufficient that a majority of the Board of Trustees should be Baptists instead of two-thirds, as at present. He added that this opinion which he had stated to Judge Baldwin he had never changed, but still held. I stated that my own feeling about the dead hand was so strong that I should not insist that it be forever under Baptist control, but I felt that it must remain so for some time to come. I reiterated my statement that the new proposal struck me as quite different from the old one, and stated my readiness to give consideration to it. I added that it would be impossible to hurry the matter, that a good deal of thought would have to be given to it and other people consulted, and that one could not say how soon anything could be done about it. In reply, Mr. Judson said, "I have now said what I

have to say. I have made my suggestion. It is for you to do whatever you think best about it."

III. Almost immediately after this interview the matter took somewhat different shape in my mind from that which it had taken in the interview. I saw that while Mr. Judson's request was a different one from the old one, for the proposal to change the charter there was substituted the proposal to remove the penalty for a change in the charter, and that when this penalty was removed there would probably be no legal obstacle to the change of the charter. From this point of view, it became an important question whether Mr. Rockefeller shared Mr. Judson's view that the University ought never to cease to be under Baptist control and whether the Board of Trustees shared it, and whether Mr. Rockefeller and the Board of Trustees would be willing to put themselves on record to this effect, so that for the legal obstacle to the change of the charter so as to release the University from Baptist control there could be substituted a powerful moral obligation to continue it under such control.

I reported my conference with Mr. Judson to Dr. Small soon after it was held (about February 3d), and on February 5th dictated a letter to Mr. Judson (written and dated February 7th) in which I asked him various questions as to the portion of the University covered by the reversionary rights of the American Baptist Education Society, etc. (See my letter dated February 7, 1916.) Meeting Dr. Padelford in New York for a brief interview Monday, February 7th, I stated the matter briefly to him. On Friday, February 18, I had an extended interview with Mr. Small and

have to say. I have made my suggestion. It is for you to do whatever

you think best about it."

III. Almost immediately after this interview the matter took

somewhat different shape in my mind from that which it had taken in the interview. I saw that while Mr. Judson's request was a different one from the old one, for the proposal to change the charter there was substituted the proposal to remove the penalty for a change in the charter, and that when this penalty was removed there would probably be no legal obstacle to the change of the charter. From this point of view, it became an important question whether Mr. Rockefeller shared Mr. Judson's view that the University ought never to cease to be under Baptist control and whether the Board of Trustees shared it, and whether Mr. Rockefeller and the Board of Trustees would be willing to put themselves on record to this effect, so that for the legal obstacle to the change of the charter so as to release the University from Baptist control there could be substituted a powerful moral obligation to continue it under such control.

I reported my conference with Mr. Judson to Dr. Small soon after it was held (about February 25), and on February 25th dictated a letter to Mr. Judson (written and dated February 25th) in which I asked him various questions as to the portion of the University covered by the reverendary rights of the American Baptist Education Society, etc. (See my letter dated February 7, 1916.) Meeting Dr. Rockefeller in New York for a brief interview Monday, February 25th, I stated the matter briefly to him. On Friday, February 26, I had an extended interview with Mr. Small and

Mr. Marsh over the whole matter. Dr. Lyon being in Chicago then, I talked the matter over with him, and the following day he and Marsh and I had conferences over it. On Wednesday, the 23d, Dr. Padelford, Dr. Lyon, Mr. Small, Mr. Marsh and I had some further talk over it. In these discussions many different aspects of the matter were considered. We were all of the opinion that the initiative in the matter must proceed from Mr. Rockefeller, that the matter could not be put upon the basis of a commercial transaction, that the Board could not act without full report of the matter to the Society and full opportunity for discussion, that in view of the University of Chicago men on the Board no course could possibly be taken that would be open to the suspicion of the matter having originated among them and being a movement of the University of Chicago contingent in the Board. The point over which we were in greatest perplexity and on which we perhaps changed our views from time to time, was whether the exclusion of the quid pro quo element in the transaction, which we agreed afterward must be excluded, involved refusal on the part of the Society to receive money from Mr. Rockefeller either before or after the presentation of his proposition, if he should make it. It was finally agreed between Mr. Marsh, Mr. Small and myself, Dr. Lyon and Dr. Padelford having meantime left town, that in my interview I should state:

1. That the initiative must lie with Mr. Rockefeller.
2. That the Board could not act in the matter of itself, but would have to pass it on to the Society.
3. That, in view of the University of Chicago men on the Board, the Board could not take an active part in securing favorable action.

Mr. Marsh over the whole matter. Dr. Lyon being in Chicago then, I talked the matter over with him, and the following day he and Marsh and I had conference over it. On Wednesday, the 23d, Dr. Pabelford, Dr. Lyon, Mr. Small, Mr. Marsh and I had some further talk over it. In these discussions many different aspects of the matter were considered. We were all of the opinion that the initiative in the matter must proceed from Mr. Rockefeller, that the matter could not be put upon the basis of a commercial transaction, that the Board could not act without full report of the matter to the Society and full opportunity for discussion, that in view of the University of Chicago men on the Board no course could possibly be taken that would be open to the suspicion of the matter having originated among them and being a movement of the University of Chicago contingent in the Board. The point over which we were in greatest perplexity and on which we perhaps changed our views from time to time, was whether the exclusion of the quid pro quo element in the transaction, which we agreed afterward must be excluded, involved refusal on the part of the Society to receive money from Mr. Rockefeller either before or after the presentation of his proposition, if he should make it. It was finally agreed between Mr. Marsh, Mr. Small and myself, Dr. Lyon and Dr. Pabelford having meantime left town, that in my interview I should state:

1. That the initiative must lie with Mr. Rockefeller.
2. That the Board could not act in the matter of itself, but would have to pass it on to the Society.
3. That, in view of the University of Chicago men on the Board, the Board could not take an active part in securing favorable action.

