

Article and letters, from March 18, 1891 to April 8, 1891, with transcript

Statement from the "Companion," Published at Faribault, Minnesota, March 7, 1891.

Tuesday morning, by request of Dr. Gallaudet, the students remained in chapel after services and he proceeded to explain his trouble with Dr. Bell. He said that his request for \$5,000, to establish a normal department, was to come before the House for consideration on Jan.26th. Bell heard of this and immediately came to Washington to oppose it. He arrived on the 24th, and on the 25th Dr. Gallaudet called on him to ascertain his objections to the appropriation, and found they were chiefly based on the fact that Bell thought only the manual system was to be taught to the teachers should the school be opened. Dr.Gallaudet explained to him his error, and told him plainly that the oral method would also be taught, and, moreover, an opportunity would be given to all those in the Collegiate department to learn articulation. Bell would not listen to any argument, and the next day he spoke in opposition to the bill before the House Committee in a 30 minute address. Dr. Gallaudet was next called upon, and in a brief manner explained Bell's errors, and the bill passed the House. For lack of time the Senate committee refused to hear either Dr . Gallaudet or Dr . Bell , but the difference of opinion existing between them over the bill was known and injured its chances , and it failed . Bell was not satisfied with the middle he had already made by meddling in affairs that did not concern him , and wrote letters to all the schools and institutions in the country , that were so worded as to misguide those not informed , and also contained several untruths , that were untruths to his knowledge . The way these letters were N.B. Passage above underlined is the passage alluded to by President Gallaudet in his letter to me of the 18th inst. A.G.B. received in the institutions, and the replies to them Bell received, showed him plainly the course he pursued was unpopular, and he tried to square himself by supporting an appropriation of \$3,000 that Dr.Gallaudet asked for to hire a professor of articulation for the Collegiate department.

Library of Congress

It appears that the Senate Committee has refused to appropriate even this amount. In conclusion, Dr. Gallaudet said Bell had always been a warm friend of ours, and his action in this matter was at variance with his usual course. It could only be explained by the belief that Dr. Bell is simply causing trouble to ride his own hobby, i.e., pure oralism.

March 16, 1891. Dear President Gallaudet:

Since I saw you in Philadelphia my attention has been directed to the enclosed cutting from the "Companion" of March 7, 1891.

Allow me to ask you whether it contains a true account of the remarks you made to the students of the College concerning me.

I have myself so often been misquoted in the Deaf-Mute Journals that I hope sincerely you have been incorrectly reported.

Yours truly, (Signed) Alexander Graham Bell. Pres. E. M. Gallaudet, Kendall Green.

Kendall Green, near Washington, D.C., March 18, 1891.

"Now I would impress upon your mind the fact that if you want to do a man justice, you should believe what a man says himself, rather than what people say he says."

A. Graham Bell, at Kendall Green March 6, 1891.

Dear Professor Bell:

I find yours of the 16th on my return home. In the paragraph you send me there are quite a number of inaccuracies, mostly of slight consequence.

The most serious error is found in the conclusion of the sentence I have taken the liberty of marking, "and also contained several untruths that were untruths to his knowledge."

Library of Congress

What I did say was that after certain facts had been brought to your notice by me, as to the plans and purposes I had in view for our new Normal Department, you published statements in regard to these purposes and plans of mine from which many important facts known to you were omitted.

And I expressed the feeling, which I certainly still entertain, that your oft repeated declaration that our Normal School was to be nothing more than a place for the “training of deaf teachers of the deaf,” did great injustice to me and to the plans I had unfolded to you on more than one occasion. Especially have I felt this as to your communications with Mr.Fechheimer.

I have, however, taken pains not to say anything to any person anywhere, as to your recent course, that could justly be considered at variance with the precepts of courtesy and fair dealing accepted by gentlemen. If reporters have represented me otherwise, I must appeal to your own eminently pertinent remark quoted above.

Very truly yours, (Signed) E.M.Gallaudet. Professor A.Graham Bell, 1336 19th St.

