

indicated, too, in the opinion of his passionate critics, that public hearings on the executive budget are ineffective.

ROERICH INVESTORS MISLED, ONE SAYS

Bondholders Believe Property Should Return to Foundation.

John O'Hara Cosgrave, 39 E. 79th St., writing to the World-Telegram today, deplored several results of the drive commenced several years ago by a bondholders' committee to prevent commercialization of the Roerich Museum, Riverside Dr. and W. 103rd St. Mr. Cosgrave said that Louis Horch, one of the trustees, has removed the Roerich name and relationship from the museum and assumed ownership on behalf of his wife.

Mr. Cosgrave stated that himself and others of the bondholders' committee had understood Mr. Horch would continue to promulgate the cultural views of the museum's founder, Nicholas Roerich. Instead, he said, the name of the painter has been removed from the 29 story building and that of the Master Institute substituted.

"The legality of these proceedings is sub judice, but at the moment our participation is subject to a construction of being that of catspaws on behalf of Mr. Horch. I hope we may be acquitted of complicity," Mr. Cosgrave said. He declared that the bondholders' committee believes that its interests will best be conserved if control of the property is restored to the Roerich Foundation.

THREE CUTTERS HUNT SLOOP

Three Coast Guard cutters searched today for the fishing sloop Anna and Ella, which has been missing with its crew of seven since January 23, when it was sighted sixty miles southeast by east of Five Fathom Lightship, off the lower coast of New Jersey. Airplanes will join the search when weather permits. The vessel put out from Cape May January 21.

*World Telegram
Feb 8*

Pl
tien
sleep
said
injec

LIF
FIN

Met
P

A
thou
the
ers
sura
Dr. I
dent
Th
thou
"I
emp
deat
fact
aver
sure
ilies
pres
in t
the
peri

Sovi

By
PA
Tou
toda
eral
for
co-o
tack
mut
form
Cha

TC

Wat

Ar
work
of th
A. t
fund
raise
TI
the
cent

2

New York Herald Tribune
Feb 10 - 1936

The Roerich Dispute

Member of Bondholders' Committee Gives Its Side

To the New York Herald Tribune:

As a member of the bondholders' committee that undertook to save the Roerich Museum and educational foundation from alien and miscomprehending financial hands a few years ago, I find myself reflecting on the vanity of human intentions. This, apropos recent proceedings in Judge Rosenmann's court, in which it was revealed that what our efforts achieved was not to confirm the Roerich group in its opportunity to carry on its good work, but to make it possible for the president, Louis Horch, to eject his fellow trustees, remove the Roerich name and relationship from the institute and assume ownership of the property on behalf of his wife, to whom he had turned over the stock.

There seemed sound reasons for our protective crusade. Roerich is an international figure, one of the world's great painters, and the collection of his works in the Roerich Museum is among New York's notable treasures. The art and music schools were well run and devoutly served. The place hummed with artistic activities and its maintenance in the hands of the group who had built it up seemed useful and desirable. Hence my own interest and I presume the co-operation of my associates on the committee.

We represented bondholders who shared our belief that their own interests would best be conserved if control of the property were restored to this Roerich Foundation. The apartment hotel which was the source of revenue not only owed its identity to the Roerich Museum, but its patronage to a considerable degree derived from its activities. Besides, its educational associations entitled it to a measure of tax exemption. The rival committee, assembled under banking pilotage, were eventually brought to this view and in the reorganization ownership was again vested in the master institute, the original foundation incorporated by Professor and Mme. Roerich, Mr. and Mrs. Lichtmann, Miss Grant and Mr. and Mrs. Horch.

In this set-up, Mr. Horch, who was a large contributor to the cost of the building, officiated as president and executive, representing Professor Roerich and having his power of attorney. The art and educational interests were conducted by Miss Grant and Mr. and Mrs. Lichtmann.

We accepted this group as embodying Roerich's principles and his cultural enthusiasms, deputies in the promulgation of his ideas. There were no indications of disharmony. We were lovers of art and good citizens rallying to a cause that needed assistance. What has happened is humiliating. The financier, Horch, has revoked the influence we sought to protect. Roerich, his great name and his devoted associates have been disowned.

