J. G. PHELPS STOKES
100 WILLIAM STREET
NEW YORK

January 25th, 1895.

Dear Madame Roland

It was most kind of you to write me as you did relative to my little contributions to Unsworth. I well know how major and the work is that is being done there — especially you are wonderful

my liability, or very nearly so; and yet I rejoice in being privileged to aid in any way whatever.

Perhaps as conditions "improve" it may be possible for some of us who are physically remote from Jerusalem to do more, in the aid, than has seemed possible hitherto.

My constant prayer is that all may function fully as <u>that</u> that all and!

With best of greetings to all I am

Very sincerely yours

[illegible]

that in it — and how difficult it must be to carry on amid such handicaps as confront you and your splendid co-workers.

In contrast to the very great service you and your immediate co-workers are rendering, the trifling aid that I have ~~been fair logged~~ felt able to extend is merely

J. G. PHELPS STOKES
100 WILLIAM STREET
NEW YORK

May 11, 1935.

Dear Mr. Morris,

I very greatly appreciate your exceedingly kind recent letter.

I am almost ashamed to have done so little for Unrest, but after all the Task is one, wherever and by how many owners it be practically performed.

As you of course know even better than I, there is much to be done "here" as

avoided.

I have just had the pleasure of sending Mr. Marsh the sum needed to replace that diverted, and presume it will have reached you long before this letter does.

With the greatest respect I am

Very sincerely Yours

W. H. Hughes

Mrs Rosing,
Umsvati,
Raffan Road,
Punjab
Brit. India.

well as "Thee".

I had expected to be able to forward £100 each month, as I presume Mr. Horch informed you. But then unforeseen situations arose requiring immediate travelling expenses for officers of the museum; and funds set apart for Arusovali had for the time being to be otherwise applied. The diversion doubtless involved inconvenience in certain aspects of the work, but I do not know how it could have been avoided

COPY

5

J.G.PHELPS STOKES
100 William Street
New-York

July 11, 1935.

Dear Mme Roerich,

I very greatly appreciate your exceedingly kind recent letter. I am almost ashamed to have done so little for Urusvati, but after all THE TASK is one, whoever and by how many soever it be fractionally performed.

So you of course know even better than I there is much to be done "here" as well as "there"

I had expected to be able to forward $100 each month as I presume Mr.Horch informed you. But then an unforseen situation arose requiring immediate travelling expenses for officers of the Museum; and funds set apart for Urusvati had for the time being to be otherwise applied - the diversion doubtless involved inconvenience in certain aspects of the work, but I do not know how it could have been properly avoided.

I have just had the pleasure of sending Mr.Horch the sum needed to replace that diverted, and presume it will have reached you long before this letter does.

With greatest respects I am

very sincerely yours

signed J.G.Phelps Stokes

Mme Roerich
Urusvati
Naggar, Kulu
Punjab. Brit.India.

J. G. PHELPS STOKES
100 WILLIAM STREET
NEW YORK

September 9, 1895.

My dear Mr. Monroe

I had much pleasure in remitting the Mr. Ridley $200 for Uruguay, the remittance being by telegraphic order to American Express Co, Bombay, and hereby directly to Uruguay.

the semi-clause was
dropped the 5th instant.
I trust it reached you
safely.

I also trust that
the situation confronting
Brussels will now
become less difficult.

Please believe me

Very sincerely yours

P. V. Vergstedt

8

J. G. PHELPS STOKES
100 WILLIAM STREET
NEW YORK

October 29 1935

My dear Franklin:

I appreciate very deeply your kindness in the matter of the [illegible], and you may be sure of my cordial cooperation regarding the social [illegible] that I have been invited to make in Brussels.

I am distressed

public opinion for the extreme character of certain of the things that have been done. I cannot believe that the present situation with respect to these matters will be permitted to continue long. It seems to me that a great wrong has been done — one for which amends must some day be made.

I should be very glad if I might receive sometime, at your convenience, a little more of the Vishnu-purana vol., which interests me especially; but pray do not put yourself to any trouble in the matter.

I hope to send another $100 next month, and meanwhile am, with great respect to you and to Prof. Roerig and to your sons, very sincerely yours

J. P. Morgan

beyond words to learn
of recent developments
~~of~~ at the museum. What
has been done in
so sweepingly
removing Professor Ramsay's
name, etc., appears to
me very shocking. I
of course realize that
the recent wholesome
compulsory transfer of
tests from one corporation
to another, but can
see no shield

COPY

10

J.G.Phelps Stokes.
100 William Street
NEW-YORK.

October 29, 1935.

My dear Mme Roerich,

I appreciate very greatly your kindness in the matter of the oils and your very generous expressions regarding the small gifts that I have been privileged to make to Urusvati.

I am distressed beyond words to learn of recent developments at the Museum. What has been done in so sweepingly removing Professor Roerich's name, all appears to me very shocking. I of course realize that the recent foreclosure compelled transfer of title from one corporation to another, but can see no slightest justification for the extreme character of certain of the things that have been done. I cannot believe that the present situation with respect to these matters will be permitted to continue long. It seems to me that a great wrong has been done - one for which amends must some day be made.

I should be very glad if I might receive sometime, at your convenience, a little more of the Vishnupurna oil which interests me especially, but pray do not put yourself to any trouble in the matter.

I hope to send another $100 next month and meanwhile am, with great respect to you and to Prof.Roerich and to your sons,

Yours sincerely,

J.G.Phelps Stokes.

