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P.S. My plans are now in Chicago for
June 4, 1892.

Cornell University,
Ithaca, New York.

Department of Political
Economy and Finance

My Dear President Harper,

The case of

The enclosed cutting appeared

in the New Yorker Staat-Zeitung of

May 27, 1891, than there have been

other letters in New York papers to

the effect that his doctors told him

ought not to go to a new climate in
his present dangerous condition.

I telegraphed on the 28th ult. the news
from Dr. Goodspeed that Mr. Hoit had been sick but was better except to come. Have you any exact information from him; or are the reports in the papers unfounded? It would be a great misfortune to our school if he should fail us. I do not see why -- on this side the Atlantic -- can be thought of as his successor except Bernard Moore, or Moses Coit Tyler. The former is more highly thought of favorably as President of Ball Union, the office which Schuman declined this spring.

I wish we had him -- not for my own sake, but for the sake of our University to which I already feel attached.

Our work at Cornell is finished, and a few more brief offices remain to be performed in the service. The prospect for Schuman's future is bright; if wise the will have a splendid administration. Everyone seems ready to give him every opportunity.

It is stated here by Schuman, and confirmed in the newspapers, that Richeman berth comes to us at Chicago. Is that settled? I hope so. He is highly praised by Williams here, who thinks him a great leader, as well as a geologist of the first rank. He thinks he will gather a great amount of material from the expedition at Chicago.

Your letter today says, "The Million Comes, yea, more!" (and these the $20,000,000 -- at least until July 10th!)

I hope this good news means the money for our great pressing necessities, viz.: books, a library building, and more sometimes. The provision for books the next year is most vital, especially in regard to graduate students: it would never do to have a crowd of good students go away disappointed by the word that we have no possibility of giving them any aid. It would take years to outgrow this report.

I am halting in ordering books. It does not seem right to go ahead of women's appropriation, although I have sent in lists costing about $2,500; yet some of our courses cannot be given as things now stand. Possibly it may be better to withdraw them, if no more money is available for the books. But I shall see you soon.

You are doing splendid work. Our blessing go with you.

Yours ever,

J. Lawren Lapham.
has arisen in which they think it best to overrule the recommendations of the faculty. Should it be known, as it will be, that the trustees had revised the action of the faculty, the influence and the leadership of the faculty with the students must be seriously undermined for the future, and it would result in bringing future pressure to bear upon the trustees themselves on all questions which may arise. I have seen so much of the disasters of this policy at Cornell that I dread to think of our moving in the same direction; nor should I suppose that the trustees would ever wish to move in that direction. It was the fundamental error of the Cornell system, and was the most serious drawback to their

The Beatrice,
Chicago, Nov. 2d, 1892.

My dear President Harper,

A matter in connection with the question of secret fraternities has appeared to me to be of very great importance and to need serious consideration. It is not concerned with the merits of the question, but with the relations of the several University governing bodies. No one more than you would see the importance of unity in action, especially at this time in our career. It does not need to be proved that the cumulative effect of joint action is immensely important. The power of the trustees to take any and all action every one accepts: it is in their power
of course to banish the whole corps of instructors, but it is equally a matter of course in actual practice that no body exercises all its rights except under peculiar and striking emergencies. After the Faculty had sent in a practically unanimous recommendation on this or any other question concerning the internal affairs of the University, while of course this opinion may be open to revision by the trustees, yet should divided counsels prevail, and the trustees see fit to overthrow this action of the faculty, it would not only destroy the prestige and influence of the faculty with the student body, but produce all the other evils of divided power. It goes without saying that the trustees and the faculty have the same things at heart. It would be supposed that the trustees would acquiesce in the action of the body of experts whom they have called to their service, so far as internal questions go; and a reversal of their policy by the trustees would be undertaken only in emergencies which would demand interference at the sacrifice of important advantages arising out of unity of action.

As you know, I have no departmental or personal interest in the question of fraternities, and therefore I can speak to the point of the general policy involved in this with the more freedom; but it does seem to me that it is a critical juncture, and that the trustees should seriously question whether a great crisis
peace and progress.

I venture to suggest these remarks upon the general principle independent of the question of fraternities, because the more I have reflected upon it the more serious it becomes. It needs a careful guidance to save us from drifting into situations which may be very injurious in the future.

I am very sincerely Yours,

J. Laurence Laughlin

President W. R. Harper,
University of Chicago.
The University of Chicago,

Chicago, Nov. 25th, 1892.

My dear President Harper,

I find that I did not express fully or exactly what I wanted to say the other night. Since then several points have come so distinctly to my mind, and clamor so strongly for utterance, and are based so deeply on my convictions, that I feel it my duty to express them to you.