The legality of these proceedings is sub judice, but at the moment our participation is subject to a construction of being that of catspaws on behalf of Mr. Horch. I hope we may be acquitted of complicity.

JOHN O'HARA COSGRAVE.

New York, Feb. 7, 1936.

3

To the Editor of

As a member of the Bondholders' Committee organized to defend the interests of the Roerich Museum as against the claims of a Bankers' group that then seemed bent on seizing the Building and Assets without regard for the aesthetic and educational values vested in the institution, I am mystified at the conditions revealed in Judge Rosenman's court, on January 31 last.

My own participation and I assume that of the other members of the Committee was not in furtherance of any interest save the preservation of the Roerich Foundation in so far as this could be achieved without distraint of the bondholders' claim.

Since the larger part of the patronage of the related apartment hotel derived from the activities of the Roerich Institution and Museum, and the identity of the building based on it, our efforts were directed at returning control to the Roerich Museum's Trustees on the ground that this was the best way of conserving the assets and assuring the flow of revenues required to meet its obligations. This was finally accomplished (~~through the good work of Siegfried Hartman, the Committee's attorney~~), and after the usual formalities, ownership was vested in the Master Institute, the original foundation incorporated by Prof. and Mme. Roerich, Mr. and Mrs. M. Lichtmann, Miss Grant and Mr. and Mrs. Horch. Mr. Horch was president and executive representing Prof. Roerich and having his power of attorney. The art and other educational interests of the Museum were conducted by Miss Grant and Mr. and Mrs. Lichtmann.

In these preliminaries there was no suspicion of disunity in the Roerich group whom we assumed were actuated by the same ideals and purposes. It was therefore most disconcerting to learn that Mr. Horch had expelled his fellow trustees including the founder, Prof. Roerich, his wife, Miss Grant and the Lichtmanns, and proposed to divest the Institution of its Roerich relation and had already removed the name from the Museum. He claims to own the Master Institute by virtue of possession of the stock of the other Trustees.

The legality of these proceedings is now sub judice, but at the moment it appears that the successful efforts of the Committee defeated the ends they were directed to serve. We seem to have officiated as tools in what now looks like a clever scheme to get possession of a desirable piece of real estate.

There is a very definite public interest in this affair. Prof. Roerich is one of the world's great artists and has an international reputation. The collection of his paintings in the Roerich Museum is one of New York's notable treasures. It is to be hoped that measures may be taken to repair all this damage.

J. O. H. C.

This is not final. Mr. Cosgrave felt he wanted to change it again

NEW YORK WORLD-TELEGRAM, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 1936.

ROERICH LOSES POINT IN MUSEUM DISPUTE

Application for Temporary Injunction Denied in Fight Against Horch and Institute Group.

Supreme Court Justice Samuel I. Rosenman today denied the application of Professor and Mrs. Nicholas Roerich and their supporters for a temporary injunction against the Master Institute of United Arts, Inc.

Professor Roerich's faction is seeking to restrain Louis L. Horch and his group from taking control of the Roerich Museum at Riverside Dr. and 103rd St. Mr. Horch is a trustee and stockholder in the institute.

Justice Rosenman set the trial for February 17.

Feb. 11th 1936

INJUNCTION DENIED TO ROERICH GROUP

***Court Holds Ownership of the
Museum Stock Must Be
Decided by Trial.***

The application in behalf of Professor Nicholas Roerich and others associated with him in founding the Roerich Museum to restrain Louis L. Horch from taking control of the museum and its activities was denied yesterday by Supreme Court Justice Samuel I. Rosenman. The suit was brought on the ground that Mr. Horch, who has contributed more than \$1,000,000 to finance the museum property in the last few years, had persuaded members of the Roerich group to turn over their stock to him.

In denying the injunction Justice Rosenman said that the dispute as to the ownership of the stock "cannot be determined upon affidavits, but must await trial." In order that the question may be decided speedily the court set the case down for trial on Feb. 17. In the meantime Mr. Horch and other defendants are restrained from transferring or otherwise disposing of the stock they now hold.