Stohen

(Memo) - Copy 11

It appears that the Plan of Reorganization submitted to the Supreme Court of this State by the two Bondholders Committees early in 1934, as referred by Mr. Justice Shientag of the Supreme Court to Mr. Burlingham as Referee, under date of March 2, 1934, and as later recommended by the said Referee (with minor modifications irrelevant to the present considerations) and as approved by the said Court, June 26, 1934, provided that the proposed New Company (the present Riverside Drive ' 103rd St. Corporation), if it should buy the Museum's premises at foreclosure, should reconvey same, upon terms designated, "to an educational corporation, organized under the laws of the State of New York, and controlled by the present Roerich Museum interest"(i.e., controlled by the "Roerich Museum interests" as existing March 2, 1934).

The joint statement of the two Bondholders Committees, dated July 31, 1934, informing Certificate Holders of the Court's approval of the said plan, declared similarly that the educational corporation to whom the premises would be conveyed, if Certificate Holders approved, would be "controlled by the present Roerich Museum interests". The said Bondholders Committees jointly recommended to the Certificate Holders the approval of the said plan, including the provision quoted, and the said plan was thereupon approved.

On December 27, 1934, pursuant to the foreclosure proceedings provided for in the said plan, as so approved, the property "known as Roerich Museum" was purchased by the Riverside Drive & 103rd St. Corporation, the latter being, as aforesaid, "the New Company provided for in the Plan of Reorganization dated July 31, 1934" (see the said Company's Distribution Letter of August 20, 1935); title passing on February 23, 1935. On the same date the/declaring in the said Distribution Letter of August 20, 1935, the said Master Institute of United Arts, Inc., to be "the educational corporation provided for in said Plan".

It will be observed that the Referee's recommendation aforesaid, as approved by the Supreme Court, Jun 26, 1934, and as alleged by the Riverside Drive and 103rd St. Corporation in their said Distribution Letter to have been complied with to date of said letter, expressly provided that the transfer of the premises by the New Company should be "to an educational corporation ### controlled by the present Roerich Museum interests", i.e., controlled by the same Roerich Museum interests as controlled the said premises on the said dates, viz., March 2, 1934 and July 31, 1934. The Roerich Museum interests that controlled the said premises on the said dates were the then trustees of Roerich Museum, viz., Prof. & Mme. Roerich, Mr. & Mrs. Lichtmann and Miss Grant and Mr. and Mrs. Horch. It was apparently the intent of the Court to place and confirm control of the premises in the hands of seven persons, five of whom, viz., Prof. & Mme. Roerich, Mr. and Mrs. Lichtmann and Miss Grant, are now sought by adverse interests to be excluded from all participation in the control of same. It would appear that an injunction would lie to prevent such exclusion of said five trustees from participation in the control of the said premises, as being not merely inconsistent with the agreement and declared intent of all the parties, but as being in effect in contempt of the decree of the Court.

.....(missing line)... "New Company" transferred the premises to Master Institute of United Arts, Inc.;

Copy

(Memo)

It appears that the plan of Reorganization submitted to the Supreme Court of this State by the two Bondholders Committees early in 1934, as referred by Mr. Justice Shientag of the Supreme Court to Mr. Burlingham as Referee, under date of March 2, 1934, and as later recommended by the said Referee (with minor modifications irrelevant to the present considerations) and as approved by the said Court, June 26, 1934, provided that the proposed New Company (the present Riverside Drive & 103rd St. Corporation), if it should buy the Museum's premises at foreclosure, should receive same, upon terms designated, "to an educational corporation, organized under the laws of the state of New York, and controlled by the present Roerich Museum interests"(i.e., controlled by the "Roerich Museum interests" as existing March 2, 1934).

The joint statement of the two Bondholders Committees, dated July 31, 1934, informing Certificate Holders of the Court's approval of the said plan, declared similarly that the educational corporation to whom the premises would be conveyed, if Certificate Holders approved, would be "controlled by the present Roerich Museum interests". The said Bondholders Committees jointly recommended to the Certificate Holders the approval of the said plan, including the provision quoted, and the said plan was thereupon approved.

On December 27, 1934, pursuant to the foreclosure proceedings provided for in the said plan, as so approved, the property "known as Roerich Museum" was purchased by the Riverside Drive & 103rd St. Corporation, the latter being, as aforesaid, "the New Company provided for in the plan of Reorganization dated July 31, 1934" (see the said Company's Distribution Letter of August 20, 1935); title passing on February 23, 1935. On the same date the defendant in the said Distribution Letter of August 20, 1935, the said Master Institute of United Arts, Inc., to be "the educational corporation provided for in said plan".

It will be observed that the Referee's recommendation aforesaid, as approved by the Supreme Court, June 26, 1934, and as alleged by the Riverside Drive and 103rd St. Corporation in their said Distribution Letter to have been complied with to date of said letter, expressly provided that the transfer of the premises by the New Company should be "to an educational corporation ... controlled by the present Roerich Museum interests", i.e., controlled by the same Roerich Museum interests as controlled the said premises on the said dates, viz., March 2, 1934 and July 31, 1934. The Roerich Museum interests that controlled the said premises on the said dates were the then trustees of Roerich Museum, viz., Prof. & Mrs. Roerich, Mr. & Mrs. Nicholson and Miss Grant and Mr. and Mrs. Horch. It was apparently the intent of the Court to place and confirm control of the premises in the hands of seven persons, five of whom, viz., Prof. & Mrs. Roerich, Mr. and Mrs. Nicholson and Miss Grant, are now sought by adverse interests to be excluded from all participation in the control of same. It would appear that an injunction would lie to prevent such exclusion of said five trustees from participation in the control of the said premises, as being not merely inconsistent with the agreement and declared intent of all the parties, but as being in effect in contempt of the decree of the Court.

...(missing line)... "New Company" transferred the premises to Master Institute of United Arts, Inc.;