President's Office,  
Colby University,  
Waterville, Me.  

126. 26. 92

My Dear Mr. Hayler—

In writing all I ought, in order to clear up the  
entirely regrettable misunderstanding that has arisen,  
and to prevent any further misunderstanding, I wish to inform  
you of the following points:

1. I regret exceedingly that I failed to take prompt  
action when requested to do so by you, as suggested by my  
friend, Mr. Blacker. We suggested no changes.

2. Plans which are familiar to those of us who have  
been in the office are entirely unclear to me.  

3. Have taken for granted that there is no disharmony  
with you and Mr. Blacker, and that we can proceed  
on the basis of mutual respect.

I hope you can get  

If you can get  

Hendred Wells for it (or  

 INDIA (Yale Catalogue p. 141) entitled this course  

Res. Comm.  

Your celebration about the title Social Science  

and Anthropology is well grounded. Prof. Smerald  

(see Catalogue p. 141) entitled this course  

Res. Comm.
in accordance with "Local Science" (renew) instead of any specific designation. You evidently have the same impression about the proposed title, which a Social Science it would have — viz. that it is like the expression "Mathematics and Architecture".

While I am all hospitality towards the culture of Auditoryology, it is not as a part of Social Science — 2nd, because I shall feel good to myself, as well as the classes, form a perfect of Summer when you know will soon be felt: yet doesn’t begin further, much principles, and the appointment of instructors otherwise than by nomination or previous cause of the heads of department. I certainly can work in scheme which Dean has men who have their trained with ideas like my own to soon reflect.

6. You will read within the limits of prospectus any doubt as to the policy to rule of Chicago — i.e. how far it is to continue, which brings itself most comfortably for the instructor to the few who need no instruction; where for hospitality, which will carry the advantages of instruction down to the level of the ability classes. Whether it proceeds in the scheme or not. Then, secured flexibility enough to adapt that cause the demands of the situation.

I shall also renew information of the member of workers which will be allowed to the design.
President's Office,
Colby University,
Waterville, Me.

[Handwritten text not legible]
of Chicago. He will not say that he has settled his question, but I have no reason to doubt it. He will not leave you much longer, I doubt. He is perfectly well, and so am I. We have seen many of our friends, and I anticipate that the Berlin Hotel will recover its place.

I heartily deplore the General. Generals always get tiresome. I am not surprised that Dr. Bayley's book has been a success. He is really too much of a specialist for a College; Colby will not be able to keep him long at his post. He is not the scientific man the world needs. Is on the U.S. Post, Sec'y. Late Summer, this editor of Astronomical Dept. in one of the periodicals—I forget which—has written extensively, as well as known to the profession, was offered a place at Cornell last year but, this year, I think, took it.

In my own estimation, he is a first-class man, Mr. Darr. Glad to know that he is in the Near West. He has done great service in the East, I hope he will be more acceptable there than he has been of late in Baltimore. I do not altogether join in some of the expectations of the Western newspapers—e.g., when they said he did not have a career as the head of a technological department, but that he will do well, etc., valuable, etc.
Presidnet’s Office,
Colby University,
Waterville, Me.

Sep. 2, 1897

My dear Prof. Walker:

Yours, together with a bundle of calendars, the current Standard, reached me by the same mail today. One thing is demonstrated, viz., that the drift of Social Science is bound to grow, so long as I keep away from it! Had not heard of this Salbot until your note came; but when I consulted the University Column in the Standard, I fell as the Christmas tree toy did when he pulled out the fuse. If you want Dr. Wayland, or Gen. Walker, or Dr. Deke, or Leslie F. Ward for vacancies in administrative departments, don’t forget that Social Science is looking for every one. Then, to complete its cohort.

By the way, if you should hear any one intimate that the credit of organizing the department of Social Science belongs to any one except the “Wreck Bremen”
will you kindly shoot him on the spot?

I have not favorable reports of him, either Bradley nor Pickham can satisfy my claims of conscience, if the thing of leaving their graduates so soon after beginning. Meanwhile it has been suggested from time to time that Rev. Walter Kausembroek, Mr. W. S. Freeman of N. Y. would like such an opportunity. I have started on this mail. You remember I presume, I have heard a good deal about him from the time he was a student at Rochester. If he should apply for the foreign fellowship, I should find no fault with the placecard as well.

Since my last, Holbrook, I have learned no news, although we held a concert with Mr. Egan, dean of business in Switzerland.

I will send notice of foreign fellowship to Rogers. Came in the train of Roy, from France, to drive off the weeks camp, I remember well, too.
My dear Chief,

I suppose it is not good policy to appear satisfied with anything that a department gets, nevertheless I am greatly pleased with the fellowship of individuals. Particularly the recognition of Archaeology. I think it can help make that department a more effective factor in the field, and this necessarily will make the process easier. Stair has some good ideas in geneeration, and these will be an important element in creating a demand for the work.

I hope no other defect has been noticed by your recommenders to us, but that they represent additions to the total of fellowships.

Please just read and enclose an ammendment letter from Allen. He wants to be able to withdraw out of the Besant-Kinleith. That is quite possible the demand. I also understand together dinner with you in Mr. Rockefeller’s hotel and to meet Bennin. Besides get Dr. Besant’s cast in assertion that the name of Bennin was placed in the original memorandum of Eglinton States to Rockefeller or any other.

Yours truly,

[Signature]
un credited but that the latest phase of the high

roc ticism makes me it hyped up for Rockville

instead of it now.

The paper can be this way that you have

stopped to accept a half million from Mr. L.

Defamation of character is to just

name in the said.

Sincerely,

mull.
President W. R. Harper,

My dear Sir:--

In accordance with your request I present herewith memoranda of the recommendations which, in my judgment, should be made to the Board of Trustees in behalf of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology.

I. Reappointments: (1) Of Frederick Starr, Assistant Professor of Anthropology and Curator of the Anthropological section of the Museum, and his promotion to the rank of Assistant Professor of Anthropology. (2) Of Marion Talbot, Assistant Professor of Sanitary Science, and her promotion to the rank of Associate Professor.

II. With reference to the distribution of vacations during the year. (1) It is my purpose to continue instruction during the current year and through the first term of the summer quarter in 1895. (2) Prof. Henderson wishes to be absent in Europe during the spring and summer quarters of 1895. (3) During the summer quarter of 1895, should the new appointments recommended below be made, the number of courses will be offered in Sociology and Anthropology equal to that given in the summer of 1894.
In accordance with your request, I present

the recommendations of the recommendation which I have

found to be in the best interest of the Department of the

Directorate of Sociological and Anthropological

Science of the University.

I recommend:

1. The appointment of Dr. R. Harper, Assistant

Professor of Anthropology and Curator of the Anthropological

Museum to the position of Associate Professor of the

Department of Sociological Science, and his promotion to the rank of

Associate Professor.

2. With reference to the recommendation of

Warner, the following:

(a) To my knowledge, he is a

competent and capable person, and I believe that his appointment

in the position of Deputy in 1989, will

provide an adequate and efficient department of 1989.