"It would be unjust and improper to enjoin the functioning of the corporation itself merely because of the dispute between the stockholders as to the ownership of certain shares," said the court. "If any other rule were adopted it would be possible to prevent corporations from operating merely by the commencement of litigation, questioning stockholders' title to certificates of stock." The stock involved is in the Master Institute of United Arts, Inc., which now holds title to the museum property, a twenty-nine-story building at Riverside Drive and 103d Street.

INJUNCTION DENIED 6

TO ROERICH GROUP

N.Y. TIMES, FEB 12, 1936

Court Holds Ownership of the Museum Stock Must Be Decided by Trial. 6

The application in behalf of Professor Nicholas Roerich and others associated with him in founding the Roerich Museum to restrain Louis L. Horch from taking control of the museum and its activities was denied yesterday by Supreme Court Justice Samuel I. Rosenman. The suit was brought on the ground that Mr. Horch, who has contributed more than \$1,000,000 to finance the museum property in the last few years, had persuaded members of the Roerich group to turn over their stock to him.

In denying the injunction Justice Rosenman said that the dispute as to the ownership of the stock "cannot be determined upon affidavits, but must await trial." In order that the question may be decided speedily the court set the case down for trial on Feb. 17. In the meantime Mr. Horch and other defendants are restrained from transferring or otherwise disposing of the stock they now hold.

"It would be unjust and improper to enjoin the functioning of the corporation itself merely because of the dispute between the stockholders as to the ownership of certain shares," said the court. "If any other rule were adopted it would be possible to prevent corporations from operating merely by the commencement of litigation, questioning stockholders' title to certificates of stock." The stock involved is in the Master Institute of United Arts, Inc., which now holds title to the museum property, a twenty-nine-story building at Riverside Drive and 103d Street.

Colonel Roosevelt into the
and stayed out of the Re-
ks at least as long as his
Mr. Borah remained with
d and President Taft, and
New Nationalism.

cord the colonel offers the
challenge in Ohio as the
liberalism and as captain
guard. But if, through one
expedients listed above, by-
be bygones, then there will
other difficulty in clearly
competitors as conserva-
ral. For a major tenet of
ationalism, which Colonel
ted, was the recall of judi-
, which Mr. Borah did not
his would seem to make
the conservative, if the
do much voting this year
ised by decisions of the
art.

however, there is a pit-
Knox is against the AAA,
in the Hoosac Mills ma-
n. While his own farm-
not innocent of the Fed-
system, his words are
praise of the six justices,
D. Roberts. Mr. Borah
cked the decision and has
against any subterfuge to
t he voted twice for AAA.
make Colonel Knox the
? And if one should recall
1922 flirtation with the bill
Supreme Court vote of 7 to
act of Congress could be
oesn't this somewhat take
f the colonel's emotional
adicial recall in 1912?

hole for Landon.

be very confusing to Re-

use of the
public in

P

12. Prot
by requir
ernment
stocks an
to bonuse
vested an

13. Reg
Federal
that sell
merce.

14. Reg
panies op

15. Reg
in securit

16. Quic
assets fo
pended ba

17. Mor
banks.

18. Seve
companie
schemes

19. Furt
serve Ba
eral Rese
purposes.

20. Inde

21. Rep
ment.

22. Imm
stead Act

23. Con
ernment
for the p

White E

WILDE

Wisconsi

To the Edit

Your e

Tekes's o

12. D2 36
New York Herald
Tribune
15

Stock Transfer Barred Pending Roerich Action

Horch Ordered to Hold
Issues as Founder Seeks
to Settle Ownership

Museum Not Affected

Cosgrave Criticism of Ad-
ministration Is Decried

Justice Samuel I. Rosenman, in Supreme Court yesterday, restrained Louis L. Horch, president of the Master Institute of United Arts, formerly the Roerich Museum, Riverside Drive and 103d Street, from disposing of any of the corporation's stock, pending settlement of a suit brought by five of the original trustees of the institution to determine ownership of the stock. Justice Rosenman set Monday as the date for the trial, and ruled that the museum could proceed with its activities as usual.