It may, perhaps, be improper for me to say these things to you as President, but you have honored me with your friendship, and if you will permit me to speak as a friend, I am sure you will understand that what I say is based not only on convictions of duty, and on an earnest desire for the best interests of the University, but also on personal affection for you; and my suggestions, even if they do not convince you, may at least throw light on the policy which looks to building up for the future the basis for safe and certain progress.

I.

That educational questions should be freely brought up in the senate seems to me of immense importance. Nor should such tendency be checked by a feeling that they should be settled entirely by personal interviews with you. This, I believe, is fraught with great danger to you and to the Uni-
The University of Chicago
Chicago, Nov. 26th, 1949

My dear President Harper,

I am glad if I can not express fully all exactly what I wanted to say the other night. Since then.
Several points have come to my mind, and
certain

so strongly on occurrences and the need so deeply on my con-

viction, that I feel it my duty to express them to you.

It may, perhaps, be improper for me to say these things to you
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and if you will permit me to speak as a friend, I am sure you
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I

That educational discussions should be freely printed as in

the senate seem to me of immense importance. You should

soon tendency be overcome by a feeling that free speech is

settling authority on personal information with you. There I

peace, to attempt with great caution to you any to the Uni-

...
versity. It opens the way for scheming and intriguing and personal pressure, while, if brought in a dignified and frank manner into the senate for full discussion, personal elements disappear, and the subject is treated on its merits as a part of a broad University policy. To use an illustration, it is the difference between absolutism and constitutional government; the former is weakness, the latter is strength. When considering the training of the kind of men with whom we have to deal in America, and especially in University life, this becomes clear. You, of course, will not misinterpret me by supposing that we think you want absolutism: you made that idea impossible in your opening remarks to the Faculty and Senate when you explained to them that any part of the existing system was open to discussion and modification if found desirable. But I am convinced that with the present system, difficulties exist in the minds of others than Professor von Holst, connected with this fundamental principle, and that is why I should like to put what I have been thinking about into words, so that you can consider them carefully.

Men are at their best only when they feel that they are trusted and honored. If any system, no matter how good, has been created, and then applied to a set of intelligent men of character and independence, such as scholars must necessarily be, and that system is not adopted by them on grounds of their own belief in it and conviction that it is the best, then,
To some University policy. To use an illustration, it is
the difference between speculation and constructive action.
When you, of course, will not misinterpret me as
supporting that we think you want speculation; you make that
supposition in your opening remark to the faculty and
those important in your opening remarks to the faculty and
Senets when you express that they think you want speculation. If
not, you are not speaking with the present system. But I am
commending that with the present system, you
gather together the minds of others, then Ponder, now
Hofstede, connected with the fundamental principles, and that to
why I should like to put what I have been thinking about into
word's, so that you can consider them carefully.
Men are at their best only when they feel that they are
trusted and honored. If any system, no matter how long,
been created, and then subjected to a series of intelligent men of
classic, and independent men. men are so important, when necessary,c
per, and that system not subjected to them on principle of right
own beliefs in it and conviction that it is the best plan.
being called upon to administer a system not in accordance with their convictions, they will feel that they have not been trusted in being called in to help shape the policy, and the inevitable consequence is either listless feebleness or friction. Unless the system is one which grows out of their united convictions and scholarly purposes, and is the expression of their development, no man will feel content, but on the contrary will always be restless. No salary or money can to a scholar make up for the want of adjustment between his scholarly ideals and his environment. The absence of this feeling is, confidentially, a source of the weakness at Cornell which makes scholars there so restless.

When men differ on any measure and are overruled under a constitutional system, in which they have a fair chance to present their case for its full value, they will acquiesce. If the measure is disposed of by authority not accompanied by a process which brings conviction, acquiescence does not exist. In the latter case there arises scheming to influence the source of power; in the former, men set themselves to carry their points by argument and learning through convincing their colleagues.

If any parts of our existing system do not commend themselves, then, to a majority, there is unsoundness which will become evident at some critical time. Strength can only come through having understanding arising from union. Even if
painting called upon to administer a system not in recognition
with their convictions. They will feel that they have not been
trusted in painting calling to help shape the policy and the
involvement. Conscience is either a weakness or a force.

Unwise is the system in one which brings out of their
united consciousness and solidarity purpose, and in the experience
join or their development, no man will feel content but on the
process with which itrius per se must. No safety or money can to
a system make up for the want of adjustment between the school
environment, the process of the feeding

unconditional, a source of the weakness of control which
makes systems there of necessity.

When men grit on any measure and the overrated order
a constitutional arena in which they have a fair chance to
present their case for the full awing, they will endure.
If the measure is drafted of no authority or accomplishment of
a process which prizes consciousness, consciousness does not exist.
In the latter case there exists some thing to influence the
source of power; in the former, men set themselves to carry
their policies of arrangement and furnishing through controlling their
consciousness.