(b) During the summer quarter of 1989, I have had the opportunity
to see him in action and I am

encouraged to recommend him for the position of Assistant

Professor of Sociological and Anthropological Sciences to take

effect from July 1989.
III. I recommend the following additions to the staff of instruction in Sociology: Dr. E. A. C. Gould to be professorial lecturer in statistics for one quarter of the coming year. With reference to this appointment permit me to say that an expert in statistics is needed to give (1) a double minor in the theory of statistical investigation (which course would be of equal value to students in all the sciences to which statistical science is tributary), and (2) a double minor in the application of statistics to Sociological investigation. This course in the planning of statistical investigation of social conditions, would supplement the courses already offered in such a way as to greatly increase their value. Dr. J. W. A. Thomas to be instructor in Sociology at a salary of $1500. Dr. E. P. Vincent to be instructor in Anthropological Psychology at a salary of $1500.

IV. In the Sociological division of the department the sum of $1500 is needed for reference books during the coming year. This sum is required partly in order to furnish material for the new division of investigation in which work is desired, viz. Anthropological Psychology. The appropriation must also be used, to a larger extent than could be wished, for cost of binding pamphlets and official reports from which a large portion of our material must be obtained. Unless binding and cataloguing is provided for, the material is practically unavailable.

In the Sanitary division of the department the recommendations are contained in the appended note which I heartily
III. I recommend the following objectives to be

To provide personalized instruction in oriental literature, to one quarter of the students.

With reference to this development, it is proposed to establish a couple minor in

the theory of sociological investigation, which some would prefer to

weaken in physiology in order to give (1) a couple minor in the

science of sociology, and (2) a couple minor in the application

of sociology to socialistic investigation. This course in

the planning of sociological investigation of social conditions

would emphasize the course in the study of social science.

IV. In the sociological division of the department

the sum of $1,200 is needed for reference books among the students.

This sum is required partly to purchase books, partly to improve periodical

and annual subscriptions. The equipment of the department may also be

need to be expanded, since the area can be increased for the comfort of the

students. Some reading material is also needed for the preparation of the

teaching and reference library.

In the sociological division of the department the expense

grows very considerable in the teaching of courses which I believe

endorse. The recommendations of the Anthropological division of the department are also stated in an appended note, which I also endorse.

V. The department has in preparation studies which will be prepared for publication during the course of the coming year. Until these studies are completed, an accurate estimate of the expense of publication cannot be made; but I would ask for the appropriation of the sum of $200 to meet probable expense.

VI. In my judgment two additional fellowships should be assigned to the Sociological division of the department, and two to the Anthropological division. You will remember that at the organization of the department three fellowships were assigned to it, but that only one was filled because it was thought that fellowships should not be given except in case of exceptional fitness for creditable advanced work. The number of graduate students doing creditable work would have justified the assignment of a large number of fellowships, if no extraordinary standard of excellence had been adopted. The fellowships not filled were given, as the Department supposed temporarily, to other departments, but they have not been again at the disposal of the department of Sociology. The students who are doing graduate work in Sociology are necessarily older, and have been obliged to spend longer time in previous study than is the case in the majority of departments in the University. As preparation for Social Philosophy, long discipline in the particular social sciences is indispensable. There
The recent suppression of the Anthropological Division of the government has also caused an increase in the number of positions.

In 1932, the government plans to provide training for prospective students in various fields, including anthropology.

Of the experiences of these students, the most anticipated are those who have completed the course at the government.

At present, these students have completed an extensive method of study, and the experience of the majority cannot be measured.

The appropriation of the sum of $800 to meet the expenses of the students.

IV. In the Department of Anthropology, we shall be seeking to the Social Science Division of the government, and two of the Anthropological Division. You will have ample time to consider the organization of the government.

The organization of the government, despite the fact that there are many students of the sciences, is not without its defects.

The number of students for the scientific work is not as great as expected, but we are confident that it will not remain as it was in the past.

The number of students for the scientific work is not as great as expected, but we are confident that it will not remain as it was in the past.
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The number of students for the scientific work is not as great as expected, but we are confident that it will not remain as it was in the past.

The number of students for the scientific work is not as great as expected, but we are confident that it will not remain as it was in the past.
is therefore unusual reason why fellowships should be assigned to
support work which has been preceded by long University labor and
large expense. I hope this statement of the case will insure
consideration of the claims of the Department in this particular.

Very respectfully,

[Signature]
In consequence numerous letters my Fellowships amount to support work which has been placed by your University for end such type experience. I hope this statement of the case will indicate consideration of the claim of the Department to this position.

Very respectfully,

[Signature]
The University of Chicago.

15 February, 1836.

My dear President Harper:—

Before you make a decision I wish to present an aspect of the case which did not appear until I found it advisable to leave in the spring instead of the summer.

To make it possible for me to come to the University at all, you kindly made some special provisions touching my salary. The last question raised (after your written proposition) was whether I might at an early date teach an extra quarter for extra pay. You said that it could be arranged within the department, and asked me to adjust it with Professor Small. I rehearsed the circumstances to Professor Small, and we arranged extra work for me for the coming Spring Quarter, and it was so announced in the July Register. The Spring Quarter is regularly my vacation, since my service began July 1st. I have just learned, however, that Professor Small has had in the meantime the impression that I wished to gain extra time, and not extra pay. He says it is a question for your settlement.

The feeling that my mission in Europe would seem but a shadowy substitute for work done on the ground was one of my reasons for setting the time of my departure for the summer: but, as Professor Small has perhaps told you, there appear imperative reasons for an earlier start. Permit me, therefore, to restate the question in this form: Will you approve the arrangement of extra work for me in the Spring Quarter, for which I shall receive extra pay? Do you further wish me to do this work in Europe?
A simpler view of the case, for our present purpose, is that you wish
me to undertake service for the University during my vacation, and pay me
for it. It is a work to which I would gladly give my vacation without com-
penation but for the fact that I have been relying on this vacation to
recoup myself in part for the year's salary I forfeited in coming to the
University.

The $400 for traveling expenses, named in my previous commu-
nication, is not affected by the foregoing. My salary will, by this arrange-
ment, be simply continued to me during the summer, and my next vacation
will begin April 1st, 1897. In virtue of such an arrangement Professor SMALL agrees with me that I cannot limit my stay in Europe to the summer months without suspicion. The Universities are
not in session at this season, and I should have no sufficient cloak for
my real purpose. The large number of persons who have become acquainted
with my connection with the affair up to the present time make it neces-
sary for me to move with great circumspection and there are other considerations
to the same effect.

Your decision may be postponed a week without inconvenience to me.

Very sincerely yours,

President William R. Harper,

Morgan Park, Ill.
The Province of Sociology.

The most original sociologist in America has said, in substance, that progress of to-day, has been more a matter of good luck than of good sense. Practice has been tried enough to make the most irrational forms of social life so inconvenient that we have been driven out of the world, I have shuddered upon futile. When right reason takes control of life, social possibilities will be realized to a degree that will make the half-hazard results of the past seem trivial.

One of the most indomitable social reformers in America has said: "Our literature abounds in studies of societies which are of little use, even when they are not positively misleading, because they do not approach their subjects from the sociological point of view. And it is not the second or third rate followers of this class of writers that we are getting a deal of social quackery or cranks. A lot of social material information is a poor substitute for sociological training."

The first inducements of the student
Sociological Science is to establish the sociological point of view. The founders of modern sociology taught that the radical difficulty in science is the failure to reach agreement about fundamental principles.

The men of the Renaissance thought they had discovered life's secrets in the classic literatures, which seemed to them, rightly too, as genuine, compared with the schoolmen's fictions. But all the modern sciences about man have been making knowledge about life a thousand times more precise than it was in classic thought. Each of these sciences has something to say, which the student of society must learn how to use.