The plaintiffs are Professor Nicholas Roerich, founder of the museum; Mrs. Roerich, Maurice Lichtmann, Mrs. Lichtmann and Miss Frances R. Grant. They sought yesterday to restrain Mr. Horch and his associates from conducting any business pending trial of the suit. In refusing their request, Justice Rosenman said "the dispute as to ownership cannot be determined upon affidavits but must await trial."

Jonas J. Shapiro, counsel for Mr. Horch, said that the ruling prohibiting the sale of stock would not affect any plans of Mr. Horch, since he had not contemplated disposing of any, and had said so in papers filed with the court.

The action had been brought against Mr. Horch, who had contributed \$1,000,000 to the museum corporation in 1922, following a meeting December 16 which the plaintiffs said had been held without their knowledge. They controlled five of the seven shares of stock, they said. Mr. Shapiro replied that they merely were nominal stockholders and never had contributed financially to the project.

A letter to the New York Herald Tribune from John O'Hara Cosgrave, which appeared in Monday's issue, evoked comment yesterday from Morris Ernst, associated with Mr. Shapiro in the defense of the suit. Mr. Cosgrave, who, in 1932, was a member of a committee formed to protect the interests of bondholders of the museum, wrote that Mr. Horch had "revoked the influence we sought to protect" and that Professor Roerich's name had been disowned.

"I have known Mr. Cosgrave for many years and I have profound respect for him," Mr. Ernst said. "I wish that he had seen me before issuing any statement for I am confident he would not have issued it had I explained the situation to him."

8

LATE CITY EDITION

VOL. XCV No. 32,602

Denies Roerich Dispute

Herald Tribune

Charles Fleischer Puts Blame on Material Litigants

To the New York Herald Tribune:

John O'Hara Cosgrave writes in your columns about "the Roerich dispute," when there is no Roerich dispute. He writes with emotion, for he evidently feels that he is fighting on the side of the angels, defending the cause of spirituality and culture.

Actually, he merely makes himself the mouthpiece of material litigants, who have contributed neither culture nor spirituality nor money to a noble and worthy enterprise, soon to emerge from temporary eclipse to fulfill its sunlit purposes.

As for Professor Roerich, there is no need to discuss (as Mr. Cosgrave does) his position in either the realm of art or in the world of culture. Suffice it to say, that Roerich is a man of rare versatility and of boundless ambition. He had for years been accepted, by all the elements involved in the present deplorable litigation, as representative and symbol of the Great Ideal that transcends personalities and individual ambitions.

If Professor Roerich permitted an adoring loyalty to center in him which should be given only to a cause—that is unfortunate both for himself and for his followers. Few men survive such test of power, opportunity and responsibility.

Adherents to the personality of Roerich may choose to contrast his presumed consecration to culture with President Horch's alleged mercenary motives in ousting the destructive elements. As a matter of fact, Professor Roerich was financed completely and maintained in affluence, both in this country and abroad, by Mr. Horch, who impoverished himself through devotion to the Great Ideal which Professor Roerich was supposed to represent.

To call President Horch "a financier," whereas he is essentially an enthusiastic idealist, is as mistaken as to picture Dr. Roerich as a selfless "saint," whereas he was always worldly enough to accept payment for his paintings and for the supposed attractive power of his mysterious personality.

There is no "Roerich dispute," except as invented by devotees to a spurious cultural and spiritual leadership, for which Americans have fallen as gullibly and easily as usual.

Sensitive, sympathetic folks have always felt a spiritual reality behind the enterprise now known simply as The Master Institute. Such spiritually aspiring Americans are confident that this Impersonal Truth is beyond defeat.

Magna est veritas, et praevalet.

CHARLES FLEISCHER.

New York, Feb. 16, 1936.