If any part of an existing system go not comming from
sense, given to a majority, there is an unconscious which will
become evident at some critical time. Strength can only come
through having maximum authority from mission. Even it
there were some part of the present system which you regarded as the apple of your eye, and if it did not commend itself to the rest of us, you would not care to have it enforced by authority, but only after our own reasons had been convinced. Enactments not backed up by conviction in favor of them, create hollow shams, and we never know where we are. Healthy strength in our University life can only come by stimulating frank and free discussion of all these questions, and accepting those things on which we can all jointly unite; that kind of unity is strength.

No gains arising from getting parts of a system hastily into operation to meet immediate emergencies, can for a moment compare with the losses which might ensue from misunderstandings between men in the Faculty and the authorities. A President can practically never go farther than he can carry his Faculty with him. By crushing out individuality and interest and suggestion, a body may be so lifeless as to be governed solely by authority, but its results will be dead and ineffectual. The individuality which we all know to be necessary to intellectual life, should be stimulated, not repressed. And the application of any general system which treats all alike, is sure to be destructive of the very thing which makes real University spirit. To have called men here from different institutions would be of value if their experience could be brought into the common fund; but it would be
there were some part of the present system which you regarded as the staple of your work, and it is not as it would seem in your opinion. The rest of us, you may not care to have it enforced by us.

My view is that it has been continued in favor of the great universities and we never know where we are. Healthy competition in our universities. It can only come by stimulating interest and free discussion of all these questions and seventy.

In this climate in which we can all join and write a kind of mutual interest.

No gain derives from getting parts of a university into operation to meet immediate emergency, can for a moment compete with the losses which might ensue from unpreparedness.

A sense of division between men in the faculty and the authorities. A President can practically never go farther than he can carry the faculty with him. By assuming real independence and in the interests of the faculty, he can very well be a leader as to financial and technical matters. No authority can contract out of inactivity. The inactivity which we all know to be necessary. Intellectually the inactivity should be stimulated, not repressed. And the spiritualism of our educational system.

The necessity of finding a way to express of the very spirit which makes the University different from all the other institutions, which makes the University different from all the other educational institutions, which makes the common land part of mankind, which makes.

Once can say produce into the common land part of mankind.
of no value if channels for getting expression to their varied experience should not be easily provided.

No doubt, many or all of these things may seem to be truisms to you, but there come to me from many sides suggestions and hints as to the state of mind of my colleagues which makes me think that this a matter which ought to be put distinctly before them. If you will pardon me for saying it, I believe that the splendid success which has followed your faith and courage before the public, will be complemented now in the greatest opportunity of your life to establish the finest University atmosphere, by attaching to yourself and your policy the power and enthusiasm of the men in the Faculty, and thereby making your power in the educational world and the influence of the University the unified conjoint power of us all. The alternative to this is divided power and weakness. Make our men feel that they have something to be proud of, and of which they are a part. So far as they may feel they have no share in it, will their work be perfunctory and listless, and the highest University spirit injured. At the present, when the flood-tide of expectation is high, and everything is possible to us, take the tide at its flood. Men will do voluntarily in that enthusiastic spirit what would be impossible under restrictive conditions. When appeal is made to our trust and honor we would work incessantly with pride, enthusiasm, and personal interest, day and night. But if the
No ground, any of all of these things may seem to be experience enough not to easily provide.

In your mind and in turn, as the state of mind of my colleagues which makes me think that this is a matter which ought to be put to the test, perhaps. If you will pardon me for saying it, I believe that the important success which we have followed your faith and courage and your courage to follow the public, will be compensated for in the great opportunity of your life to express the

Faculty. The University, understands, of attracting to your heart and your body. The power and enthusiasm of the men in the Faculty, and the faculty working your power in the educational work and the influence of the University. The University will have to this in giving power and weakness.

The ability to this in giving power and weakness. And of which they are a part, so far as they can feel they have no share in it; with their work and promotion, and their -

The University, and the greatest University spirit. At the present, when the look-tide of expectation is high, and even stronger, and this tide of the tide. And cannot make it possible to us, we take the tide of the tide. We must go voluntarily in that enthusiastic spirit, which would most resemble under restrictive conditions. When spoken, it made to our great and honest work, work necessity with pride, enthusiasm and personal interest, can and might. But if the
feeling comes that we are set aside, and treated as persons incapable of or distrusted for helping establish the policy, the whole lofty spirit will vanish, and instead of it will appear the obsolete feeling which belongs to the American college, and it will drop to the level of the system for the treatment of boys. I need not say that this would be impossible now.

II.

On the second point, of the effect on the spirit of the students, I think the same tendency to impose a system not accompanied by conviction, is already having an unfortunate influence on their state of mind. It is the same point of which I have been speaking, but appearing in a different form, in regard to students rather than to instructors. The whole aim of our existence here ought to be to create a feeling among the students that they are men and not boys. But on this point I shall say nothing more at present, although I should like to state myself more fully.