1336 Nineteenth Street, Washington, D.C.,March 19th, 1891. Dear Sir:

Yours of the 13th instant received. In reference to the remarks you addressed to the students, you state:

“What I did say was that after certain facts had been brought to your notice by me, as to the plans and purposes I had in view for our new Normal Department, you published statements in regard to these purposes and plans of mine from which many important facts known to you were omitted.”

Before replying to your note I should like to know definitely what “important facts” you allude to, which, you state, were known to me and were omitted.

Library of Congress

Yours truly, (Signed) Alexander Graham Bell. Pres.E.M.Gallaudet, Kendall Green.

1336 19th Street, Washington, D.C.,March 18, 1891. Dear Prof.Fay:

I presume that the April Annals will contain some account of my recent opposition to the plans of the College. In justice to myself, I am anxious that my side of the question should be properly presented.

I enclose a copy of a letter received from Mr.Dobyns, and also a copy of my reply. I am somewhat surprised that Mr.Dobyns should have given very wide circulation to his own letter and failed to make my reply public. Of course, I may be mistaken in supposing that he has not given my letter to the public, but I have looked for its appearance in vain. I would take it as a personal favor if you would publish Mr.Dobyns' letter to me and also my reply in the April Annals.

The importance of the subject, and the interest that has been aroused will, I am sure, justify you in giving space to these communications.

Yours sincerely, (Signed) Alexander Graham Bell.

Kendall Green, Washington, D.C.,March 18, 1891. Dear Professor Bell:

“Your contribution to the Annals is respectfully declined” is a sentence that I always write with regret, for it usually makes an enemy of the person to whom it is addressed. I hope that will not be the case in the present instance.

I had not thought of such a thing as publishing Mr.Dobyns' letter, and should not regard it as suitable for the Annals.

Library of Congress

I do not intend to open the Annals to any controversy on this subject, nor to contribute in any way to widen the breach which at present exists. If I can do anything to aid in closing it, I shall be very glad.

Sincerely your friend, (Signed) E.A.Fay.

1336 Nineteenth Street, Washington, D.C., March 19th, 1891. Dear Professor Fay:

I have just received your note of the 18th instant. I am glad that you do not intend to continue this controversy in the "Annals," and I can assure you that you have not made an "enemy" of me by declining to insert the Doby's correspondence.

Yours truly, (Signed) Alexander Graham Bell.

Kendall Green, Washington, D.C., March 20, 1891. Dear Dr. Bell:

I wrote you that I did not intend to open the Annals to a controversy on the subject of your course in opposing the Normal Department. Several articles criticising your course, your motives and your methods I have declined, and such I shall continue to decline.

Dr. Gallaudet, however, who certainly has a right to speak in the matter if any one has, has written an article giving a history of the whole movement, which he thinks should have a place as an historical record in the Annals. He has written it with great self-restraint; he imputes no motives, characterizes no methods, but simply states the facts as he knows them.

Now if the publication of this statement is going to lead to controversy, I do not want to publish it in the Annals. If the controversy must go on, I cannot help it. I can only say that it must not be in the Annals, so long as the Annals is under my direction.

But it may be that the publication of this statement may open the way to a reconciliation, which I join Mr. Crouter and, I think, all the sincere friends of Dr. Gallaudet and yourself,

Library of Congress

in ardently desiring. The statement shows you in the attitude of having persistently represented Dr. Gallaudet's purposes to the public as something different from what he himself told you they were. All your correspondence that I have seen, your letters to Mr. Allison, Mr. Fechheimer, Mr. Dobyms, etc., show that that is what you really did. That makes it very difficult for friendly relations to be re-established. But while I know that Dr. Gallaudet feels very deeply on this point—as we all do at Kendall Green—I think that if you now were disposed to make some conciliatory advances, they would be received in such a spirit as to result in the restoration of harmony. If, for instance, having read Dr. Gallaudet's statement, you were to say that your mind was so preoccupied with the idea that he, being the son of his father, could not be expected to do anything more than establish a training school for deaf teachers of the deaf, that it was difficult for you to believe otherwise; but that now, being convinced that Pres. Gallaudet's purposes are what they are represented to be in this statement and in the Circular of Information, you are ready to forego any further opposition to the Normal Department; if you were to say something of this sort in the April Annals, I am confident it would result in that harmony which your friends, and I trust you yourself, desire alike from personal reasons and for the sake of the good cause.