4. That the campaign in favor of it would have to be conducted by Mr. Rockefeller's representatives.

5. That in my initial statement nothing would be said one way or the other about money. It was further agreed that if the question was raised I should state

a) The matter absolutely could not be on the basis of a commercial transaction.

b) That the Board would undoubtedly be very glad if Mr. Rockefeller approved our work and were willing to contribute to education through this Society as he had done twenty-five years ago, but that such gifts should be made from interest in the work which the Board is capable of doing and not as a quid pro quo for the quitclaim deed. To succeed in the effort, Mr. Rockefeller must convince the denomination that he is in sympathy with what they are trying to do in education. If, for example, he could say that what he sought to do twenty-five years ago in establishing the University of Chicago as a denominational college, he wished now to do through the same Society on a large scale, or at least at a number of points, that would undoubtedly help.

c) That it would undoubtedly be helpful if Mr. Rockefeller's letter should state that he shared the views above referred to as Mr. Judson's own respecting the continuance of Baptist control over the University, and if at a later stage the Board of Trustees could pass a resolution to similar effect.

As will appear below, most of the matters here indicated as to

be stated if the question was asked, were not in fact brought up at all in the interview with Mr. Judson.

IV. After the conferences above referred to, I called on Mr. Judson in the latter's office on Wednesday, March 1st, at 11:15 A.M. The following is a record of this conversation made immediately at its close.

1. I stated that while both Mr. Judson and I were members of the Baptist denomination and connected with the University of Chicago, in this conversation I would represent the Baptist denomination, Mr. Judson the University.

2. Referring to the previous conversation, I stated that if anything was to be accomplished in the direction of Mr. Judson's suggestion, the initiative would have to be taken by Mr. Rockefeller, probably in the form of a letter to the Secretary of the Board of Managers of the Education Society, and added that any initiation of action in this direction by the members of the Board would be prejudicial both to the work of the Board and to the success of the effort. To this, Mr. Judson added, "I quite understand that."

3. I stated that if such a letter is sent, the Board, though having all the powers of the Society, would not feel justified in exercising those powers without referring the matter to the Society. Mr. Judson replied that he understood the necessity of that, that if anything was done it was not the desire of the University that it should be done without full consideration and discussion by the Society, "which," he said, "is practically identical with the Northern Baptist Convention, is it not?" To which, of course, I answered in the affirmative.

4. I stated that in view of the number of University of Chicago men on the Board it did not seem practicable that the Board should take an active part in securing favorable action by the Society; that before the discussion was over the individual members of the Board would undoubtedly have to declare themselves on one side or the other, yet it was my judgment that the Board would be unwilling as a Board to take any position in the matter other than that of receiving the communication and transmitting it to the Society; and further, that in the effort to secure favorable action,

whether by articles in newspapers or by speeches on the platform of the Convention, the advocacy of the measure would have to be arranged for by Mr. Rockefeller or his representatives. This led to a somewhat extended discussion of the part which the Board of Managers would have to take either for or against the proposal of Mr. Rockefeller. It is impossible for me to recall precisely the order of the various statements, but the following is the substance of what was said on both sides:

Mr. Judson stated that in his judgment it would be impossible for Mr. Rockefeller, having written a letter, then to undertake a propoganda in favor of the action which he was asking the Society to take, and that the Board of Managers could not escape the responsibility of their position as the Board of Managers and the necessity of taking a position either for or against the action which Mr. Rockefeller asks for. Mr. Burdett asked why it would not be possible, in case the letter were in the hands of the Board of Managers before an annual meeting of the Convention, to call a meeting of the Society without giving notice of the business to be transacted, to present the letter of Mr. Rockefeller and ask that it be referred to a special committee, which committee should take it under consideration for a year, during which the matter would be published and widely discussed, and action be had on the committee's report at the end of the year. Mr. Judson replied that the provision for public discussion was necessary, unless indeed the Society should itself wish to act immediately, and that the procedure suggested was feasible except in its proposal that the Board of Managers should transmit the letter without recommendation. This, he said, was what was known in

politics as "ducking", that is, it would be an attempt on the part of the Board to which the responsibility properly belonged to shift it to another body, and that while it had not quite the same effect as reporting it without recommendation, it nevertheless virtually carried with it a disapproval. He thought the Board could not escape the responsibility of taking a position for or against it. He then raised the question how many members of the Board there were, and being told there were twenty-one, asked how many of them were connected with the University of Chicago. Being told there were four or five, and asking how many others of the Board were likely to favor the request of Mr. Rockefeller and being told it would be very difficult to answer that question, he asked whether when the matter was presented to the Board a group of such persons not connected with the University, but likely to be favorable to this action, could not take the responsibility of handling the matter before the Board. To this I made no definite reply. I stated, however, that if the Board became convinced that it was its duty to take a definite position in the matter (and I should certainly communicate to them his view on that point) it would undoubtedly do so.