The student of social science must begin with first, learn the facts of society, past, present, until he can make them divinely some of the missing fundamental principles. Does matter make mind, or does mind make matter? Is morality moral or physical, elective or compulsory? Is the immortal
sitions of thoroughly rational life. Many sociologists would scoff at this,
but, I fear that in the end, the study may hardly deserve to be called practical.
The final aim of Social Science is the discovery and application of the most direct and natural means and methods of changing irrational into rational social relations.

Any civilized community or society presents endless problems enough to occupy the attention of a group of trained sociologists. With few or no exceptions, our social procedure, local or national, is not the result of the operation of a grand scientific process, but by rule of thumb, not by discipline of science. The regime of the social quack will continue until the discipline of the social sciences qualifies the best men to demonstrate their fitness for social leadership.

In public office, or in private occupation, or in professions or in business, there is more of the money in one country than ever before, for
To salutary influence of adequate trained social judgment. Unwarranted social disadjustment propagates disturbance wider or farther. There could an isolated social discovery become to doom the common fate of civilization.

Sociology has been used as a mere pretentious rase for the theme of charity. Sociology is rather the modern humanity. Sociology expands the Greek wisdom: "Know thyself!" into the ideal of comprehending society, the larger self. Sociology is not a name for unrelated social facts. It is neither star-gazing nor skimming. It is the rationale of human life. Sociology is the science, not of criminality but of legality, not of the dependent, but of the independent; not of the defective, but of the effective. Sociology challenges...
The attention of every man who aspires to be a positive and progressive force.

Alston W. Small.
Aug. 12, 1944

My dear Dr. Harper:

Now, my head is full of things that I want to tell you. I have just received your letter, as there are so many last things to do and yet not enough time.

I should like to say a word about the new departmental structure. It seems to me that it is a good idea to have separate departments for the different fields of sociology. The new departmental structure, I think, will be a great improvement over the old system. It has been a long time coming, but now it is finally here.

I would like to thank you for your kind words in my letter. I really appreciate it. I hope that you will consider my suggestion and make the necessary changes. I am sure that it will be for the better.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]
work until the demand for it is more fixed than at present. There is no consensus in the board which has now liberal counter to the field everywhere than we have. There is room enough for much more teaching; but the demand for it at present is not such that we can have the funds to seek the bursaries for partial appropriations for instructors.

Just how is certain an attractor investment. Just only a small number can get the early stage.

There were heard a student speak expressively the earnest praise of Thomas work, and the earnest praise of the students themselves. The students the more appreciation. But their numbers are not yet large. Meanwhile there is every need of a thing specialist in this is eager need if a thing specialist in the demand for it has never fallen statistics and the demand for it has never fallen statistics. If the salary that would secure the professorship is needed, one could not let personal friendship lead one into asking for another appointment until circumstances change.

Of course, there is entire confusion with the Teachers' College faculties involved, and the main refers solely to the University system.

Sincerely,

Albert W. Small.
The Dismissal of Professor Ross

from C. A. Seligman
324 86th St.
N.Y. City.

Sociology

REPORT OF

COMMITTEE OF ECONOMISTS
Report of the Committee of Economists on the Dismissal of Professor Ross from Leland Stanford Junior University.

The committee, appointed at the meeting of the economists in Detroit, December 28, 1900, to enquire into the causes of the dismissal of Professor Ross from Leland Stanford University, have earnestly endeavored to learn the facts of the case. In addition to a careful examination of the statements made in the newspapers, we have asked Professor Jordan for a full and frank statement of the causes which led to Professor Ross's removal, and have obtained the replies printed in the appendix, in which Professor Jordan declines to give specific information in regard to them. We have also in our possession copies of letters bearing upon this case from various persons, including letters from Professor Ross, as well as from President Jordan, not only to Professor Ross, but also to others.

The following facts are, we believe, undisputed:

It is customary for professors in the Leland Stanford University to be reappointed early in May of each year. Professor Ross failed to receive his annual reappointment early in May, 1900. He was, however, reappointed on June 2. On June 5, he handed to President Jordan his resignation as follows:

"Dear Dr. Jordan:—I was sorry to learn from you a fortnight ago that Mrs. Stanford does not approve of me as an economist, and does not want me to remain here. It was a pleasure, however, to learn at the same time of the unqualified terms in which you had expressed to her your opinion of my work and your complete confidence in me as a teacher, a scientist and a man.

While I appreciate the steadfast support you have given me, I am unwilling to become a cause of worry to Mrs. Stanford or of embarrassment to you. I, therefore, beg leave to offer my resignation as professor of sociology, the same to take effect at the close of the academic year, 1900-1901."
This resignation was not acted on until November 12, when it was accepted by President Jordan in the following letter:

"I have waited till now in the hope that circumstances might arise which would lead you to a reconsideration. As this has not been the case, I, therefore, with great reluctance, accept your resignation, to take effect at your own convenience. In doing so I wish to express once more the high esteem in which your work, as a student and as a teacher, as well as your character as a man, is held by all your colleagues."

On November 14, Professor Ross authorized the publication in the newspapers of a statement setting forth the causes of his resignation and its acceptance, attributing it to a dissatisfaction felt by Mrs. Stanford with his expressions of opinion on questions of public policy, particularly Coolie Immigration and Municipal Ownership of public service corporations. On the following day, President Jordan wrote Professor Ross to the effect that, in view of his published statement, it was desirable that his connection with the University should terminate immediately.

The evidence which we have been able to obtain indicates clearly also the following facts:

(1) The causes which led to the dismissal of Professor Ross existed in May, 1900.

(2) Although the dismissal of Professor Ross may have been occasioned by his published statement of November 14, his resignation was practically forced by the wish of Mrs. Stanford. This fact is distinctly stated in the report of the Alumni Committee of Investigation, which report apparently has the full endorsement of the University authorities.

(3) Mrs. Stanford's wishes in the matter were expressed as early as May, 1900.

(4) The delay in the acceptance of Professor Ross's resignation was due to an effort on the part of President Jordan to overcome Mrs. Stanford's objections.

The question in regard to which we have been called upon to express an opinion is: What were the reasons which led Mrs. Stanford to force Professor Ross's resignation?

Two classes of reasons have been alleged:

(1) Dissatisfaction on the part of Mrs. Stanford with Professor Ross's expressions of opinion on questions of economic policy, notably in regard to the free coinage of silver in the campaign of 1896, and more recently in regard to coolie immigration and municipal monopolies.

(2) It has been asserted or suggested that Professor Ross had made statements before his classes reflecting upon Senator Stanford, that he had shown himself selfish and lacking in loyalty to the University, that he was erratic and frequently overstepped the bounds of academic propriety in the manner of giving expression to his opinions, that his publication of November 14th was a violation of confidence, and that there are facts which, if disclosed, would reflect upon his personal character.

While it is, of course, impossible for us definitely to determine what facts, or reports of supposed facts, may have weighed with Mrs. Stanford, the evidence in the possession of the committee seems to justify the following conclusions:

(1) There is no evidence to show that Professor Ross gave occasion for his dismissal by any defect in moral character. On the contrary, President Jordan states in his letter of February 7 to the committee: "No ground exists for any interpretation of his dismissal reflecting on his private character.

(2) There is no evidence to show that Professor Ross gave occasion for his dismissal by incompetence.
On the contrary, President Jordan stated in a letter of May, 1900, that he was "a careful thinker and a patient investigator," "a constant source of strength" to the University and "one of the best teachers, always just, moderate and fair."