III.

On the subject of the arrangement of work in the University which would make it possible for a scholar to remain an investigator, I did not express all my thought the other night. The situation in our department as at present is, of course, impossible as a permanent one, and it connects itself with parts of the existing system. From my point of view, entire-
II

On the second point of the effect of the spirit of the

I think the same tendency to improve a system not

To reach a higher point of mind. If in the same point of

which have been expressed, put appearing in a different form.

In regard to students rather than to institutions, the whole

others. And I will not mention more of present situation

should like to stress myself more fully.

III

On the subject of the strangeness of work in the University

which would be possible for a scholar to remain as in-

voluntary. I am not impressed with my reputation the other night.

The attention in our department as at present is of course

impossible as a permanent one, and it connects itself with

parts of the existing system.
ly too much importance is attached to the system of mere hours of teaching and to attendance on exercises. A man is over-
whelmed with teaching, and is prevented from being an inves-
tigator. For myself, I should never be content to go in the
future in this fashion. No money could hire me to give up
the opportunity of doing something else than teaching alone.
And for this men must have some leisure. It would be a mis-
take, however, to suppose that that leisure would give men an
opportunity for idleness. There is no man in our department
who would not use every hour, in case of cessation of work for
a term, in such a way as best to serve the interests of our
subject and the University. In brief, the whole life and
progress of such a department as ours depends upon the oppor-
tunity for reflection, thought, and deliberative study. If
any system of prescribing a certain number of hours for teach-
ing, for every man, irrespective of the man or the department,
is permanent, it will be very unfortunate. None of us can
produce the proper influence on our students by following at
a safe distance in the rear when we are urging them forward,
instead of leading in front of the column. For myself, while
I should be willing, and I think my actions have shown the
truth of it so far, to do any exceptional things to meet pres-
ent emergencies, yet I should not be properly understood if it
were supposed that I acquiesced in a situation in which full
In too much importance is attached to the system of more practice or of teaching and to attendance on experiences. A man is over-concerned with teaching and in being removed from paying for his experience. For myself, I am not yet content to go in the future in this fashion. No money could convince me to give up the opportunity of going some further. It would be a misfortune to lose this man who has given some leisure to those who work for it. There is no man in our department who would take such a view as I have to serve the interests of our subject and the university. In print, the whole idea and procedure of such a department as one depends upon the opportunity for reflection and preparation for teaching and for research of a nature of being or teaching a certain number of hours for teaching and for research. In performance, it will be very important to have of us can produce the proper influence on our students or following of a close attention and in front of the column. For myself, white I should be willing, and I think my students have shown the truth of it so far, to go in expectation of prizes to meet three emergencies, not I should not be properly understood. It is

Insuppression that I acknowledge in an attention to which not
opportunity for investigation were not to be provided for; and in my judgment, it would be a serious error to hold men to a certain number of hours at any time, as if unless watched and held strictly to account they would shirk their duty,—if thereby they were prevented from having opportunities for research. On the splendid scale which we have built, our brightest outlook is in stimulating men to produce, and think for themselves. In such a department as ours the large number of students ought not to be a reason why we should not have an equal chance with such departments as Biology or Geology for investigation. On the contrary, that ought to be the reason why it should be granted us.

I should be sorry, indeed, if you might regard these suggestions from me as improper. You know as well as I that they would not have not been presented if I had not been impelled to them, not only by a sense of duty, but by a very earnest desire to help you in your work by conveying such things to you as seemed of grave importance from my point of view.

Very sincerely Yours,

J. Laurence Laughlin,

President William R. Harper,

University of Chicago.
opportunity for investigation were not to be prolonged for;
and in my judgment, it would be a serious error to hold men
for a certain number of hours at any time, so it makes watching
and then strictly to account for working up their gain.
thereby they were prevented from having opportunities for re-
seeking. On the one hand, costly which we have paid, our
principal outlook is to attain, to make men progress and think
for themselves. In such a department as ours, the future can-
not or influence ought not to be a reason why we should not
have an easy chance with such opportunities as Biological or Geol-
try for investigation. On the contrary, that ought to be
the reason with it should be esteemed as
I should be sorry, indeed, if you might regard these
suggestions from me as impolite. You know as well as I that
they would not have not been presented. If I had not been
better to them not only in a sense of duty, but a very
esteemed gesture to help you in your work of conducting such
views. To you as seems to be seen of great importance from my point of

Very sincerely yours,

William R. Harper
President, University of Chicago,
August 28, 1893.