5. The question which had been very carefully considered in the discussions of Mr. Marsh, Dr. Small, Dr. Lyon, Dr. Padelford and myself, as to the relation between this proposed release of the University from the reversionary rights of the Society and Mr. Rockefeller's relation to the Education Society, did not come up at all. The only thing that approached it was that in closing the conversation I said that very much would depend upon the precise character of Mr. Rockefeller's letter, to which Mr. Judson replied, "I understand," without further comment.

politics as "ducking", that is, it would be an attempt on the part of the Board to which the responsibility properly belonged to shift it to another body, and that while it had not quite the same effect as reporting it without recommendation, it nevertheless virtually carried with it a disapproval. He thought the Board could not escape the responsibility of taking a position for or against it. He then raised the question how many members of the Board

there were, and being told there were twenty-one, asked how many of them were connected with the University of Chicago. Being told there were four or five, and asking how many others of the Board were likely to favor the request of Mr. Rockefeller and being told it would be very difficult to answer that question, he asked whether when the matter was presented to the Board a group of such persons not connected with the University, but likely to be favorable to this action, could not take the responsibility of handling the matter before the Board. To this I made no definite reply. I stated, however, that if the Board became convinced that it was its duty to take a definite position in the matter (and I should certainly communicate to them his view on that point) it would undoubtedly do so.

5. The question which had been very carefully considered in the discussions of Mr. Marsh, Dr. Small, Dr. Lyon, Dr. Fiske and myself, as to the relation between this proposed release of the University from the revolutionary rights of the Society and Mr. Rockefeller's relation to the Education Society, did not come up at all. The only thing that approached it was that in closing the conversation I said that very much would depend upon the precise character of Mr. Rockefeller's letter, to which Mr. Jackson replied, "I understand," without further comment.

In the midst of this conversation, Mr. Judson handed me the letter which I had written him, dated February 7th, together with a letter of Mr. Heckman to Mr. Judson, dated February 25th, in which a portion of these questions were answered, Mr. Heckman having stated in answer to the sixth question that he had no means of knowing what part of the \$400,000 contributed in 1890-92 was contributed by Baptists, and having made no answer to question 7, as to how much money had been contributed by Baptists since that time.

Mr. Judson, on my calling attention to the lack of answers to these questions, called up Dr. T. W. Goodspeed on the telephone and the following additional facts were elicited:

The amount originally subscribed toward the required \$400,000 to meet Mr. Rockefeller's gift of \$600,000 was considerably more than \$400,000. The amount actually paid in, including Mr. Marshall Field's gift of land (counted at \$125,000), was about \$425,000. Of this amount Baptists gave about \$200,000. / 0

Subsequent gifts of Baptists to the University, other than those of Mr. Rockefeller, have been chiefly Baptist contributions to the \$200,000 raised for the building of the Harper Memorial Library. These contributions, together with such other contributions as have been made by Baptists, probably do not exceed \$100,000, certainly do not exceed \$200,000.

The total gifts of Baptists to the University, therefore, exclusive of Mr. Rockefeller's gifts, have been not to exceed \$400,000, probably less than \$300,000.

In the midst of this conversation, Mr. Judson handed me the letter which I had written him, dated February 7th, together with a letter of Mr. Heckman to Mr. Judson, dated February 25th, in which a portion of these questions were answered, Mr. Heckman having stated in answer to the sixth question that he had no means of knowing what part of the \$400,000 contributed in 1890-92 was contributed by Baptists, and having made no answer to question 7, as to how much money had been contributed by Baptists since that time.

Mr. Judson, on my calling attention to the lack of answers to these questions, called up Dr. T. W. Goodspeed on the telephone and the following additional facts were elicited:

The amount originally subscribed toward the required \$400,000 to meet Mr. Rockefeller's gift of \$600,000 was considerably more than \$400,000. The amount actually paid in, including Mr. Marshall Field's gift of land (counted at \$125,000), was about \$425,000. Of this amount Baptists gave about \$200,000.

Subsequent gifts of Baptists to the University, other than those of Mr. Rockefeller, have been chiefly Baptist contributions to the \$200,000 raised for the building of the Harper Memorial Library. These contributions, together with such other contributions as have been made by Baptists, probably do not exceed \$100,000, certainly do not exceed \$200,000.

The total gifts of Baptists to the University, therefore, exclusive of Mr. Rockefeller's gifts, have been not to exceed \$400,000, probably less than \$300,000.

Of the original \$1,020,000, Mr. Rockefeller's \$600,000 was set aside for endowment. The \$420,000 was spent:

For land, \$132,500, of which Mr. Field contributed \$125,000.

The remaining \$287,500 was used for various purposes, such as

a) Excess of cost of Cobb Hall and of the Divinity Dormitories above the amount of the gifts for these purposes. Thus, Cobb Hall cost \$221,956.03, while Mr. Cobb's gift for it was \$165,000; the Divinity Dormitories cost \$172,805.72, of which Mr. Rockefeller gave \$100,000. Perhaps also the excess cost of Kelly and Beecher Halls was paid from this sum.

b) Other expenses of the founding and the current expenses in the first year or two were also paid from this original Founding Fund.

The total gifts to the University up to date have amounted in round numbers to \$43,000,000, of which in round numbers \$4,000,000 has been spent, in accordance with the terms of the gifts, for current expenses. Of the total \$43,000,000, Mr. Rockefeller's gifts have amounted to \$35,000,000; the gifts of other Baptists, as above stated, to \$300,000 or \$400,000.