Yours sincerely, (Signed) E. A. Fay.

March 20, 1891. Dear Prof. Fay:

I return herewith President Gallaudet's article upon "The Genesis of the Normal Department at Washington."

In your note you say very truly, "The statement shows you in the attitude of having persistently represented Dr. Gallaudet's purposes to the public as something different from what he himself told you they were."

Of course, I should controvert a statement like that. I do not see how you could well give insertion to an article of that kind without also affording me an opportunity for reply. Still I don't wish to embarrass you in the matter. I shall be perfectly willing to print my

Library of Congress

reply independently at my own expense. Indeed, so far as that is concerned, I would be perfectly willing to publish President Gallaudet's article, too, in the same pamphlet with mine.

This perhaps might not only relieve you from an embarrassing position, but would also show President Gallaudet that I desire to be perfectly fair to him.

If President Gallaudet would only be willing to admit the purity and honesty of my motives, and the fact that I am incapable of intentionally misrepresenting his views, there would be no difficulty in our coming together. There is no reason in the world why we should not treat each other with courtesy and respect while we differ from one another in opinion.

If I have misrepresented him in any way, I should be perfectly willing to make amends, but he must convince me of the fact first.

I have asked him to tell me definitely what are the "important facts" which, he states, I knew and omitted from my published statements.

Surely I am entitled to a reply.

It was very good of you to call upon me to-day and take the part of a peacemaker. I thank you very much for all you said.

I cannot, however, consent to accept your statements as a reply to my letter to President Gallaudet. He surely owes it to me to communicate with me directly.

Indeed, he has himself charged me—in my own words—"to believe what a man says himself rather than what people say he says."

I, therefore, await a direct reply.

Yours very sincerely, (Signed) Alexander Graham Bell. Prof.E.A.Fay, Kendall Green.

Library of Congress

No.

10-98-1006.1.1771.2.3a

March 30th, 1891. President E.M.Gallaudet, Kendall Green. My dear Sir:

Your note of the 23d instant received.

It is not my custom, as you know, to reply to personal attacks.

In deference, however, to the wishes of mutual friends, and out of regard for our past friendship, I shall endeavor to disabuse your mind of the ungenerous thoughts you have allowed yourself to entertain concerning me.

In your note you say:

“If you can give me proof that you have not intentionally misrepresented my views, I shall receive such proof with the greatest pleasure.”

Allow me to remind you of the fact that I myself notified you of the day and hour of my appearance before both Committees of Congress, and invited you to attend, so that you might have the same opportunity for presenting your views that I myself enjoyed. In response to this invitation you attended both meetings. Only a few words were allowed us by the Senate Committee, but the House Committee permitted me to make an argument—to which you replied. Copies of your reply—as well as of my argument, were sent by me to every person with whom I held communication.

Surely—in these facts—you have the proof that I have not intentionally misrepresented your views. I wished to present both sides, equally, to every one, and desired to treat you with perfect fairness and courtesy.

Library of Congress

I sent copies of my argument, and of your reply, to the Principals of the Oral Schools, and then telegraphed them for an expression of their views.

This was all the communication I had with most of them; but to Mr. Fechheimer, Mr. Greenberger and a few others I also sent the full text of your letter to the Secretary of the Interior, and a copy of your Annual Report.

I trust that these facts may convince you that my conduct throughout has been perfectly honorable to myself, and courteous to you.

And now permit me to examine the question whether I have, as a matter of fact, misrepresented your views.

The charges you brought against me, before the students of your College, you state in your note of the 18th instant was as follows:

“What I did say was that after certain facts had been brought to your notice by me as to the plans and purposes I had in view, for our new Normal Department, you published statements in regard to these purposes and plans of mine from which many important facts, known to you, were omitted. And I expressed the feeling, which I certainly still entertain, that your oft repeated declaration that our Normal School was to be nothing more than a place for the ‘training of deaf teachers of the deaf’ did great injustice to me and to the plans I had unfolded to you on more than one occasion.”