(3) There is no evidence to show that Professor Ross gave occasion for his dismissal by any unfaithfulness in the discharge of his duties. On the contrary, President Jordan stated in a letter of May, 1900, that "he has been most loyal, accepting extra work and all kinds of embarrassments without a word of complaint," and that he was "a wise, learned and noble man, one of the most loyal and devoted of all the band" at the University.

(4) There is no evidence to show that in his published statement of November 14, Professor Ross violated any confidence reposed in him. On the contrary, in a letter of December 24, President Jordan states: "I wish after conversation with Dr. Ross to withdraw anything I may have said implying that he had knowingly used confidential material, or in any other way violated personal proprieties in making his statement."

(5) Concerning the point that Professor Ross gave occasion for his dismissal by remarks derogatory to Senator Stanford, your committee finds in a statement by Mr. C. F. Lummis, in The Land of Sunshine, dated Christmas, 1900, the following passage:

"The precise words Professor Ross may have used I do not know, but I do know that he has stated in his classes in Stanford many things which his students understood to be reflections on Senator Stanford, and I know, also, that Mrs. Stanford firmly believes that he did slur her husband's memory."

In The Independent of February 7, 1901, Mr. Lummis repeats this charge, quoting Mrs. Stanford's reasons for his dismissal: "** * * He has called my husband a thief." (marginal)

The committee also finds that President Jordan in a letter of November 16, 1900, states:

"Mr. Keeling informs me that he and others of the alumni have heard you in your classes condemn the means by which Mr. Stanford became rich in such a way as to make it clearly a personal reference, and that some time last year Mrs. Stanford was told this by a prominent alumnus, Mr. Crothers, if I understood correctly."

In a letter of the next day, however, President Jordan retracts this by saying: "Mr. Crothers tells me that he has never mentioned the matter in question to Mrs. Stanford. I was not sure that I understood my informant to say so."

Professor Ross, moreover, at the time, unqualifiedly denied all such charges, and insisted that statements to this effect were "a thorough-paced falsehood and a disingenuous attempt to befog the real issue." In another place he says: "The charge from any quarter that I have ever made remarks derogatory to the character of Senator Stanford is false—absolutely without foundation." In a subsequent letter he states: "I have never referred in a derogatory way to Senator Stanford, nor have I reflected upon the manner in which he accumulated his fortune. Both my sincere respect for the Senator and my sense of the proprieties of my position forbade anything of the kind."

Moreover, that this charge could not have been a determining cause in President Jordan's acceptance of Professor Ross's resignation, is shown by the fact that in a letter of November 16, two days after his dismissal, President Jordan says, in reference to these charges: "I never heard anything of the sort before."

(6) There is no evidence to show that in the opinion of the President of the University, Professor Ross, in his utterances on the silver question, on coolie immigration, or on municipal ownership, overstepped the limits of professorial propriety. On the contrary, President Jordan stated in May, 1900, that his remarks on
cooly immigration and on municipal ownership were in accord with the drift of public sentiment on those subjects, and that even on the silver question "he never stepped outside of the recognized rights of a professor."

(7) There is evidence to show:

(a) That Mrs. Stanford's objections to Professor Ross were due, in part at all events, to his former attitude on the silver question, and to his utterances on coolie immigration and on municipal ownership; and

(b) That while the dissatisfaction of Mrs. Stanford due to his former attitude on the silver question antedated his utterances on coolie immigration and municipal ownership, her dissatisfaction was greatly increased by these utterances.

As to (a). This is shown by the fact that President Jordan at first attempted to deter Mrs. Stanford from taking any action for such reasons, stating in a letter of May, 1900: "I feel sure that if his critics would come forth and make their complaints to me in manly fashion I could convince any of them that they have no real ground for complaint." President Jordan, moreover, intimated that to dismiss him for such reasons would be improper in the extreme, for "no graver charge can be made against a University than that it denies its professors freedom of speech."

As to (b). This is shown by the fact that not until immediately after delivery of the coolie immigration speech did Mrs. Stanford force Professor Ross's resignation, as well as by the fact that in a letter of June, 1900, President Jordan stated: "The matter of immigration she [Mrs. Stanford] takes most seriously."

In the same letter, while Mrs. Stanford's objection is declared to be due to the fact that the reputation of the University for serious conservatism is impaired by the hasty acceptance of social and political fads, it is added, that these "local criticisms" which weighed with Mrs.

Stanford "unfortunately are based on chance matters and obiter dicta, not at all upon your serious work."

We have not deemed it wise to publish in full the letters upon which we have based our conclusions, but we stand ready to publish them if such a course is necessary to establish the truth in this matter.

We are aware that owing to the failure of President Jordan to give definite replies to all our questions, there may be important facts with which we are unacquainted. On the other hand, we cannot but feel that a refusal to furnish specific information in a case of such importance—in which it is charged that the freedom of speech is at stake—is itself a fact of significance, which, to say the least, is much to be regretted.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

EDWIN R. A. SELIGMAN, Professor of Political Economy and Finance, Columbia University.

HENRY W. FARNAM, Professor of Political Economy, Yale University.

HENRY B. GARDNER, Professor of Political Economy, Brown University.

February 20th, 1901.
The undersigned have examined the evidence submitted by the above committee, and believe that it justifies the conclusions which they have drawn:

Horace White, Editor of the Evening Post, New York.
John B. Clark, Columbia University.
Henry C. Adams, University of Michigan.
Frank W. Taussig, Harvard University.
Richard T. Ely, University of Wisconsin.
Simon N. Fatten, University of Pennsylvania.
Richmond Mayo-Smith, Columbia University.
John C. Schaar, Yale University.
Sidney Sherwood, Johns Hopkins University.
Franklin H. Giddings, Columbia University.
William J. Ashley, Harvard University.
Charles H. Hull, Cornell University.
Davies R. Dewey, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
Henry C. Emery, Yale University.
Henry R. Seager, University of Pennsylvania.

APPENDIX.

December 30, 1900.

President Jordan, Leland Stanford Junior University,
Palo Alto, Cal.:

Dear Sir:—In behalf of a considerable number of economists, recently assembled in Detroit and much interested in the resignation of Professor Ross from the Leland Stanford University, we venture to address you on the subject. We understand from the public prints as well as from other sources, that Professor Ross was asked to sever his connection with the University owing to the loss of confidence in him by Mrs. Stanford, and that this loss of confidence was due primarily to the opinions expressed by him in a lecture on the subject of coolie immigration as well as to incidental remarks on the problem of municipal ownership.

May we inquire whether, as it has been alleged in some of the Eastern journals, there are any other reasons than those mentioned for the resignation of Professor Ross, and may we hope that, if such other reasons exist, you may be disposed to communicate them to us? Many university men have been led to believe that in this case the legitimate freedom of thought without which no progress in science is possible has been discouraged. As this is a matter which concerns not a single university, but the interests of scholarship all over the country, we believe that we are not overstepping the bounds of propriety in asking information which will enable university teachers to form a just opinion on the merits of the case.
We desire to add that Dr. Ross is neither the instigator of this letter nor aware of its contents.

Very truly yours,

EDWIN R. A. SELIGMAN,
Columbia University.
HENRY W. FARNAM,
Yale University.
HENRY B. GARDNER,
Brown University.

LELAND STANFORD JUNIOR UNIVERSITY,
Stanford University, Cal., Jan. 7, 1901.