Of the original \$1,020,000, Mr. Rockefeller's \$500,000 was set

aside for endowment. The \$420,000 was spent:

For land, \$122,500, of which Mr. Field contributed \$122,000.

The remaining \$297,500 was used for various purposes, such as

a) Excess of cost of Cobb Hall and of the Divinity Dormitories

above the amount of the gifts for these purposes. Thus, Cobb Hall cost

\$221,986.02, while Mr. Cobb's gift for it was \$122,000; the Divinity Dormi-

tores cost \$122,802.72, of which Mr. Rockefeller gave \$100,000. Perhaps

also the excess cost of Kelly and Beecher Halls was paid from this sum.

b) Other expenses of the founding and the current expenses in

the first year or two were also paid from this original founding fund.

The total gifts to the University up to date have amounted in

round numbers to \$43,000,000, of which in round numbers \$4,000,000 has been

spent, in accordance with the terms of the gifts, for current expenses. Of

the total \$43,000,000, Mr. Rockefeller's gifts have amounted to \$22,000,000;

the gifts of other Baptists, as above stated, to \$200,000 or \$400,000.

At 2:30 of the same day, not being quite able to recall whether I had said to Mr. Judson that if the matter were proposed the proposal should put chief emphasis on and make its chief appeal to the spirit of fairness in the denomination, and fearing that if I had not said this my closing remark might be given an interpretation quite the reverse of what I intended, I stepped into his office and asked him whether I had made the above statement in the morning. He replied, "I do not know that you said it, but that is the essence of all we were saying this morning." He added, "I can imagine its being put on a cold, hard, commercial basis, but that would be quite unworthy." I replied that I thought it quite impossible. He said, "Whether impossible or not, it would be unworthy." To which I added, "Not only unworthy, but inexpedient." "Very likely," he said, "At any rate, we want to put it on the high ground of what is fair and worthy of the denomination."

At 2:30 of the same day, not being quite able to recall whether I had said to Mr. Judson that if the matter were proposed the proposal should put chief emphasis on and make its chief appeal to the spirit of fairness in the denomination, and fearing that if I had not said this my closing remark might be given an interpretation quite the reverse of what I intended, I stepped into his office and asked him whether I had made the above statement in the morning. He replied, "I do not know that you said it, but that is the essence of all we were saying this morning." He added, "I can imagine its being put on a cold, hard, commercial basis, but that would be quite unworthy." I replied that I thought it quite impossible. He said, "Whether impossible or not, it would be unworthy." To which I added, "Not only unworthy, but inexpedient." "Very likely," he said, "At any rate, we want to put it on the high ground of what is fair and worthy of the denomination."

OFFICERS

President—
CHESTER B. CURTIS,
Central High School,
St. Louis, Missouri

First Vice-President—
THOMAS F. HOLGATE,
Northwestern University,
Evanston, Illinois

Second Vice-President—
HOMER H. SEERLEY,
Iowa State Normal School,
Cedar Falls, Iowa

Secretary—
HENRY E. BROWN,
New Trier Township High School,
Kenilworth, Illinois

Treasurer—
MILO H. STUART,
Technical High School,
Indianapolis, Indiana

NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION

OF

COLLEGES AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS

NEXT ANNUAL MEETING,
ST. LOUIS, MARCH 22 AND 23, 1917

Kenilworth, Ill.,

Nov. 10, 1916.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The President, Secretary, and
Treasurer are members ex-officio.
THOMAS ARKLE CLARK,
University of Illinois,
Urbana, Illinois

C. H. JOHNSTON,
University of Illinois,
Urbana, Illinois

J. D. ELLIFF,
University of Missouri,
Columbia, Missouri

CHARLES H. JUDD,
University of Chicago,
Chicago, Illinois

J. H. T. MAIN,
Grinnell College,
Grinnell, Iowa

E. L. MILLER,
Northwestern High School,
Detroit, Michigan

JOHN S. NOLLEN,
Lake Forest College,
Lake Forest, Illinois

WILLIAM E. SMYSER,
Ohio Wesleyan University,
Delaware, Ohio

Pres. Harry Pratt Judson,

Chicago, Ill.

My dear Pres. Judson:

The meeting of the Executive Committee of the North Central Association will be held in Chicago on Friday, Dec. 8, 1916. One of the objects of this meeting is to plan the program for the coming meeting of the Association to be held in St. Louis, Mo., on March 22, 23, and 24. Your interest in the Association emboldens me to write you with the request that you send me at your earliest convenience any suggestions that may occur to you as to the nature of the program for the coming year. The Executive Committee would be pleased to receive suggestions and to consider them most seriously.

I shall hope to hear from you relative to this matter before the meeting of the Executive Committee on Dec. 8.

Yours very truly,

Henry E. Brown

Secretary.

Dear Mr. B

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
The following members are elected
THOMAS ARKLE CLARK
University of Illinois
C. H. JOHNSON
University of Illinois
J. D. ELLIFF
University of Illinois
CHARLES H. JUDG
University of Chicago
L. H. T. MAIN
University of Illinois
E. F. MILLER
University of Illinois
JOHN S. WOLLEN
University of Illinois
WILLIAM E. MYSTON
University of Illinois

NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS

NEXT ANNUAL MEETING
ST. LOUIS, MARCH 22 AND 23, 1917

W. H. SEELY
University of Illinois
H. E. BROWN
University of Illinois
R. H. STUART
University of Illinois

The meeting of the Executive Committee of the North Central Association will be held in Chicago on Friday, Dec. 5, 1916. One of the objects of this meeting is to plan the program for the coming meeting of the Association to be held at St. Louis, Mo., March 22 and 23, 1917. I am sure that you will be glad to write me with the request that you send me at your earliest convenience any suggestions that may occur to you as to the nature of the program for the coming year. The Executive Committee would be pleased to receive suggestions and to consider them most seriously.