9

NY HERALD TRIBUNE
The Roerich Disputants
FEB. 24 1936
Allegation of Lack of Culture
Arouses a Correspondent

To the New York Herald Tribune:

In Dr. Charles Fleischer's letter as published on your editorial page this morning a statement is made, relative to "the Roerich dispute," that the present litigants (those whose cause John O'Hara Cosgrave has so eloquently and so justly espoused) "have contributed neither culture nor spirituality nor money to a worthy enterprise soon to emerge from temporary eclipse to fulfill its sunlit purposes." The litigants referred to are Mr. and Mrs. Maurice Lichtmann and Miss Frances Grant, co-founders with Professor and Mme. Roerich, in 1921, of the Master Institute, whose work was for a time absorbed by the Roerich Museum. As a close friend of both institutions during many years, and also as a close friend during many years of all the parties to the present issue, and intimately familiar with the cultural work of the museum as well as of the institute, I feel it my duty to say that the persons whose cultural contributions Dr. Fleischer has so disparaged have been the principal resident contributors to the cultural work of both institutions ever since their foundation, and that all three brought to their tasks in both institutions cultural qualifications and services of a high order.

Mr. and Mrs. Lichtmann had conducted their own music school in this city (the Lichtmann Piano Institute, then of 730 Riverside Drive) during the seven years immediately preceding the opening of the Master Institute. During two of those years Deems Taylor, our distinguished American composer, collaborated closely with them, conducting their institute's classes in the theory of music. Mr. and Mrs. Lichtmann merged their institute with the Master Institute in 1921, bringing to the latter their small staff and some seventy pupils. Since then Mr. Lichtmann has been continuously and is still vice-president of the Master Institute and dean of its school of music. Since 1923 he has always been first vice-president of the Roerich Museum. Both Mr. and Mrs. Lichtmann are highly accomplished musicians. Mr. Lichtmann is a graduate of the Vienna Royal Conservatory and Mrs. Lichtmann of the Royal Meisterschule, of the same city.

Miss Grant, graduating from Columbia University in 1918 with the degree of B. Lit., became almost at once editor of "Musical America," continuing in that position for four years and resigning in 1922 to become, upon the invitation of Professor and Mme. Roerich, a co-founder with them and with Mr. and Mrs. Lichtmann, of the Master Institute, of which, from 1922 to 1929, she was executive director. In 1929-'30, during a tour in South America, Miss Grant lectured, by executive invitation, before the foremost educational association of Brazil, the Association of Advanced Education, at Rio; at the National Museum of Argentina, at Buenos Aires; at the University of Santiago, Chile; at the National Academy of Peru, at Lima; at the University of Bolivia, at La Paz, and at the National Academy of Colombia, at Bogota.

As to Professor Roerich, he surely needs no words of praise from me, but it is interesting to recall at this time Dr. Fleischer's public eulogy of him, a little while ago, as "a man who illustrates in all his life what culture really is, what 'glory to God in the highest' through love really is!"

J. G. PHELPS STOKES.

New York, Feb. 19, 1936.

COPY

NEW-YORK HERALD TRIBUNE. Feb. 24, 1936.

THE ROERICHS DISPUTANTS

Allegation of Lack of Culture Arouses a Correspondent .

To The New York Herald Tribune:

In Dr. Charles Fleischer's letter as published on your editorial page this morning a statement is made, relative to "the Roerich dispute", that the present litigants (those whose cause John O'Hara Cochrane has so eloquently and so justly espoused) "have contributed neither culture nor spirituality nor money to a worthy enterprise soon to emerge from temporary eclipse to fulfill its sunlit purposes". The litigants referred to are Mr and Mrs Maurice Lichtmann and Miss Frances Grant, co-founders with Professor and Mme Roerich, in 1921, of the Master Institute, whose work was for a time absorbed by the Roerich Museum. As a close friend of both institutions during many years, and also as a close friend during many years of all the parties to the present issue, and intimately familiar with the cultural work of the museum as well as of the institute, I feel it my duty to say that the persons whose cultural contributions Dr. Fleischer has so disparaged have been the principal resident contributors to the cultural work of both institutions ever since their foundation, and that all three brought to their tasks in both institutions cultural qualifications and services of a high order.

Mr and Mrs Lichtmann had conducted their own music school in this city (the Lichtmann Piano Institute, then of 730 Riverside Drive) during the seven years immediately preceding the opening of the Master Institute. During two of those years Deems Taylor, our distinguished American composer, collaborated closely with them, conducting their institute's classes in the theory of music. Mr and Mrs Lichtmann merged their institute with the Master Institute in 1921, bringing to the latter their small staff and some seventy pupils. Since then Mr. Lichtmann has been continuously and is still vice-president of the Master Institute and dean of its school of music. Since 1923 he has always been first vice-president of the Roerich Museum. Both Mr and Mrs Lichtmann are highly accomplished musicians. Mr. Lichtmann is a graduate of the Vienna Royal Conservatory and Mrs Lichtmann of the Royal Meisterschule, of the same city.