My dear President Harper,

I hear from Mrs. Palmer very difficultly about Lovell's appointment salary. I hope he needs not hear of it. I have sent Mrs. Palmer today my note for two different sums, one a smaller one ($200), another for $750, which will cover the deficiency. The only note of mine to the University will cover the remainder of Lovell's salary; so Mrs. Palmer and I can surely get what we want when we get back. But even if we do not, my dear man, I would gladly give the sum to relieve you of any worry. So drop the matter off your mind, please it to do. You can say you have pledged for the whole sum, have his appointment made in due form.

Naturally, I know nothing as to how you are getting on, nor whether you are resting. Augusta & I are gaining splendidly here, she 6 lbs. & I with 12 lbs. I rode yesterday 10 miles from a camp in the woods where there was fish, but with large salmon—trout, and had a long shot at a deer—missed it. Left 9th to reach Chicago, Sept. 9th, in the evening.

With my affectionate good wishes, believe me, ever yours,

J. Lawrence Laughlin

Deane River, Station via Steubenville, N. Y.
Beaver River Station, 
via Herkimer, N.Y. 
Aug. 29, 1893.

My dear Pres. Harper,

I have been asked to go to San Domingo (West Indies) on the duty of advising the government in establishing its monetary system. The request is made for the time from Oct. 1 to Dec. 1, or practically the autumn quarter. Possibly the time might be postponed to the winter quarter, but I have not inquired as yet as to that.

My first wish is to have your opinion as to my going or to its expediency. My first duty is to the University. Of course, if I were absent, I should draw no salary for that time, as it might cover at least the ease of Lowell's salary. As to arranging my work, the only hitch would arise as to my course on "Money," which is
offset in the Autumn of this year. If I were away, it might be possible to give it in the Winter quarters, as I saw it last year, not extended over the two quarters, as I planned for this year. Miller could surprise the Senior students after I had started them; and the journal is already planned for so far as the December number is concerned.

The main question, however, is whether you believe it wise for me to consider the proposition at all. The prestige to the University from having an expert selected from its corps is something; but still there may be weightier reasons against it.

On receipt of this, indicate briefly by telegraph your general feeling. You can telegraph to Louisville, Ky., direct to Beach River Club by telephone from Louisville.

Sincerely yours,

J. Lawrence Laughlin.
Confidential

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO,
HYDE PARK.

January 8, 1894.

My dear President Harris,

In connection with the Andrews matter, I wish to say something. You would wish me to be entirely frank, I know. I do not like the proposition any more than the others, but voicing objections to the plan itself, I have in mind only the way in which it is being done.

It has been done in a way to make it harder for you, harder for us, and—should Mr. Andrews come—harder for him. In brief, it has produced a very disquieting situation. It has made us, many of us, feel again unsettled. Being not a mere matter of executive appointments, it has affected the whole educational system here; for so important. And yet you never said this before the Senate until it had been acted upon by the Trustees. You distrusted us; you trusted the whole plan. This is now a plan in which we were not consulted; placed upon us from outside, it is none of ours; consequently, it will be regarded critically, exciting antipathy; it cannot have our loyal support. As a friend of Mr. Andrews, you have made a difficult future for him; and also you have lost hold on our enthusiasm for the University. You have done it carelessly, unconsciously, in the Napoleonic plan. It is your, not ours; yet you expect us to act as if it were ours.

I sincerely wish that the friendly influence to induce you to see how injurious this method has been is today. I know it, feel the exasperation it creates more than you know—call about me. You cannot make the University strong unless you weld the Faculty to you & the system. Suppose you had consulted the
Senate confidentially suggested it with them. They would gladly have aided you in spirit were they able to give you relief of any kind. And what they decided with you would have been their own as well as yours, even though some minority might have existed, they would have accepted the result in a loyal spirit. It is the old question of Constitutional Method—so old as Magna Carta and human nature. No successful government ever has been, or will be, carried on without it.

If you chose to do so, try your own plan of doing things, you could in this University in a single month change the whole atmosphere, from a spirit of criticism into one of enthusiastic devotion to the University. You cannot keep the great workers in the class-room or laboratory; we are not what must have a vital interest in some question of University policy. And no man who could not be trusted to take his part nobly, helpfully, in the general work and take over a policy of the University's, as it were, by appointment.

You, of course, have before you: to make this a great University. And you cannot but wish, of course, to have a lack of any spirit which works for that aim. And our aims are the same. In writing this, I have had no ulterior purpose, independently of our personal professional relations, it is my duty as a member of your staff to point out any thing which seems to me to be full of danger.

Always faithfully yours,

J. Laurence Laughlin.
The recent painful occurrences at Homestead, Pa., at the mines in Idaho and Tennessee, & at Buffalo, N.Y., cannot fail to have a serious effect on the cause of the workman wherever employed. In these cases, as in the case of the great Southwestern Railway strike, the sympathy of the public was originally with the strikers; in every case this sympathy was subsequently withdrawn from the strikers. The reason in each case was perfectly obvious; but it does not seem so obvious to the community striking workmen, nor do the public realize fully the lessons of the community in such emergencies teach.