Prof. EDWIN R. A. SELIGMAN, Columbia University, New York City.

MY DEAR SIR:—In response to your kind letter of December 30th, permit me to say that in view of the importance of the matter I have referred the contents of your letter to a committee of three of our professors, Vice-President J. C. Branner, Dr. J. M. Stillman and Dr. C. H. Gilbert. They are in possession of the facts and are at liberty to answer any questions which your committee may desire to ask. For reasons which will readily appear it has not been deemed advisable for us to state the reasons why Dr. Ross was dismissed. His statement to the press does not assign any of the true reasons.

Very truly yours,

DAVID JORDAN,
President.

LELAND STANFORD JUNIOR UNIVERSITY,

Jan. 14, 1901.

Professor EDWIN R. A. SELIGMAN.
Professor HENRY W. FARNAM.
Professor HENRY B. GARDNER.

DEAR SIRS:—

Your letter of December 30th addressed to President Jordan has been referred by him to us for reply.

In your letter you say: "We understand from the public prints as well as from other sources that Professor Ross was asked to sever his connection with the University owing to loss of confidence in him by Mrs. Stanford, and that this loss of confidence was due primarily to the opinions expressed by him in a lecture on the subject of coolie immigration as well as to incidental remarks on the problem of municipal ownership."

In reply we beg to say that the dissatisfaction of the University management with Professor Ross antedated his utterances on the topics you refer to. His removal was not due primarily to what he published, said or thought in regard to coolie immigration or in regard to municipal ownership.

We can assure you furthermore that in our opinion his removal cannot be interpreted as an interference with freedom of speech or thought within the proper and reasonable meaning of that expression.

These statements are made with a full knowledge of the facts of the case.

Very truly yours,

J. C. BRANNER,
J. M. STILLMAN,
C. H. GILBERT.
January 30, 1901.

President Jordan,
Leland Stanford University,
Palo Alto, California:

Dear Sir:—

We beg to acknowledge receipt of your letter of January 7th, as well as the letter of your committee of three, of January 14th.

You state in your letter that you are ready to answer all questions. May we venture to put the following:

1.—In the committee's letter of January 14th, it is stated that the "dissatisfaction of the University Management with Professor Ross antedated his utterances on the topics you refer to." How can this dissatisfaction of the University management be made to agree with the statement of the President, speaking for himself and the faculty, and quoted in the public prints of November 14th as follows:—

a.—Extract from a letter from Professor Ross to President Jordan: "It was a pleasure, however, to learn from you of the unqualified terms in which you have expressed to her (Mrs. Stanford) your high opinion of my work and your complete confidence in me as a teacher, a scientist, and a man."

b.—Quotation from a letter from President Jordan to Professor Ross: "I wish to express once more the high esteem in which your work as a student and a teacher, as well as your character as a man, is held by your colleagues."

2.—In your letter of January 7th, you say—"His (Professor Ross's) statement to the press does not assign any of the true reasons." If the speeches on coolie immigration and municipal ownership did not constitute any of the reasons for his dismissal, why was the dissatisfaction, which in your judgment antedated these speeches, not manifested until immediately after the delivery of the same? Why was the reappointment so dubious and tardy while Professor Ross had no intimation of his possible non-appointment till May 18?

3.—In saying that Professor Ross does not assign any of the true reasons for his dismissal, do we understand you to deny the truth of Professor Ross's published statement, containing quotations from your remarks to him:

a.—That "he (Dr. Jordan) had heard from her (Mrs. Stanford) just after my address on coolie immigration."

b.—That "quite unexpectedly to him (President Jordan) Mrs. Stanford had shown herself greatly displeased with me (Professor Ross)."

c.—That "he (President Jordan) was profoundly distressed at the idea of dismissing a scientist for utterances within the scientist's own field."

d.—That "he (President Jordan) made earnest representations to Mrs. Stanford."

4.—What are the real reasons for the dismissal of Dr. Ross? In your letter of January 7th, you say: "For reasons which will readily appear, it has not been deemed advisable for us to state the reasons why Dr. Ross was dismissed." Will you pardon us for saying that we fail readily to recognize any such reasons? If the reasons are that you fear to injure the personal reputation of Professor Ross, may we venture to suggest that nothing that you could do would be more calculated to injure Dr. Ross than the insinuation that there are some secret reasons which cannot be divulged. It is just because some such innuendoes have been printed in the papers that our committee addressed itself to you, in order to ascertain the true state of affairs.

While we regret to prolong this correspondence, you will readily see that unless we can give the members of the American Economic Association some explicit reasons for Professor Ross's dismissal other than those assigned by him, they will naturally adhere to the opinion
based upon the statements first made in the public press. A mere denial of the truth of the statements made by him will not be apt to satisfy gentlemen who are not willing to believe that any of the parties concerned in the question would intentionally make a false statement, and facts alone will enable them to reconcile assertions that would otherwise seem contradictory. It is for that reason that we venture again to express the hope that a more explicit answer may be given to our questions.

Very truly yours,

EDWIN R. A. SELIGMAN,
HENRY W. FARNAM,
HENRY B. GARDNER.

LELAND STANFORD UNIVERSITY, CAL.,
Feb. 7, 1901.

Professors
EDWIN R. A. SELIGMAN,
HENRY W. FARNAM,
HENRY B. GARDNER.

GENTLEMEN:

Your letter of January 30th is at hand asking further information as to the reasons for the dismissal of Professor Ross. When I expressed my willingness to answer further questions I did not mean to indicate that I would enter into any circumstantial description of events leading to or following from Professor Ross's dismissal. Nor do I consider it expedient or proper to go into a discussion of extracts from my letters or conversations or of my statements or alleged statements, or those of others, as published in the newspapers. There are, however, certain assurances which it is within the privilege of the public to ask, and which it is my desire to furnish, that the public may be assisted in forming a judgment as to the position of the University upon important questions. It seems to me that I shall answer these questions best by certain plain statements which involve the important facts concerning the University. It will be necessary for you to assume my knowledge of all the facts, also that the interpretation herewith presented is authoritative from the University standpoint.

First:  Professor Ross was not dismissed on account of his views on Oriental immigration nor on account of his opinions on any economic question.

Second:  Professor Ross was dismissed because in the judgment of the University authorities he was not the proper man for the place he held. The responsibility for the correctness of this judgment belongs to the University authorities and to them alone.

Third:  No ground exists for any interpretation of his dismissal reflecting on his private character, of which your letter seems to imply a fear.

Fourth:  The judgment that Professor Ross was not the proper man for the place he held is not incompatible with my appreciation of many good qualities he possesses, nor with my wishes or efforts at any time to further his prospects. I have been neither ignorant of his professional shortcomings nor inappreciative of his good qualities. Of such appreciation Professor Ross has himself adduced several expressions from my letters.

In the hope that you may find in the above a substantial answer to the questions involved in your inquiries, I remain,

Very truly yours,

DAVID L. JORDAN.
November 14, 1900.

My dear President Harper:—

As far as I can make out, Kovel-
evsky might very suitably be honored with the LL.D. degree. I know little of him except his writings. I have read practically all of these, and everything he writes is good. His field is comparative sociology and comparative juris-

prudence, and in certain parts of these fields he is the highest authority. You are perhaps informed to some extent as to his personality. I am not.

I have talked with Mr. Small about the mat-
ter, and he offered no objection. I have delayed my reply to you, expecting to have something more definite from Mr. Small. I will see him immediately, and will return Kovel-
vsky's letter, together with anything which Mr. Small has to say in addition.

