

Hon. William Windom:

Dear Sir;

I fear from the tone of your letter that you must have regarded my ^{former} ~~as having been intended to be~~ in some manner as offensive. I do not know how but I am well aware that what any man may only intend as a frank statement of ^{opinion} ~~of his own conviction~~ another may regard as ~~constitute~~ an interference with his own proper function ~~on a court~~ ~~street~~.

I had only a Raleigh newspaper's version of the matter and have no more interest in ~~the matter~~ ^{it} than I have in the Alaska seal fisheries — not so much, indeed, but I happened to understand Shaffer's peculiarities ~~and knew the same under them~~ which I well understood knew that one seeing him only in such a controversy ^{as was there reported} might well misconceive. As to Ellison I don't I had no thought of interfering pro or con as regards Ellison. I have known him for twenty-five years and seen his ~~own~~

counsel above than one. I did not suppose there was any question about his holding the place but merely inferred from ~~what you~~ what the paper said that you ~~were~~ were inclined to regard Shaffer's action in refusing him entrance to his meeting rooms unless some one was present, as a sort of contempt of court — a counsel about attack upon the yourself. Confident that I knew the real reason and that Shaffer if once understood by you would be fully appreciated, I tried to give you a just idea of his character, with I fear very poor success.

I was not seeking Ellison's removal — did not know that any one was — but merely apprehended that Shaffer's ^{counsel} might make you his enemy or at least distrustful of him when I judged his purpose to be very different ^{from what you might suppose} and merely hoped to ease a misunderstanding between two men whom I highly prize. I understood that it was merely a question as to whether the Director

should be allowed to invade the Post Office at will or not. I knew on this Shaffer would fight stubbornly and perhaps indirectly. I merely wanted to explain why he would do so. I suppose another man would simply have asked to have the Post Office exempted from the Junitor's ^{privilege} ~~right~~ of entry, ^{and such} instead of asserting his right to exclude him as was reported. This was ~~Shaffer like and not like~~ like the man ~~but not intended~~ and a very foolish thing to do, but which one with a fair knowledge of his character would understand was not intended as an act of insubordination but merely a characteristic expression of ~~about~~ his own sense of duty.

If you understood my letter as intended to have any reference to Ellison's continuance in the position, I beg you will dismiss it. I do not and could not care enough about the matter to say a word about it. Like Shaffer I would not want him in the mailing room when no one was present but beyond that there is nothing worth fussing about in the matter. (Over)

As he was under bonds for the said
it was well enough for him to ask this ex-
emption — to assert it was foolish, but
characteristic ~~was~~ and without any sort
of insubordinate intent.

~~Kindly yours~~
But I intended to show you
Shaffer's real character — not to
take up his quarrels or help him
in any controversy of which I do
not know any thing about the
merits or the facts connected
with it. That was all.

Sincerely Yours