I shall hope to hear from you relative to this matter before the meeting of the Executive Committee on Dec. 5.

Yours very truly,

W. H. Seely
Secretary

Chicago, November 11, 1916

Dear Mr. Brown:

Your favor of the 10th inst. is received. The most pressing matter at present in my opinion is the question of the relationship between the high schools and the colleges in the way of common matter of instruction. My opinion is that all the first year of the colleges in essence, and part of the second, is simply high-school work. I think there ought to be a telescoping there which would save at least a year's time to the student, without the slightest harm to his intellectual progress. I should be glad if consideration could be given by the Association to this vital question.

Very truly yours,

H.P.J. - L.

Mr. Henry E. Brown
New Trier Township High School
Kenilworth, Illinois

Chicago, November 11, 1916

Dear Mr. Brown:

Your favor of the 10th inst. is received. The most pressing matter at present in my opinion is the question of the relationship between the high schools and the colleges in the way of common matter of instruction. My opinion is that all the first year of the colleges in essence, and part of the second, is simply high-school work. I think there ought to be a telescoping there which would save at least a year's time to the student, without the slightest harm to his intellectual progress. I should be glad if consideration could be given by the Association to this vital question.

Very truly yours,

H.P.J. - L.

Mr. Henry E. Brown
New Trier Township High School
Kenilworth, Illinois

T4B
November 20, 1916.

MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE BOARD OF MANAGERS
OF THE AMERICAN BAPTIST EDUCATION SOCIETY.

Pursuant to the call of the Chairman and Secretaries, the Executive Committee of the Board of Managers of the American Baptist Education Society met in the office of the Chairman at Harper Memorial Library, Monday evening, November 20, at 9 o'clock, being called to order by the Chairman.

The following members were present: Mr. Trevor Arnett, Dr. Emory Hunt and the Chairman, Dr. Ernest D. Burton.

It was voted that the committee invite representative members of the Baptist denomination to meet with them on Tuesday evening, November 21, at 5:30 at the University Club. The following persons were selected to be invited: Ambrose Swasey, Henry Bond, D. C. Shull, T. W. Goodspeed, W. C. Bitting, C. S. Burton, F. L. Anderson, F. W. Ayer, Shailer Mathews, Emory Hunt.

Albion W. Small

Secretary pro tem.

November 30, 1918.

MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE BOARD OF MANAGERS
OF THE AMERICAN BAPTIST EDUCATION SOCIETY.

Pursuant to the call of the Chairman and
Secretaries, the Executive Committee of the Board of
Managers of the American Baptist Education Society met in
the office of the Chairman at Harper Memorial Library,
Monday evening, November 30, at 9 o'clock, being called to
order by the Chairman.

The following members were present: Mr. Trevor

Arnett, Dr. Emory Hunt and the Chairman, Dr. Ernest D.

Burton.

It was voted that the committee invite repre-
sentative members of the Baptist denomination to meet
with them on Tuesday evening, November 21, at 8:30 at
the University Club. The following persons were selected
to be invited: Ambrose Swasey, Henry Bond, D. C. Small,
T. W. Goodspeed, W. C. Bittling, C. S. Burton, F. J.
Anderson, F. W. Ayer, Shailer Mathews, Emory Hunt.

Aldwin W. Small

Secretary pro tem.

November 27, 1916. THB

On November 9, 1916, Mr. Burton having called on Mr. Judson to ask his advice as to the wisdom of asking a certain Chicago man for \$50,000 for McMinnville College, Mr. Judson advised against it. Whereupon there ensued substantially the following conversation:

Mr. Judson: There is one way that you can get the money. You can exercise your reversionary rights on the property of the University of Chicago.

Mr. Burton: I dislike to have you refer to that again. We are not going to cash in on those rights.

Mr. Judson: But you need money and a great deal of it.

Mr. Burton: But not bad enough to get it in that way. You know that I believe that the property of the University should eventually be free from those reversionary rights, but when it comes about, it should not be by virtue of a bargain and sale.

Mr. Judson: Of course you know that I agree with you, and when it does come about, your Board will not suffer.

Mr. Burton: But that will have to come by a modification of the attitude of the denomination under the influence of such actions as the framing of the charter for the Union College of Iowa.

Mr. Judson: Yes, that was a great thing that you did in that charter, and when the sentiment of the denomination is ready for a change in the situation at Chicago, it will come about naturally.

On the morning of November 10, Dr. T. W. Goodspeed came to Mr. Burton's office at the University and said that he was greatly distressed over the situation in which the Board of Education found itself in respect to McMinnville and that he had been talking with President Judson about it. Mr. Judson had referred to the matter of the reversionary rights of the American Baptist Education Society to a portion of the real estate of the University of Chicago, and Dr. Goodspeed

November 27, 1916

On November 2, 1916, Mr. Burton having called on Mr. Judson to ask

his advice as to the wisdom of asking a certain Chicago man for \$50,000 for

Wilmington College, Mr. Judson advised against it. Whereupon there ensued sub-

stantially the following conversation:

Mr. Judson: There is one way that you can get the money. You can
exercise your reversionary rights on the property of the Uni-
versity of Chicago.