Very respectfully yours,

[Signature]

W. J. Thomas
November 11, 1900

My dear President Harper:

I have been very much pleased to receive the letter I mentioned in my last note. I do not know anything definite about the matter, but I am quite sure that some sort of action will be taken. I shall be glad to do anything I can to help in the matter, and I shall be happy to see you if you will be kind enough to call on me.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
My Dear Dr. Triggs: A short time ago a high officer in the faculty of the University of Chicago informed me that you would not be reappointed, which of course means that you are to be removed from the chair that you have so long and so brilliantly filled. No grounds were assigned for this action, and so far as I am aware, none have been assigned. Unless the authorities assign some valid and sufficient reason based on some specific and demonstrable charge against you, such as the world at large would unanimously agree to regard as disqualifying you from holding your position, this action will be considered by all who have no personal interest in your removal, as constituting another and flagrant violation of the principle of academic freedom, of which there have been in these late years so many disgraceful examples.

I do not of course wish to imply that I have the least idea that any such grounds for your removal exist or can even be seriously alleged. Before I went to Chicago in the summer of 1887 I had heard of you as a friend of John Burroughs, a lover of nature and art, and a successful lecturer, but during the month that I then spent at the University I found that your name was on everybody's lips. Of no other professor did I hear a tenth part of the spontaneous praise that was so freely and constantly lavished on you. Your lectures on Browning and other poetsphilosophers were celebrated and no one seemed able to say enough in commendation of them. You have shed great luster on the University of Chicago and this is your reward.

Much is being said about "academic freedom," but rarely does any one clearly solve and set forth its full meaning. The Trustees of Trinity College, North Carolina have immortalized themselves by putting on record in the case of Professor Bassett a terse expression of the fundamental
principle underlying academic freedom. Rising above their own prejudices in the case they boldly and nobly declare: "We are particularly unwilling to lend ourselves to any tendency to destroy or limit academic liberty. We believe that society in the end will find a super benefit by exercising patience than it can secure by yielding to its resentments. The search for truth should be unhampered and in an atmosphere that is free. Liberty may sometimes lead to folly; yet it is better that some should be tolerated than that all should think and speak under the deadening influence of repression."

These are grand words that might profitably be graven in stone over the door of every higher institution of learning. Think for a moment what "the deadening influence of repression" means in an institution of learning. Nothing that any professor says really represents his thought. He may have delved and discovered a great truth. He dare not teach it to his class. The teaching body of an institution that denies academic freedom, instead of being enthusiastic gatherers and transmitters of knowledge and truth, become cringing and truckling sycophants. What they teach to their students or write is not what they know, think, or feel, but what they suppose will best protect them from the espionage by which they are surrounded. If such an institution publishes a series of journals representing the several departments, nothing that they contain has any scientific value. It does not represent the views of the writers or the results of their researches, but must constitute in one form or another a defense of certain often sordid interests. Such publications are thus lowered to the level of the subsidized press of the country. Books regarded as dangerous will be put on a sort of "index prohibitus" and no one dare mention them favorably, and all honest expression of opinion is virtually suppressed. All the noble spirits that will not brook such influences will either voluntarily withdraw or will be forced out, and nothing will be
prize for my attempts to improve the teaching of science. I have spent years on improving the teaching of science, and I believe that my efforts have been rewarded. I have seen improvements in the way science is taught and I believe that these improvements will continue to evolve.

To bring awareness to the need for better teaching of science, I believe that we need a new approach. We need to focus on developing students' understanding of scientific concepts and their ability to apply these concepts in real-world situations. This will require a reevaluation of the current teaching methods and the development of new approaches that are more engaging and effective.

In conclusion, I believe that improving the teaching of science is a critical issue that we need to address. It is essential to ensure that our students have a strong foundation in science, and that they have the skills and knowledge to succeed in the future. By focusing on improving the teaching of science, we can help to prepare a new generation of scientists and innovators who will shape the world of tomorrow.
Letter from the superintendent of schools, Aurora, Ill. Jan. 8, 1904.

Dear Sir: One of the most enjoyable and lasting memories that I have of any of the exercises of the Illinois State Teachers Association for the past fourteen years is that of a paper read by you before the Child Study section in 1898 on "The Philosophy of Play".

As chairman of the executive committee for the coming year I am already planning for the program of the coming meeting, and it seemed to me that it would be wise to devote one of the main sessions to this subject, "Play", somewhat after this method: Psychology, Physiology, Sociology of Play; these to be treated by yourself, Dr. Bayard Holmes, and Jane Addams or Graham Taylor, provided that you and the others will consent to discuss the subject.

Though not personally acquainted with you I wish to express to you the pleasure and profit that I gained from a course of lectures that I attended under you in the summer session of 1898. Of all the courses that I took during the two summers at the University and of all the people that I came in contact with, none made such a lasting impression as yourself and that course on Browning.

From a letter by Dr. Colin Scott, Boston, Jan. 2.

I have just finished your book on the Arts and Crafts Movement with the greatest warmth of conviction. Allow me to congratulate you on the reserve and energy of your production. The special paragraphs on school education, page 170 and ff, are absolutely just and true. Some day or another we must have you down here in Boston to talk to us of these things.


From a letter by politician Roger Taney,

I have just finished your book on the lives and careers of some of the great men of our country. It has inspired me to undertake the task of compiling a biography of each of them. I am now working on the lives of Abe Lincoln and John F. Kennedy. The work is very time-consuming, but I am determined to complete it in time for publication next year.
left but mediocre minds that do not feel their chains. The effect is the same on an institution of learning as it is in a country where systematic repression of the freedom of opinion and its expression had long been practiced. It falls into inevitable and deserved imbecility and decadence.

This is not a letter of sympathy or commiseration. Doubtless with you to be thus banished is but to be set free, and no man of your attainments could, even if he would, long remain outside of a field of usefulness. If there were any place for sympathy it would be rather for the misguided and short-sighted, possibly well-meaning, persons who still in the twentieth century imagine that something can be gained by persecution. Quem Deus vult perdere prius dementat.

But I can imagine that to this the answer might be made with a cynical smile that an institution with so many millions behind it is not so easily destroyed. True, its body may remain, but when the soul is fled it is only a cadaver.

Yours in great esteem.
The object of American cinema that went to support the cutting of the editor's nest is to find a community where...

...problematic. It falls into the category of cases where the expression has long ceased to exist.

There is no letter or sympathy or comfort beyond. I have written to put to be felt free, and no man of your statement.

ment of a field of neutrality. Even if the writing, I would have written to put to be felt free, and no man of your statement.

If there were any peace in America. It would not be better for the world. And every country. I am writing that something can be gained by peace.

But I can imagine that to find the smallest might be made with a cunning...
December 19, 1908

My dear Dr. Barrows:

President H. F. Judson, in a letter inviting me to go to the Islands after the communication from Washington, and I am now absent, very respectfully yours.

In China, Lauglie and the Alps, and in South America, and in Europe, and it is naturally an inopportune time.

I had no intimation that the invitation was coming, and had myself made other plans, which I would, indeed, have changed if I could have secured the leave of absence.

My main interest is in the relation of the child to the race, and the study of mental life in this connection with various cultural stages, and it would have been a great pleasure to meet to the tenorists in the Islands along these lines.
December 18, 1928

Mr. President,

I am writing to inform you that I have been appointed as a member of the faculty of the University of Illinois. I would be grateful if you could arrange for me to begin my duties as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
December 19, 1908

Dr. David B. Barrows  
Director of Education  
Manila  
P.I.