We shall leave wholly out of account the merits of the causes assigned for striking. Granted that they were such as to make the employees prefer to leave work in a body rather than submit. Their wages may have been too low, or the hours too long, in the opinion of the employees; but suppose they were. Our point now is not concerned with that question. What we wish to discuss is this: Supposing a grievance, what course of action is open to the
employee? What is the value of organization? And, finally, what is the consequent duty of the community?

First of all, the employee may stop working. How, then, does the employer own his employees, except in slavery? But, can the employer force the employee by the act of striking in an organized body to submit to their demands for higher wages? That depends wholly on the possibility of obtaining new men to fill the places of strikers. If the population at any given time is such in its relation to our industries that many are unemployed, or accept low wages, then that is an industrial fact which cannot be changed by a strike. Clearly enough, a strike does not increase employment by increasing the means of employment. Now this truth is generally accepted; in fact, acceptance is manifest in the policy of the striking organizations. Realizing that, after striking, that the employer is powerless to fill the places of strikers by new men, the labor organization loses its demand. It fails, because it does not adequately gauge the supply of demand for labor. Then, what is to be done? Just here we touch the crux of the whole matter. Every organization recognizes today, that if the employees remain quiet, peaceful, and steady and patiently postpone the strike, either the employer families or the employees eventually suffer for food, or the employer
find new men to take the places of the old men. But if the new men need work, as well as the old men, this means that one set of men must another set of men chase about the market. By what right? By virtue of membership in an organization. The action is generally decided upon by a committee of leaders; a men with families are dependent on the opinions of leaders who may be untaught, unskilled in the state of the market, rash, conceited, high-handed, and perhaps forced to act in order to show why they should earn the salary of a walking delegate. We do say they are always so, but this may often happen.

In short, the aim of many organizations is to force upon an industrial community, against its will, a principle which the leaders of the strikers hold to be right, but which the community does not regard as right. The method of enforcing this principle is my subject.

The manifesto of the Homestead strikers to the public was based throughout on the assumption that the workmen had created the wealth visible in the manufacturing plant, and that they had property rights in it. This, of course, is a consequence of the teaching of Carl Marx, which reading is most absorbed by the laborers. Now, we do not all agree in this doctrine of Marx. But suppose it were true. Then what? Is it a proper mode of converting the community to new ideas of property to kill men, or break the heads of non-union men, in order to destroy wealth? Is it necessary to justify the existence of law and order in this day and age of the world? Why should we need to show that, if Marx's doctrine were true, the only way to obtain its results would be to act peacefully, convert men by argument and to induce legislation...
To change the laws of property? The conclusion is forced home on us that law-brained men, mostly of foreign extraction, find this a hopeless task; the process is too slow too uncertain. These men, unaccustomed to Anglo-Saxon ideas of representative local self-government, trained to regard the State as a means of forcing ideas on a people at the will of despotic rulers, rush into bloody deeds against without any reflection as to the illogic of their acts.

After shooting a Pinkerton, a non-union man, or an employer, they are no nearer their accomplished purpose. Their only effect is to test the efficiency of the local representatives of the State in maintaining order. The supremacy of the law (in the enactment of which the free action of each citizen united)

The inability to see the entire lack of connection between force and the establishment of their ideas is a sad thing in all these troubles. It has nothing whatever to do with the rightness wrong of their ideas. The men who sympathize with any hopeful plan of increasing wages (although the real hope for the poor is not merely more high wages but higher character to use the higher wages), but use all sympathy with methods ten years ago regarded as stupid or dangerous. If workers resort to force, then why cannot employers? If laborers with insufficient support go about shooting and taking possession of other persons' property — if the laws now regard property — then, others can do it. What of, in the present depression in the leather trade, the employers, facing bankruptcy impending, should think meanly of the desirability of the earnings of the lifetime of wives or children left penniless, and combine, taking in perhaps the bankrupt employees of other trades, they go about the streets, shouting demanding an assessment
from house to house to better their financial position a clubbing v. shooting innocent persons who refused to meet their demands. The mere fact that the bankrupts believed they were wholly right justified in their action of beliefs, does not justify their clubbing or shooting, or pre-
tending to impose their ideas on others by force.

That a government exists equally for all; to protect all alike, poor or rich, in the peaceful pursuit of their occupations is so simple a proposition as generally appre-
hended that the inference is almost inevitable that these labor troubles that they are inspired by foreign or foreign ideas of government foreign to our democratic system.