Mr. Burton: I dislike to have you refer to that again. We are not
going to cash in on those rights.

Mr. Judson: But you need money and a great deal of it.

Mr. Burton: But not bad enough to get it in that way. You know
that I believe that the property of the University should
eventually be free from those reversionary rights, but when
it comes about, it should not be by virtue of a bargain and
sale.

Mr. Judson: Of course you know that I agree with you, and when it
does come about, your Board will not suffer.

Mr. Burton: But that will have to come by a modification of the
attitude of the denomination under the influence of such
actions as the framing of the charter for the Union College
of Iowa.

Mr. Judson: Yes, that was a great thing that you did in that
charter, and when the settlement of the denomination is ready
for a change in the situation at Chicago, it will come about
naturally.

On the morning of November 15, Dr. T. W. Goodspeed came to Mr. Burton's

office at the University and said that he was greatly distressed over the situa-

tion in which the Board of Education found itself in respect to Wilmington and

that he had been talking with President Judson about it. Mr. Judson had referred

to the matter of the reversionary rights of the American Baptist Education Society

to a portion of the real estate of the University of Chicago, and Mr. Goodspeed

raised the question whether we should not obtain money for our work in that way. He stated that he had not come at President Judson's suggestion, that Mr. Judson did not know that he was coming. Mr. Burton answered that this question had been up a number of times and that in the judgment of those with whom he had conferred there were two objections to our surrendering those reversionary rights for a cash consideration. First, we believed that it would seriously interfere with our raising money for Baptist colleges. The men whom we asked to give money to a college which by its charter was kept under control of the Baptist denomination would be likely to answer that they had no assurance that the institution would remain under such control, our action in reference to the University of Chicago showing that we ourselves do not regard contracts of this sort as things to be sacredly maintained. Mr. Goodspeed said: "I see your point. You are probably right."

Mr. Burton then stated as his second reason that in our judgment, if such a step were ever taken, it ought not to be upon a money basis. If the thing was right, the denomination ought to do it without any payment; if it was wrong, we ought not to do it for payment. To this Dr. Goodspeed said: "Oh, that is nonsense. That is quixotic. That is being too good. It is simply a business matter. The University, which is a great corporation, finds a cloud on its title; not a serious matter, but no corporation likes to have any cloud on the title of its property. They want it removed. There is no reason in the world why you should not take pay for it."

This conversation made a great impression upon Mr. Burton's mind, as indicating that those who had previously conferred on the matter were entirely mistaken as to the attitude of at least one man, for we had mentioned

Dr. Goodspeed as an example of men who would be bitterly opposed to any such change.

On Sunday, November 12, Mr. Burton mentioned to Mr. Marsh the above-mentioned conversation with Dr. Goodspeed, and suggested that perhaps, in view of it, a few of us had assumed too much responsibility in this matter and that we ought probably to call into conference a larger number of the leading men of the denomination. To this suggestion, Mr. Marsh gave immediate assent.

Mr. Burton, having occasion to go to Northfield to attend a meeting of the Board of Managers of the Foreign Mission Society, took occasion to confer with Dr. L. A. Crandall and Mr. Henry Bond, but separately. He told the story recorded in these minutes in outline to each of these men. In both cases they at first recoiled from the suggestion of any change. On further presentation of the matter, not argumentative, but only by way of stating the facts, each of them said: "There is more in that than I thought, but it ought not to be done for money." On still further consideration, each of them said in substance: "After all, I don't know that there is any objection to doing it for money." Mr. Bond, in particular, said: "If the thing is right, it does not become wrong because you receive money in connection with it", and especially made the point that the Baptists who in 1891 gave money to the University of Chicago, did it for the promotion of education under Baptist auspices. If now the money which they gave, and more too, is paid back to the Education Society, that money can now be used to carry out their original intentions, and perhaps more perfectly than if it remains in the hands of the University of Chicago. Therefore, so far from its being the case that the change ought not to be made for money, it is precisely by taking money for it that the Society of today can carry out the original purpose of the donors.

To surrender the rights without taking money is to fail to achieve the purpose for which the money was given.

On Monday, November 20, at a meeting of the Executive Committee of the Board of Education and Board of Managers, at which there were present of the Committee: Marsh, Small, Stilwell, Hanley, and Burton; and of the Board: Arnett and Hunt, Mr. Burton, following out his thought that a larger number ought to share the responsibility of decision than had hitherto done so, related in brief the whole story recorded in these minutes. There was at first, evidently, on the part of some of them a repugnance to the whole suggestion, but a manifest diminution of this as the discussion went on, and at the close it was voted by the Executive Committee of the Board of Managers of the American Baptist Education Society to invite certain leading men of the denomination who were at present in Chicago to confer with the Committee respecting the matter at the University Club at half past five the next day. Mr. Burton was deputed to invite Dr. T. W. Goodspeed to be present. This he did by telephone Tuesday morning and Dr. Goodspeed accepted. Later in the morning, however, he called up to say that he had had a conference with Mr. Judson and that Mr. Judson had expressed the following opinions:

1. That the question of the removal of the cloud from the title should be entirely disassociated from the denominational requirements of the charter.
2. That the University would not act in the matter without some indication from the Board of Managers of the Education Society that they were willing to consider the question.
3. That the financial consideration in the case could not be named, but would be a substantial sum.
4. That the Board of Trustees of the University would not be deterred from taking any action which they thought to be necessary for the interest of the University by the fact of the reversionary clause

in the deed. What would deter them would be the sense of obligation to the charter in any possible financial damage resulting from the reversionary clause.