Miss Grant, graduating from Columbia University in 1918 with the degree of B.Lit., became almost at once editor of "Musical America" continuing in that position for four years and resigning in 1922 to become, upon the invitation of Professor and Mme. Roerich, a co-founder with them and with Mr. and Mrs Lichtmann, of the Master Institute, of which, from 1922 to 1929 she was executive director. In 1929-30, during a tour in South America, Miss Grant lectured, by executive invitation, before the foremost educational association of Brazil, the Association of Advanced Education, at Rio; at the National Museum of Argentina, at Buenos Aires; at the University of Santiago, Chile; at the National Academy of Peru at Lima; at the University of Bolivia at La Paz and at the National Academy of Colombia, at Bogota.

As to Professor Roerich, he surely needs no words of praise from me, but it is interesting to recall at this time Dr. Fleischer's public eulogy of him, a little while ago, as "a man who illustrates in all his life what culture really is, what 'glory to God in the highest' through love really is!"

J.C. Phelps Stokes

New York, Feb. 19, 1936.

11

International Press-Cutting Bureau
110, Fleet Street. London, E.C.4

Extract from
New York Times

FEB 29 1938

Roerich Opposes Tax Claim.

WASHINGTON, Feb. 28 (AP).—Nicholes Roerich, New York artist, ~~appealed today from~~ the government's charge of income tax deficiency between 1923-28. He filed with the Board of Tax Appeals a petition contending he did not receive about \$147,000 for paintings done while he was in Mongolia and Tibet when he headed an expedition of the Roerich Museum. The government charged him with deficiency and penalty aggregating \$48,758. Mr. Roerich contended he donated nearly 500 paintings to the United States and received nothing in return but his actual expenses.

876

NY HERALD TRIBUNE
Nicholas Roerich Appeals

U. S. Income Tax Claims

FEB. 29 1936
Artist Denies Receiving \$147,000 for Expedition Paintings

WASHINGTON, Feb. 28 (AP).—Nicholas Roerich, New York artist, appealed today from the government's charge of income tax deficiency between 1923 and 1928. He filed with the Board of Tax Appeals a petition contending he did not receive approximately \$147,000 for paintings done while he was in Mongolia and Tibet when he headed an expedition of the Roerich Museum.

The government charged him with deficiency and penalty aggregating \$48,758. Mr. Roerich contended he donated nearly 500 paintings to the United States and that he received nothing in return but his actual expenses. He left in 1934 with the present expedition, into the Far East, and said his failure to file a return for that year was the fault of his New York attorney.

He denied owing any income taxes for 1926-'27, but said he was willing to pay any tax due for 1934.

Settle • *vd xcv*

НАЛОГ И ШТРАФ — НА АКАД. РЕРИХА.

ВАШИНГТОН. От академика Н. К. Рериха поступила жалоба на обложение его доходным налогом в 48,758 долларов.

Он отрицает, что получил 147,000 долл. за картины, которые он писал, находясь в Монголии и Тибетѣ, и напоминает, что он подарил, находясь в Соед. Штатах, болѣе пятисот картин, получив в возмѣщеніе только свои дѣйствительные расходы.

VOZROJDENIYE

24 March 1936

1A

Доходы Н. К. Рериха

Из Вашингтона сообщают, что от академика Н. К. Рериха поступила жалоба на несправедливое обложение его подоходным налогом и штрафом в 48.758 долларов. Он отрицает, что получил 147.000 долл. за картины, которые писал, находясь в Монголии и Тибете, и напоминает, что он роздал, находясь в Соед. Штатах, более 500 картин, причем получил за них лишь сумму, равную его расходам.

НЕПРИНЯТЫЯ РУКОПИСИ
НЕ ВОЗВРАЩАЮТСЯ

Возрождение 24 марта 36г.