If you turn to my argument (pp.7 to 10) you will find that I have told every one of your intention to receive hearing persons, and teach both the sign and oral methods. Indeed, all the points specified by you in your letter of the 23d instant—which you charged me with omitting—are, as a matter of fact, mentioned either in that argument or in your reply.

Library of Congress

You have probably obtained your mistaken idea of my position from the opinion I have expressed that your application to Congress limited the grant to the specific purpose of training the graduates of your College as teachers of the deaf.

I did not mean to convey the idea that your intentions were limited to that end. I did not doubt that you intended to do more than that; but I believed, and still believe, that you could not do it under the wording of your application.

You claim that my construction is “a forced and mistaken one.” On the other hand, I claim that it is the obvious construction, and that other possible interpretations are forced and require explanation. In proof of this I beg to quote the exact language of the passage:

“The amount submitted for current expenses is larger by \$5,000 than the appropriation made for the current year. The object of this increase is to enable the directors to enlarge the facilities in the institution for normal instruction. For many years the graduates of our Collegiate Department have been in demand as teachers of the deaf in the primary schools of the several States. The demand for such teachers has far outgrown our limited supply. And as no normal school for the training of teachers of the deaf exists in this country, while several are sustained in Europe, it has been thought extremely desirable that the advantages for normal instruction existing in this institution to a limited degree should be increased.”

Surely this means, upon its face, the training of the graduates of your College as teachers of the deaf.

The above quotation, though only a part of your letter to the Secretary of the Interior, constitutes the whole of the passage defining the object of the proposed increase of appropriation; and this increase, therefore—if granted—would necessarily be limited to the purposes specified in that paragraph.

Library of Congress

Now I need hardly state to an experienced man like yourself, that what you say to me in my private parlor does not bind the expenditure of congressional funds. And while I have not ignored or omitted any of the important facts you stated to me, I felt bound to confine my argument, as much as possible, to the actual proposition before Congress.

After careful examination of all your sayings and writings that by any possible construction might be considered to be before Congress—by which I mean (1) your letter to the Secretary of the Interior, (2) your Annual Report, and (3) your reply to my argument before the House Committee— I fail to find any definite proposition to do more than train the graduates of your College to teach the deaf .

I have, therefore, given you credit, in my argument, for more than was actually before Congress, simply because of the private interviews you had with me. In my argument (p)7) I said that “both the oral and sign methods will be taught,” but you simply say they “could.” (Report, p. 11).

“It is true,” you say, “that we could give thorough normal training in all the valuable and accepted methods of teaching the deaf.”

That is all the promise you made in the matter, so far as I can find out.

The actual expressions in your Report are vague and indefinite and bind you to nothing. The same is true of your reply to my argument. The only definite proposition that I can find is the one contained in your letter to the Secretary of the Interior which I have quoted above.

Now, sir, I submit that, whether my construction be right or wrong, I have a perfect right to express my opinion without being charged with wilful misrepresentation or falsehood. I have a perfect right to lay the matter before others and ask them whether they agree with me or not.

Library of Congress

That is all I have done—and I am sure that no fair-minded man will say that because your judgment differs from mine, you are, therefore, justified in treating me with personal discourtesy.

You have impugned my motives to Mr. Fechheimer and others; and you have publicly discredited me before the young men and women of your College, which our interests I have at heart.

Now I do not wish to write to you in any unkind spirit. I do not even write to demand the withdrawal of your remarks, for I care very little what people may say against my good name so long as the charges are unmerited and unjust.

But I do care that one who was my friend should entertain ungenerous thoughts concerning me, and, therefore, I have written you this letter in order to disabuse your mind.

Yours truly, (Signed) Alexander Graham Bell.

March 31st, 1891. Dear Professor Bell:

I have just received yours of yesterday.

I am in the midst of our term examinations and shall be for two or three days too much occupied to be able to reply as I would like to do.

But I must express my gratification with the closing paragraph of your letter, and assure you I reciprocate the sentiment most sincerely.

I believe if we could sit down together for a quiet talk of an hour or two, thus having the opportunity of presenting each to the other his own "point of view," our existing misunderstanding could be removed. And as I believe we could much better talk the matter to a happy conclusion, than reach such an end by correspondence, I am moved to say that I hope Mrs. Bell and you will favor us with your presence at the "Literary" to-

Library of Congress

morrow evening, when you and I can arranged for a time later in the week at which we can meet and talk freely together in that friendly spirit which is still alive between us.