5. That it was unadvisable for Dr. Goodspeed to attend the meeting at the University Club, inasmuch as he was an officer of the University.

Later in the morning Mr. Burton had an interview with Dr. Goodspeed, confirming this telephone conversation, and also went to see Mr. Judson. He stated to Mr. Judson that the remarks of Dr. Goodspeed, recorded above under date of November 9th, had made a great impression upon his mind, because they showed that he had been quite mistaken in his estimate of one man's attitude of mind and might therefore be mistaken in respect to the thought of others. He then related what steps he had taken since, leading up to the statement of the arrangement for the meeting in the evening of the same day.

Mr. Judson then repeated in substance what he had said to Dr. Goodspeed, but explained it a little more fully. In respect to the first point, he said that the only question up was that of the clearing of the cloud on the title, that the question of change of the charter would not be raised in the near future and he did not expect it to come up in the lifetime of either of them. On the second point, he said that he had never taken up the matter with the Board of Trustees and would not do so unless he had some intimation that the Board of Education was willing to consider it. Mr. Burton stated that he was glad to have him put it in that way, as it was his judgment that the Board of Education would not be willing to go further than that at present; that is, would not be willing to say more than that they were willing to consider the matter. To this Mr. Judson answered, "Of course not." Mr. Burton thinks that if Mr. Judson should receive an intimation that the Board would be willing to consider it (he had indicated to Dr. Goodspeed that this need not be by any formal action of the Board), he

would then ascertain whether the Board of Trustees of the University were willing to consider it, and if the Board of Trustees were, the next step would be the appointment of a joint committee to confer.

On the third point, which he himself raised, Mr. Judson said that he had no idea what the amount would be, but of course it would be a substantial sum. Mr. Burton replied that Mr. Judson was aware that he had been strongly opposed to considering the matter on a financial basis, but that the recent conversations had modified his thought somewhat and that if the Board would be willing to consider it on that ground, it would be necessary of course to consider of how much benefit it would be to the Board and how much damage, and suggested that doubtless in some cases men would be unwilling to give money to the Board if this action was taken who might give it if it were not taken.

Mr. Judson also reiterated his reasons for advising Mr. Goodspeed not to go to the meeting on the ground that he was an officer of the University. Mr. Burton stated that he had invited him without that thought in mind, thinking of him only as a member of the denomination who had opinions on the subject.

On the evening of November 21, there met at the University Club for dinner, on invitation of the Board of Managers of the American Baptist Education Society, the following eighteen persons:

From the Board of Managers, Messrs. Marsh, Small, Stifler, Hanley, Brown, Barbour, Hunt, Arnett, Stilwell, Burton, and Secretary Padelord.

From outside the Board, Messrs. Swasey, Ayer, Shull, C. S. Burton, Beman, Bitting, Mathews.

The Chairman of the Board made before dinner a compendious statement of the history of the matter from the founding of the University to the present moment, and asked for a frank expression of opinion. Discussion was suspended

would then ascertain whether the Board of Trustees of the University were willing to consider it, and if the Board of Trustees were, the next step would be the appointment of a joint committee to confer.

On the third point, which he himself raised, Mr. Johnson said that he had no idea what the result would be, but of course it would be a substantial sum. Mr. Burton replied that Mr. Johnson was aware that he had been strongly opposed to considering the matter on a financial basis, but that the recent conversations had modified his thought somewhat and that if the Board would be willing to consider it on that ground, it would be necessary of course to consider of how much benefit it would be to the Board and how much damage, and suggested that doubtless in some cases men would be unwilling to give money to the Board if this action was taken who might give it if it were not taken.

Mr. Johnson also reiterated his reasons for advising Mr. Goodspeed not to go to the meeting on the ground that he was an officer of the University. Mr. Burton stated that he had invited him without that thought in mind, thinking of him only as a member of the denomination who had opinions on the subject.

On the evening of November 21, there met at the University Club for dinner, on invitation of the Board of Managers of the American Baptist Education Society, the following eighteen persons:

From the Board of Managers, Messrs. Marsh, Gail, Kilmer, Hendry, Brown, Hancock, Hunt, Arnsperg, Stillwell, Burton, and Secretary Redford.

From outside the Board, Messrs. Gressy, Kyer, Shull, C. S. Burton, Green, Stirling, Watkins.

The Chairman of the Board made before dinner a comprehensive statement of the history of the matter from the founding of the University to the present moment, and asked for a frank expression of opinion. Discussion was suspended

during the eating because of the presence of the waiters, but resumed after dinner, the Chairman calling upon different persons to speak.

Dr. Padelford did not speak. Dr. Stifler went out without expressing an opinion. All the others present, except Mr. Beman who at the close of the discussion announced himself as quite "up in the air", expressed themselves in favor of granting the request of the University as far as the reversionary clause was concerned. Mr. Shull even more pronouncedly expressed himself in favor of doing this without money consideration, believing that the denomination which had founded the institution ought to be proud of that fact, satisfied with it, and now disposed in a large-minded way to take its hands completely off and let the institution go its way unhampered. He did not expressly indicate whether he would release the University from all charter obligations respecting the number of trustees who should be Baptists. But his general attitude was that of giving to the University its entire freedom. Mr. Swasey expressed himself to much the same effect, but not so explicitly and emphatically. Most of the rest seemed to take it for granted that the release, if it took place, would be accompanied, either by way of definite agreement or as a subsequent act by the University, by a gift of money to the American Baptist Education Society.