My dear Dr. Barrows:

Your letter inviting me to lecture at Baguio reached me shortly after a communication from Washington to President Judson on the same subject.

I was extremely anxious to accept, but it turns out that it cannot be arranged at this time. An unusually large number of our men are now absent—Chamberlain and Burton in China, Laughlin and Michelson and Smith in South America, and Manly in Europe—and it is naturally an inopportune time.

I had no intimation that the invitation was coming, and had myself made other plans, which I would, indeed, have changed if I could have secured the leave of absence.

My main interest is in the relation of the child to the race, and the study of mental life in its connection with various cultural stages, and it would have been a great pleasure to speak to the teachers in the Islands along these lines.
December 19, 1903

Mr. Geo. A. Bissell
Director of Education
Memphis

Dear Mr. Bissell:

I have been extremely anxious to secure a communication from you regarding the extension of the free school system to include a large number of our men in South America, and why in nature and if it is necessarily an important line.

I have no information that the initiative was coming and have been made aware of plans by whom I understand to have offered. If I could have secured the line of action...

My main interest is in the relation of the city to the textile factories. The study of mental life in the home and selection with various different aspects and if it would have been a great pleasure to speak to the teachers in the presence....
Please accept the expression of my deep appreciation of your invitation.

Very sincerely yours,
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PROGRAMME

MONDAY EVENING, APRIL 15TH.

TUESDAY, APRIL 16TH.
Department of Jurisprudence.
Hon. Francis Wayland, LL.D., Chairman.
Professor Isaac F. Russell, D.C.L., Secretary.

Morning Session.
9.30. Lawyers' Work Among the Poor. Miss Rosalie Loew, of the New York Bar.
11.00. The Latin-American Constitutions and Revolutions. Hon. John W. Foster, LL.D., of Washington, D. C.

Evening Session.

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 17TH.
Department of Health.
W. H. Daly, M. D., Chairman.
Elmer Lee, M. D., Secretary.

Morning Session.

9.30. Address by the Chairman.

THURSDAY, APRIL 18TH.
Department of Education and Art.
S. T. Dutton, M. A., Secretary.

Morning Session.
The general topic for discussion will be: "The Outlook for the Education and Progress of the Colored Race in the Light of Present Reactionary Tendencies in the South." Beginning at 9.30, papers may be expected from Mr. George Stebbins, of Washington, D. C.; Professor Kelly Miller, of Howard University, and the Hon. George R. Glenn, Commissioner of Education, Atlanta, Ga. It is expected that Mr. Booker T. Washington, of Tuskegee Institute; Dr. L. M. N. Curry, and the Hon. William T. Harris, of Washington, will participate in the discussion to follow the reading of papers.

Evening Session.
8.30. General topic for discussion: "The Future of the Library Movement in the United States, in the Light of Andrew Carnegie's Recent Gift." The discussion will be opened by Mr. Melville Dewey, State Librarian, of Albany, N. Y., and Mr. Herbert Putnam, of the Congressional Library, will also participate.

FRIDAY, APRIL 19TH.
Report of Nominating Committee—Other Business.

Department of Social Economy.

Morning Session.
9.00. An Address by the Chairman of the Department, F. B. Sands, Esq., of Concord, Mass., on "Home-Building and Land-Owning by the Industrious Classes in the United States."
A Report by the Secretary of the Department, Mrs. Orra Langhorne, of Lexington, Va., on “Domestic Service in Virginia and Carolina.”

A Paper by Miss Elizabeth Dangerfield and Miss Henderson Dengerfield, of Lexington, Ky., on “Settlement and Educational Work Among the Mountaineers of Eastern Kentucky.”

Discussion of the preceding papers, in which Prince Kropotkin, the Russian Publicist, will lead.

Evening Session.

8.30. An Address by Z. R. Brockway, Esq., of Elmira, N. Y., on “The Best Treatment of Criminals, Whether Felons or Misdemianants.” Should Mr. Brockway be detained in Elmira, his address will be read by Gen. H. C. Boies, of Scranton, Pa., who will lead in its discussion, followed by Prof. Wayland, of Yale University; Eugene Smith, Esq., of the New York Bar; F. B. Sanborn, and others.

Information for Members of the Association.

Members of the Association will be entertained at the Hotel Gordon (16th and I Streets) at reduced rates. This hotel will be, as last year, the headquarters of the Society, and is in close proximity to the large hall of Columbian University where daily sessions are held.

The Pennsylvania Railroad issues round-trip tickets from New York to Washington and return for $10.00, good for ten days.

By vote of the General Council the following amendments to the Constitution are proposed and will be acted upon by the Association at the general meeting of that body:

Article III. To strike out the word “honorary” immediately before “Vice-Presidents,” etc.

Article III. After the word “Secretary” in the clause beginning “The Council shall consist of President, Treasurer, Secretary,” insert “First and Second Vice-Presidents.”

Article IV. In place of clause reading “Any person, upon nomination by Council,” etc., it is proposed to insert “Elections to membership shall be made by Standing Committee appointed by the Council in such manner as Council may provide.” Other provisions of Article IV. to remain as they are.

For all other information respecting the programme or general work of the Association, apply to the General Secretary.

Frederick Stanley Root,

129 East 15th Street, New York City.
Jan. 27th, 1902.

Dr. Alfred C. Schmitt,
Elisen Str. 17, Leipzig.

My dear Sir:

I am very much obliged to you for the full and kind statement which you have made to me concerning Professor Henderson's work. We have great confidence in him and in his methods.

Appreciating your courtesy, I remain

Yours very truly,

W. R. Harper
My dear Pres. Harper:

You will pardon a word from one of your former students; for it seems only fair that you should know something of the impression made here by your Prof. Henderson.

Some of the college and university professors from America come here without any definite object or purpose in mind. They dabble here a little and there a little, and murder the German language most unmercifully. Consequently the average German student and professor has not a very exalted opinion of our American institutions. But Prof. Henderson showed our institutions in quite a different light. A number of the German students who became acquainted with him while he was here, came to me afterwards and expressed their appreciation of him as a man and a scholar. One of the professors, in whose department Dr. Henderson had done some work,
recommended Prof. Henderson's writings most warmly to his class.

He referred to Prof. Henderson as a man who had done considerable research work in his chosen field. I feel justified in saying that the German students who came in touch with Prof. Henderson regard him with as much esteem as they do their own professors. Some have come to me and have asked particulars about the institution which Prof. Henderson represented. If we could have more men of Prof. Henderson's stamp here, it would do much toward correcting that false impression about our American institutions. In his intercourse with the German and American students, in his use of the German language, in his work in the university, and in his whole bearing, Dr. Henderson conducted himself with great credit to his countrymen and to the institution which he represents.

Sincerely,

Alfred C. Schmitt,

Elisen Str., 171.
Leipzig, Jan. 4, 1903.
It is my conviction that the interests of the University and of the Department of Sociology require that I should have an assistant for part of the time with several hundred dollars for the expenses of collecting and arranging materials.

1. The University cannot afford to use my time on work which can be done just as well under my direction by a person on a salary of $600 to $1000. No business man would think of employing a superintendent on a salary such as I receive on clerical work. It is waste of money and energy, and the University is the loser.

2. Much of the labor I am now compelled to do is waste of my own life and it is wearing me out with relatively small output.