Very truly yours, (Signed) E.M. Gallaudet.

April 1st, 1891. President Gallaudet, Kendall Green. My dear Sir:

Allow me to thank you for your kind invitation to attend the meeting of the Literary Society at your house this evening.

I would gladly accept, but for the fact that my appearance at Kendall Green just now would convey a false impression to our friends who would be there.

They would naturally conclude that all misunderstandings between us had been settled, whereas from your note of yesterday I see you will be too much occupied for a few days with your term examinations to be able to give the matter the attention you would like to do.

Allow me to thank you, however, for the friendly tone of your note.

Yours truly, (Signed) Alexander Graham Bell.

April 1st, 1891. Dear Professor Fay:

Please find enclosed a copy of my letter to Pres. Gallaudet of the 30th instant.

If this should happily accomplish the end in view both you and Mr.Crouter will be pleased to know that your efforts to bring us together have not been in vain.

Pres. Gallaudet has acknowledged receipt of my letter. I am much encouraged to find that he writes in a cordial and friendly tone. At the same time he regrets that he will not be able to reply as he would like to do for a few days on account of the term examinations He expresses the hope that I will attend the Literary Society tonight, and suggests that we

Library of Congress

might then arrange for a time when we could meet and talk freely together over the matter in a friendly spirit.

I am very much pleased that Pres. Gallaudet should have expressed the desire to see me at his house to-night at the meeting of the Literary Society, at the same time the fact that he has not replied to my letter places me in rather an embarrassing position. Upon reflection I have decided not to go, as my appearance at Kendall Green as Pres. Gallaudet's guest would be apt to create the impression that friendly relations had been thoroughly re-established. Of this I cannot be sure, for, of course, it will be impossible for me to entertain cordial feelings towards Pres. Gallaudet so long as he retains a shadow of a doubt that I have acted towards him in any other than an honorable way. The friendly tone of his note, however, leads me to hope that I have succeeded in disabusing his mind of any such idea.

I have sent another copy of the accompanying letter to Mr. Crouter, and I trust that both you and he will recognize the fact that, in response to your wishes, I have done my best to bring about a better understanding.

I cannot, however, in justice to myself do anything further in the matter. Should Pres. Gallaudet not be willing to accept my explanation, I must decline to have any further discussion of the matter with him. My natural desire would be to respond to his request for "a quiet talk" upon the subject, but when I remember that the present misunderstanding has arisen from just such quiet talks in the past, I am sure that further misunderstandings will be much less liable to arise if all our communications upon this subject are carried on in black and white.

Yours truly, (Signed) Alexander Graham Bell.

Kendall Green. Washington, D. C., April 2, 1891. Dear Dr. Bell:

Library of Congress

I was glad to receive your letter of yesterday, enclosing yours to Dr. Gallaudet, which I return herewith.

It seems to me you make a mistake, if you decline his proposal for a personal interview at the present time. If, as seems to be the case, you are both disposed to resume friendly relations, I think that result could be most effectually reached by a candid talk in which each should enable the other to see the matter from his own point of view as it could not be done by a formal correspondence. You may not be able to take precisely the same view, but something will be gained by each having a clear understanding of the way the other regards it.

Yours sincerely, (Signed) E.A. Fay.

April 2nd, 1891. Dear Professor Bell:

In reply to yours of yesterday, let me say that I should not have suggested your coming to the meeting of the "Literary" at any hour had I not felt quite sure that our misunderstandings would be cleared up in the friendly talk I suggested for the near future. So certain was I of this that it seemed to me rather a happy thought that we should take advantage of the meeting of a society of which we were both members, to let our friends see that there was no break in our social relations. But I will not criticize you for feeling differently.

I still think that the best next step towards an understanding between us will be a talk quite free from the presence of any third party, and so I will invite you to meet me at my office in the College building at two o'clock to-morrow (Friday) afternoon, or as soon thereafter as you can conveniently be here.

Very truly yours, (Signed) E.M.Gallaudet.