In what has been said, our conclusions have been reached independently of the merits of the disputes between the employers and strikers. And, in most cases, we admit the conclusion, the duty of the community in respect of education becomes very clear. The workmen are evidently uneducated either in the principles of constitutional government, or in the fundamental principles of economics. They get a certain kind of socialististic reading, and out of that do not hear the otherwise. Much as in political campaigns, once an opinion is entertained the reader cares only for reading which satisfies his partisan leaning.

Hence, the duty of the community, of the press, the school in particular, is peculiarly important. The unthinking, the ignorant, utterances of many people is discouraging. The press too often publishes what it thinks its readers wants. The schools teach little or nothing to that great majority who never see the inside of a
The simpler principle of economics are not taught even in our high schools, or that.

University training is the necessary background of our people. Who knows anything of economics? If then, we propose to examine the merits of these labor questions, how can we So it untrained to criticize a doctrine like Marx's, which demands preliminary training? The urgent presence of economic questions at every point of our daily life, when taken with the great general lack of economic education is one of the central points of our educational life, striking inconsistencies of our day. Perhaps it explains the marvelous growth in the development of economic instruction in the past 20 years; it justifies the University of Chicago in giving it so large a place in its courses of instruction.
my dear President Harper,

Just before leaving Chicago a letter from Mr. John Graham Brooks gave little hope of our getting him. But I saw a chance to get to Boston, and the storm which delayed my steamer gave me three or four days there. Of course, I sounded Mr. Brooks again, and removed many small objections. He evidently believes in us, is greatly interested in the chance of getting him to Chicago. In Boston he is in great demand, lecturing, speaking, advising on his special topics of liquor traffic, workmen's insurance, trade organizations, the unemployed. I obtained from him an expression of willingness to make a trial of Chicago, neither side making any promises for the future. He would be willing to come when for the fall quarter next year, giving lectures as we suggest, and thereby he could see if - as he expressed it - he would be a success or not. And the arrangement for the
quarte was not to imply anything whatever for you or him as to subsequent engagements. Everything would end with the end of the quarter unless both sides wished to enter into a new arrangement. This was the only terms we discussed. I said nothing about salary whatever. I advise you to arrange with him for the FallQuarte. He will be very popular both with the "swells" and the workingmen (with whom he has done a great deal). If you agree to this scheme, I suggest that you write him (Ash St. Cambridge, Mass) favorably, so that he will make no other arrangement for next fall. He should give a course in the University, another where the Prairie Ave. people mostly get at him, and others to the workingmen.

While in Cambridge, I kept my ears open, and I gave you some results for your help. In two or three years Professor Marsh will have the full professorship at 4000. which was held (he now has 8000}
by Longfellow and Lowell. If he is to be had, he must be tried for now. The more I saw of him, the more I valued him. In a strong discussion in which he and I were vigorously opposed to Palmer, he showed himself admirably. But the special "points" about him is that Baltimore has been "feeling" him. For myself I should think it infinitely wiser to put the English department into shape than the Philosophy department. The English department is a by-word among students and the outside public; and above all it needs a genuine scholar, and no "chrono" methods.

Another matter you should know. Eliot is determined to get Lorrett back. He spoke of him in the Faculty once as "an extraordinary man". In Cambridge he was one of the founders of the Brookfield Union, a settlement in Cambridgeport. If they offer him the same salary as Chicago now gives him, Lorrett can earn $600 annually.
in the Annex, and Thos. proposes to give him some part of the office administrative work. All this will allow him to many need during the summer. I give you this for what it may be worth to you, beloved, I believe, is going to Cambridge in the spring recess.

Again, in regard to Mrs. Palmer. You will recall the suggestion you made to me about her. You may or may not know that her husband goes abroad on his Sabbatical vacation year after next, & she goes with him. Would it not be wiser to make the change at the end of next year, when there won't be this evident reason? Her known power to draw influential people to our support would be generally recognized, and if she were to be retired on grounds of retirement, when such persons as Mr. Hitchcock, Mrs. Trow, others are retained, it would cause some criticism which would be difficult to meet. You asked me on this point, and after
Careful deliberation, without consultation with any other person whatever, this is my opinion, I believe her salary is so good an investment as could be made. Her connection with us means that she believes in us; and, so widely is she known, hosts of people will believe in us because they believe in her.

If Mr. Goodfellow has not already paid them, may I ask you to see if the Contributors' Guilds for December have been paid. He has the bills, with my approval on them.

I wish with all my heart you were here to enjoy the balmy air, the flowers, the green trees, the fruit, and the Dickies. The storm has delayed my steamer, but we are hoping that she will call at Fernandina for us on Saturday. We sail on the "Miranda". My mail address will be Care C. T. Den Pez Bondt, San Domingo City, San Domingo. A cablegram address to
"Laughlin, San Antonio City" will reach me. I remain here at the Windsor Hotel, Jacksonville, until Saturday, because Fernandina hotels are not the choicest.