3. I have been compelled to give away much of my material and many ideas and plans to persons who were not in a position to mature the results from lack of experience, simply because it was the only way to collect the materials and make a motive for others to bring out my ideas. I can give concrete examples of this assertion.

4. The University expects advanced investigative work of us with published results. I have sketches of plans of many such investigations and know where the materials are, and how to use them, but it is impossible for me to do the clerical work necessary and spend the time in archives. I believe the University suffers from this more than I do.
It is my opinion that the interests of the University
and of the Department of Sociology require that I remain
as an Assistant for part of the time with several
years of service for the expression of collation and assistance
and for the satisfaction of the University.

The University cannot afford to lose my time on work which
I can do just as well myself without the addition of a person
or a salary of $100-$200. No expenses men want paid
or to employ or a superintendent on a salary and as I see
serve as Scientific Work. It is waste of money and energy
and the University is the loser.

Should I accept I am not satisfied to go to waste of
my own time and it is wasting me out with relatively small
outlay.

I have been compelled to give away many of my interests
and many these are plans to better my place or help in a
section to reconcile the results from lack of experience and
reasons it was the only way to continue the operations and
make a make for others to work on in the future. I can give
complete examples of this discussion.

The University expects a scholarly investigation work or
with impartial gaze. I have experience of place of work
and more important ones and know where the interests are and
you to the President if it important for me to do the
alleged work necessary and please the time of excavation.

I believe the University expects from this more than I do.
I have formed personal connections with competent experimenters in my line all over North America and in Europe, and I am securing materials which will belong to the University for coming generations of students; but I could extend this effort very much farther if I had help and means. My salary is so low that every time I attempt a piece of real investigation I lose all my savings, and several times have trespassed on former earnings. I submit that this is not right and I cannot believe that the President and Trustees, if they knew the facts, would wish to subject an earnest teacher to such a strain. If it is necessary, and the University cannot afford to help me, I will cheerfully go on and do my best; but I protest against a judgment of my work that does not take into account the facts. One investigation in Germany cost me over $150 cash, and the results are valuable to the National Prison Association and the cause of humane social efforts.

6. At this time I have more than twenty subjects for investigative work. With a moderate amount of help I could follow them out and add to knowledge on the subjects involved.

7. The raw practice work of classes and even of Seminars seldom ripens into mature results fit for publication. I need continuous control of a helper whom I have trained and who has some insight into my methods.

8. My department of study suffers unjustly in comparison with those of the physical sciences, with their costly
I have never been fortunate with my personal experiences. I am an Edinburgh writer, and my work will appear in the forthcoming future. I am interested in the current state of affairs, and I consider the situation very serious.

In my spare time, I focus on my writing and my work. I have been working on several projects, and I am currently working on a novel. I am also working on several other projects, which I am excited about.

In conclusion, I am committed to my work and my writing. I am always looking for new opportunities, and I am always open to new ideas. I am confident that my work will be successful, and I am excited about the future.
equipment and corps of permanent assistants. I do not hope to be put on an equality with them, nor do I wish them any diminution of equipment; but I want a little chance to demonstrate what can be done for the science of human welfare and furtherance of the higher life, with even a meagre supply of help.

9. Such assistance as I here ask for can easily be secured for a modest sum, if there is hope of promotion afterwards, here or elsewhere, as the case may be.

10. It should be known that my own work is somewhat peculiar in this: that my subject is new, my materials are not in books and journals, but scattered over the civilized world in thousands of out of the way places which only a person of long experience and much travel would know anything about.

Very respectfully,
Charles C. Hubbard

The University of Chicago
Feb. 24, 1902.

Since writing the above I have learned that a similar arrangement to this proposed to be here successfully tried at Columbia by Professor Edkins.
enlightened and capable of performing essential. I so hope to be put on a basis with them, so I may then
satisfy my ambition of advancement, and I want a little space to
refine and improve my abilities. I am sure I have gone too far to see the
perilous interest in the present time with such a
message already of reply.

8. Such assurance as I have, see you can easily be reached
for a moment, and in case of promotion afterwards,
pure to the extent.

I feel I should be known that my own work is somewhat better
in this first year at present in my use. It is not
more so, but my success and position in the civilising world
in proportion of one of the men places which only a person
of your experience and more travel would know such high
"remark..."

"remark..."
My dear Mr. Feuerlicht,-

Your letter February 3rd was received and I have given it consideration. I agree with you that the proposed sociological treatment of the prophetic work is hazy and indefinite. The sources of Mosaic legislation is, however, so much more general and so much more difficult, that I should hesitate to suggest it. The University has no manuscripts that could be used for this purpose. I am sorry that the matter has not taken more definite shape, but perhaps we ought not to expect anything more definite until we have gone into the subject more fully. I should like to propose that you consider the advisability of selecting some small point which has not been fully treated and of carrying it through the Old Testament Literature: this might be some small point in connection with social conditions. The difficulty with the topic you have been considering is that it is too large. I am leaving the city for a couple of weeks, but shall be here during the third week of March and shall be glad to see you if you find it possible to come up.

Yours very truly,

W. R. Harper
Dear Dr. Harper,

The time limit within which I was to communicate to you my thesis subject having passed, I confess I have been unable to reach a decision beyond the vague suggestion offered a month ago. I cannot say that I am satisfied even with the subject I proposed then, namely, "The Social Conditions in Biblical Times." The chronology is so extensive and varied in its scope as to allow at best only the deduction of a few general and tentative principles of development which at present I do not trust myself to hazard. Perhaps a study of the social
I am not sure how to proceed with the work. Can you please provide more information on what is required? I am anxious to get started.

[Handwritten text continues]

The project seems quite complex and will likely take a significant amount of time. I am not sure if I have the resources or expertise to complete it successfully. Would it be possible to provide more guidance or support?

[Handwritten text continues]

Thank you for your understanding and patience. I assure you that I am doing my best to meet all your requirements.

[Handwritten text continues]
conditions of the prophetic period, and their relation to prophecy in general would afford more solid material. If such a subject would receive your approval I should treat it somewhat along the following lines:

An introductory chapter on the general character of the prophet's activity, religious, political, social, etc.

A survey of the historical background in the prophetic period.

The specific sociological problems in this period: the various classes, social customs, woman, social and economic evils, etc.

The prophets' treatment of these problems; and finally, a summary of the
sociological aspect of prophecy, and prophecy's contribution to social science.

Of course, I realize that this is vague and hazy even as a sketch. But I believe I can eventually crystallize it into some definite form.

Another subject has suggested itself to me in connection with M. de Morgan's recent discovery of Hammurabi's Civil Code. It is "The Sources of the Mosaic Legislation," which would afford opportunity for a consideration of the date and origin of the various Biblical Laws. But I fear the meagerness of the "Sources."

Has the University any manuscripts or other material that you would advise investigating and subsequently pub-
LaFayette, Ind.

Is being under University auspices perhaps?

I trust I am not obtrusive in this statement of my difficulties, yet I shall be very grateful to you for any solution your leisure may allow you to suggest; or, if you deem it more desirable, I shall present myself at the University any time you may appoint in the early part of the coming weeks.

With highest regards,

Yours,

Very sincerely yours,

Morris M. Fussich.
Burns
Pulil
Day

I learned to work in my garden in the morning.

It's been a long, hard day.

I hope it's worked out well.

I'm feeling a little tired.

I'll write more tomorrow.

Sincerely,

[Signature]