April 3d, 1891. My dear President Gallaudet:

Library of Congress

Your note of last night received. Nothing would give me greater satisfaction at this time than to be able to meet you in the friendly manner which you propose.

I have, however, been deeply hurt not only by the doubt of the truth of the assurance given to Prof. Fay that I had never intentionally misrepresented you—shown in your request that I should furnish you with proof that I had not done so—but also by the hesitation you have since shown to fully and freely admit your satisfaction with the proof I gave you in my letter of the 30th ult.

I feel, therefore, that it is impossible for me to meet you in the friendly and cordial spirit we both desire until I have received your assurance that you are satisfied with these proofs, and that you no longer doubt either the purity and honesty of my motives or the desire and intention I had to represent your views truly and fairly.

Once I have this assurance from you, I shall be most happy to meet you and trust that any remaining misunderstandings may be removed by friendly discussion.

Yours truly, (Signed) Alexander Graham Bell. Pres. E. M. Gallaudet, Kendall Green.

April 3, 1891. Dear Prof. Gallaudet:

Mr. Bell has a meeting of gentlemen here this evening and cannot write you until later tonight. He asks me to drop you a note concerning the closing paragraph of his letter of this afternoon.

He says that he does not wish to convey the idea that he is willing to enter into any verbal discussion concerning the matter in question principally because some misunderstandings between you and himself have been charged to just such verbal discussions.

Yours sincerely, (Signed) Arthur W. McCurdy. Pres. E. M. Gallaudet.

Library of Congress

April 3d, 1891. Dear President Gallaudet:

You may perhaps know that I have been selected to preside at the important meeting to be held next week (April 10) to celebrate the Centennial Anniversary of the establishment of the Patent System of the United States.

My whole time and thoughts must now be given to the preparation of my address.

I cannot, therefore, again write to you until after that meeting—if at all. You, too, are busy with your term examinations.

I have shown you by my letter of the 30th ult. my desire and anxiety—if possible—to re-establish friendly relations with you. You also, by the cordial tone of your recent communications, express the same desire.

Why, then, can we not come together? Let us examine the matter.

We are both desirous of doing so, and yet there is some obstacle to further approach.

What is it? And is there no way by which it can be removed? If so, upon whose head does the responsibility rest?

At first sight the responsibility seems to rest with me—for your letters are couched in the most friendly terms. Yet I have rejected your request for a personal interview, and your letters, which were undoubtedly written with friendly intent, have only succeeded in arousing in me a feeling of the deepest indignation.

Now why is this? It is because you have unfortunately placed in my path an obstacle that renders it impossible for me to approach you nearer, and you do not seem to see it—or recognize its existence.

Library of Congress

Now this may perhaps be the last letter I shall ever write to you upon the subject (though I hope not). I shall, therefore, endeavor to make my meaning clear, so that there may be no possible misunderstandings as to which of us is at fault in this matter, and upon whose head rests the responsibility.

You have made grave charges against my personal honour. You have accused me—both in public and private—of conduct unbecoming in a gentleman. In public—you have charged me before the students of your college—with intentional misrepresentation of your views.

In private—both in conversation and in writing—you have impugned my motives and conduct, stating, for example, to Mr. Fechheimer, in writing, that I was “evidently inspired by jealousy of the College”—that I had “poured misrepresentations and garbled statements into the ears of many Senators and Representatives,” and that my opposition to your plans had been carried on “in an ungenerous and partisan spirit.”

I asked you for an explanation of your charges so that I might disabuse your mind; and I assured Prof. Fay (in a letter which you saw) that I was incapable of intentionally misrepresenting your views, and that if any real misrepresentation had been made I would only be too glad to make amends.

You doubted the assurance that I gave to Prof. Fay, and called for proof that I had not intentionally misrepresented your views.

Well, sir, I have given you proof , and I await your reply.

Two notes have since been received from you, couched undoubtedly in friendly terms. But have you said: “Your letter has convinced me that you had no intention or desire to misrepresent me in any way, and I acquit you of any charge of conduct unbecoming in a

Library of Congress

gentleman”—or words to that effect? No, not at all. Your first note simply expressed your gratification “ with the closing paragraph” of my letter, which reads:

“But I do care that one who was my friend should entertain ungenerous thoughts concerning me, and, therefore, I have written you this letter in order to disabuse your mind.”