Dr. Goodspeed's History of the University was brought in and attention was called to the fact that the form of pledge which was commonly used in the securing of subscriptions to the first million dollars, did not stipulate that the college was to be under Baptist control, and also to the further fact that this first million dollars, which was contributed for the building of a college and which was the only money which came to the University through the Education Society, was by these two facts sharply differentiated from all the subsequent

giving to the University. There was a suggestion, not very pointedly put, that the Education Society might very properly recover this million dollars and make use of it for the development of Baptist colleges, thus achieving more nearly than by its remaining in the hands of the University the original purpose of the gift. Mr. C. S. Burton expressed the opinion, after hearing the pledge form, that there was no obligation to the donors of this money that the University should remain under Baptist control, the contract to that effect being between the American Baptist Education Society, after it had secured the money on pledges which contained no such clause, and the University. Dr. Bitting suggested the desirability that the money paid to the Education Society should not come directly from the University but from some person interested in the University, possibly John D. Rockefeller, Jr. The general impression seemed to be that the Education Society would be justified on the one side in releasing the University from the reversionary clause, if not also from the requirement respecting the President, and on the part of the majority that it would be justified in accepting a sum of money, perhaps one million dollars, in consideration of this release.

On the evening of November 22, the Executive Committee of the Board of Education met in Committee of the Whole at the Metropole Hotel, Mr. Arnett, Dr. Hunt and Dr. Padelford being also present. After the transaction of other business, the matter of the reversionary rights was brought up again and at first discussed from the point of view of a business transaction. When, however, Dr. Padelford was asked to speak, he referred to the fact that he and Mr. Burton had felt very strongly that this transaction if it ever took place should not be on a money basis and insisted very strongly that we ought not to be swept off our feet by the opinions of Dr. Goodspeed and others who seemed to agree with him. He announced that he himself was ready to grant to the University release from

our reversionary rights because it was right, but that he was strongly opposed to doing it for money. He urged that no steps should be taken in the matter now and especially that nothing be done which would invite a financial proposition from the University. It was evident that all those who were present were much impressed with what he said. It should be noted that his attitude marked a change from his former position in one respect, namely, that while formerly he had been opposed to doing this thing at all and especially for money, he was now prepared to do it but equally opposed to doing it for money.

At the meeting of the Executive Committee held in the Chairman's office November 23d, all the members of the Executive Committee being present except Dr. Stifler, who had gone out before this came up (Dr. Stifler was also absent the evening before), this being the first time Mr. Gillette was present when the matter was discussed, and Dr. Hunt being present, but Dr. Padelford absent, the matter was again brought up and after discussion it was agreed informally that the Chairman should report to Mr. Judson that he found the members of the Board more hospitable to the consideration of the suggestion of the President than the Chairman himself had hitherto expressed himself as being, but that the Committee wished further time in which to think of the matter and did not at present desire any action on the part of anybody.

On the morning of November 25th, Mr. Burton called on the President and after speaking of other matters mentioned that the dinner, of which he had previously been informed, was held and that the matter had been subsequently discussed again by the Executive Committee of the Board of Managers, and that in both bodies there was found a considerable measure of sympathy with the University in the embarrassment created by the reversionary clause and a disposition to consider the whole situation very carefully, but that the Committee was not

prepared for any action or to consider any proposals. Mr. Burton spoke of the Committee as being more hospitable toward the idea than he had expected to find them. Mr. Judson said, "Now disposed to take a business view of the situation." Mr. Burton said, "Not at all. An indisposition to take a business view of the situation, but a disposition to look at the matter sympathetically from the point of view of the University." Mr. Burton added that while he couldn't at all foresee what the final attitude of the Committee would be, his impression at present was that they were quite indisposed, as he himself had been and as the President knew, to deal with the matter on a business basis. The President said, "That is very gratifying. Your Committee is evidently dealing with the matter on a high ground." It was made perfectly clear that the matter would remain in statu quo for the present. Mr. Burton did not particularly speak of the point suggested by Mr. Hanley, the Committee's appreciation of the desire of the University that control of the University should still be in the hands of the Baptists. There will be opportunity, no doubt, for this later.

proposed for any action or to consider any proposals. Mr. Burton spoke of the Committee as being more hospitable toward the idea than he had expected to find them. Mr. Johnson said, "Now disposed to take a business view of the situation." Mr. Burton said, "Not at all. An indisposition to take a business view of the situation, but a disposition to look at the matter sympathetically from the point of view of the University." Mr. Burton added that while he couldn't at all foresee what the final attitude of the Committee would be, his impression at present was that they were quite indisposed, as he himself had been and as the President knew, to deal with the matter on a business basis. The President said, "That is very gratifying. Your Committee is evidently dealing with the matter on a high ground." It was made perfectly clear that the matter would remain in statu quo for the present. Mr. Burton did not particularly speak of the point suggested by Mr. Hanley, the Committee's appreciation of the desire of the University that control of the University should still be in the hands of the Regents. There will be opportunity, no doubt, for this later.