But did you state that I had disabused your mind? No, not a word to that effect. You simply stated that you “reciprocated my sentiments,” and hoped that I would come to your house to attend the meeting of the Literary Society (of which we are both members) and than arrange for a personal meeting when we could talk over the matter in a friendly spirit.

Now, sir, I appeal to you as gentleman to say whether it is possible for me to talk over matters in a friendly spirit with one who hesitates to acknowledge me as an honorable man

.

You pleaded your term examinations as an excuse for delay, but how long would it take you to write that, if you really believed it in your heart .

There, sir, is the obstacle that prevents my further advances, and its removal lies with you

.

Your second note received this morning, also, fails to say that you are satisfied with my proofs. On the contrary, you want more proofs in the shape of a “talk quite free from the presence of a third party.” I am sorry that my self-respect forbids acceding to your request. If you are not satisfied, from my letter of the 30th ult., that I have intended and desired to treat you in a perfectly fair and honorable manner, you may retain your doubt till time and circumstance dispel the illusion from your mind, I shall not trouble myself about the matter any more.

Library of Congress

It is quite impossible for us to meet in friendly talk so long as you consider me capable of dishonorable work, or so long as any doubt exists in your mind.

I will not enter into further explanation until this point is settled first.

When that is done, then I should be glad, if there are any other points you wish explained, to do my best to discuss them with you in a friendly way. But all our communications upon this subject must be in black and white. I will not consent to a private talk at all, for the present misunderstanding has arisen from just such private talks in the past. You charged me with omitting to publish what you told me in private conversation, and I will not again discuss the subject with you in that way.

I feel indignant that you should treat me as you do, and I am quite at a loss to understand the doubt and distrust that your acts imply.

Yours very truly, (Signed) Alexander Graham Bell.

April 3rd, 1891. My dear Professor Bell:

Yours of this date reached me early in the afternoon. I am sorry you did not give me the pleasure of seeing you, for had you done so, my first words would have given you the assurance you desired; viz, that yours of the 30th had satisfied me that you had not intentionally misrepresented my views in the recent discussions.

If you could know how pressed I am at this time with labors, official and otherwise, you would not attribute my little delay in responding to yours of the 30th to "hesitation." There are several points in that letter in reference to which I have somewhat to say, and there are matters connected with the events of the past few weeks in regard to which I, too, have been "deeply hurt," about which I would like to speak to you—matters to which I have made no allusion whatever in my letters, but I cannot command the time to write on these points. I had hoped that all these things might have been put out of the way this afternoon.

Library of Congress

And if, as I trust may be the case, my assurance given above removes the difficulty which kept you from coming to me to-day, we may perhaps have an opportunity to clear away the “remaining misunderstandings” in the near future.

Very truly yours, (Signed) E.M.Gallaudet.

April 4, 1891. My dear President Gallaudet:

Your note of the 3d instant just received has lifted a load of sorrow from my heart. I am specially gratified to observe by the date that you had written me this assurance of your satisfaction with my proofs— before you received the letter I write to you last night .

After having read that letter, you can imagine—much better than I can tell you—how great has been the relief.

I feel now that I can set to work upon my Address for the Patent Centennial, with nothing to distract my mind, and you also can go on, undisturbed, with the work of the College.

This will be good for us both, and give time for angry feelings to subside. Then we will write to one another again and endeavor to make clear whatever may be now obscure. I, too, have points that require explanation from you.

If we approach each other in a spirit of perfect trust—if we assume as the necessary basis of friendly discussion the fact that, of course , neither of us are capable of dishonorable acts—then surely we shall be able to render complete satisfaction each to the other.

Yours very truly, (Signed) Alexander Graham Bell. President Gallaudet, Kendall Green.

(Copy.) 1336 Nineteenth Street Washington D.C. April 8th.1891. My Dear President Gallaudet;

Thanks for your note of yesterday just received.

Library of Congress

It will give me pleasure to call upon you on Saturday at two o'clock or at any other time that may be convenient to you.

Yours sincerely, (Signed.) Alexander Graham Bell. Pres. Gallaudet. Kendall Green.

Near Washington D.C. April 7th. 1891. Dear Professor Bell;

Yours of yesterday just received. I first saw a copy of what purports to be a report of my Statement before the House Committee, in the Committee Room more than a week after our discussion.

This copy was in Mr. Cannon's completed report accompanying the Sundry Civil Bill. No proof of my statement was ever sent me from the printer—I never asked to have one sent me. Had I known of your purpose to circulate with your speech a copy of my reply I should certainly have asked the privilege of reading the proof. I did not know of your intention to send out even your own speech until I received the copy you were good enough to furnish me.

I have no knowledge as to how the "omission" of which you allude occurred, and the only light I can throw on the matter is to suggest that this blunder, and the many others evident in my "statement", were due to incompetency and carelessness on the part of the official stenographer and proof reader. I infer from yours of yesterday that you will call on me on Saturday next—if you will kindly let me know at what hour to expect you I will be sure to be in my office.

Very sincerely yours, (Signed.) E.M.Gallaudet.

A1336-19502—

April 5th, 1891. My dear Professor Bell:

Library of Congress

It gave me sincere pleasure to learn from yours of the 4th, received yesterday afternoon, that my note of the day before had removed a weight from your mind and heart.

I wrote you on the 3rd before receiving Mr. McCurdy's note, and, of course, your second note of the 3rd, sent by mail, did not reach me until last evening.

It was, therefore, too late for you to withdraw the closing paragraph of your first note of the 3rd, for I had already accepted it in my only note to you of that day. Aside from this accident, if it may be so considered, I am disposed to hold you to that paragraph, for I am convinced it will be in every way better for us to "remove" the "remaining misunderstandings" in a "friendly discussion" face to face, than to employ the slow process of writing. Indeed, if you will run your mind over the causes of our misunderstandings you will see that much more is due to what has been written than to what has been spoken. And even were this otherwise, with the experience we have now had, we are certainly capable of avoiding in the future a repetition of any of the mistakes of the past.

So I shall ask you to consider Mr. McCurdy's note and your second note of the 3d as laid aside from this correspondence.

I can wait for our personal interview until you are quite free from the pressure of your impending address at the Patent Centennial.

That no misunderstanding may grow out of this note, let me quote the closing paragraph of your first communication of the 3rd, in which you give me an assurance that, under the circumstances I have recited above, I think you will admit, you cannot withdraw without my consent.

"Once I have this assurance from you I shall be most happy to meet you, and trust that any remaining misunderstandings may be removed by friendly discussion."

Library of Congress

The pressure under which I was laboring last week is over, and, although my ordinary duties always occupy my time quite fully, I shall be ready to meet you whenever your engagements allow you to make an appointment.

Wishing you entire success in your address, I am,

Very truly yours, (Signed) E.M.Gallaudet.

#1336 19th St., Washington, D.C., April 6, 1891. Dear President Gallaudet:

Yours of the 5th instant received.

I shall be happy to call upon you at the end of next week, after the meeting over which I preside, and have a full talk with you on the subject.

There are certain points, however, as I stated to you in my last note, concerning which I would like information from you. I will state them here, and I shall be obliged if you will let me know whether you prefer to reply to them in writing or by word of mouth. For my part, I would prefer to have your reply in writing, so that I may send it to the few people who are already aware to the facts.

It was suggested to me that my argument before the House Committee had been revised, while your reply was not. Now the following facts have led me to believe that your reply had been revised.

1. You made an important statement before the House Committee, to which I replied; and neither your statement nor my reply appeared in the printed copy of the your remarks.
2. The printer's "copy" of your remarks at the Government Printing Office was partly in type-written form and partly in manuscript; whereas, the "copy" of my argument supplied me by the stenographer was wholly in type-written form.

Library of Congress

The important statement and reply omitted were as follows:

You directed the attention of the House Committee to the resolution of the California Convention, which I had read, and you

No.

Copy of Correspondence with Hon. Gallaudet in 1891 about my opposition to Gallaudet's application for a Congressional Appropriation.

AGB