With my cordial good wishes for you and the stone scholar factory, believe me
Sincerely yours,

J. Lawrence Laughlin
April 26, 1895.

My dear President Harper,

In straightening out my accounts, and putting my affairs in order, I found your very kind letter mentioning my loan of the fall of 1893 for $900, and stating that you wished to be regarded as responsible for it. As it is always simpler to have these things in business form, I thought you would prefer to sign the enclosed note.

Sincerely yours,

J. Laurence Laughlin.
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Department of

Political Economy

February 5, 1942

Mr. Henry F. May, Jr.,

President

We are pleased to welcome you to the University. Your presence in the

field of political economy will be most appreciated.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

[Address]
Aug. 31, 1893.

My dear President Harper,

Yours of 29th

at hand.

The real difficulty in re Beniso, is that (1) he was acquired in solid for University Extension work, and I fear for a moment thought of him as holding a permanent position in the regular offices of instruction. And (2) at that time also you emphasized the clear line of demarcation between the Extension office and University proper. Now, nothing has occurred to change these two things. But from a desire for uniformity simply, a move is made which, in the judgment of a Head-Professor seriously injures the morale of his department, it is my duty to enter my protest, both as a matter of policy and principle. (1)
so much believe dismissed is a man of such value to you that he is worth
the incurring of a department. Consequently, I suggest that he be transferred to another department. Would
it not be perfectly easy to put both his courses into Social Science? (3) A man
really wishes to lecture on labor or rather, than on Trade Unions or, the labor
course might go under Sc. Sci.? if
Small does not object. Then, I have
no objection to his remaining in charge
of the Extension work in Economics; although
I do not believe he is competent to treat
a difficult economic problem. (2) Is
it fair to hold a head professor respon-
sible for the working of his department
if action is taken contrary to his judg-
ment? In this case, I think you
are unwittingly doing no harm; and
consequently, I must ask to be relieved
of settling questions arising from it, or
of responsibility for the efficiency of
the work. Of course, if it is your
policy to take on yourself a large
part of the responsibility hitherto laid
on the head professor, and yourself to
watch many of the details, that is
another matter; no doubt, you can

so it far better than I. Only
we should clearly understand what you
expect me to do. I need not say
it would be a great relief to have
these matters taken off my mind; then
I could occupy myself entirely with
my own economic studies.

I am very sorry indeed to trouble
you with this matter; but I should
be dishonored to you on to the Univer-
sity if I did not point out the
daughters inherent in this case. It is
no easy matter to keep harmonious
adjusting the work of the instructors of
six or seven men in a new depart-
ment, as you will be the first to
appreciate.

Very sincerely yours,
J. Laurence Laughlin.
my dear Prof. Harper,

I have your letter of the 10th inst. in which you say: "I hope that it will be possible for you and Mr. Small to arrange the work of the departments in such a manner as that (1) there shall be no duplication, and (2) the courses may fit into each other to the best possible advantage."

I think you will find both Mr. Small and myself quite ready to do anything we can to save the University from any criticism. Both of us, however, will probably be struck by the lack of point in what has been said. I do not quite see what is meant by "harmony of work between the two departments," as opposed to what now exists. As I understand Mr. Small, Social Science takes its data from the existing sciences, of which Political Economy is only one, the others being Philosophy (or Ethics), Political Science, Jurisprudence, and History. Social Science is the same, building the pillars of all these sciences. The relations of Political Economy to Social Science are not other than the relations of Political Science, or Philosophy, or History—and there is no reason for singling out Political Economy.

I can see, of course, that students of Social Science should have their Political Economy before they enter Social Science—under the above relations; and I have notices that few students in Social Science are also taking Political Economy. But this is probably quite as true of Social Science and Political Science.

I am speaking, of course, not of the subdivisions of Anthropology, Sanitary Science. They are not in question. And
as to the study of dependent classes (Mr. Henderson's work) much of it is independent of economic data. So I have spoken only of Mr. Small's work.

If there had been any discussion as to personal work, I should do my best to oppose. But if any discussion first relating to scientific work, independent of persons, such as that of the relations of the sciences, I believe it to be healthy, and I should welcome it so far as it relates to Political Economy. The proper University spirit demands it. And this also to be remembered that the University of Chicago is the only institution in the world—so far as my knowledge goes—in which a division is made into Political Economy, Political Science, History, and Social Science, and Ethics; and there must naturally be some question arise as to boundaries.

So far as reduplication goes the only case I know of is a course by Mr. Cummings on the Utopias (similar to only Mr. Thomas). I was ignorant of Mr. Thomas's course when it was proposed to allow Mr. Cummings to copy his. Before leaving Chicago, it happened that I had advised Mr. Cummings to take that course, he assented. Hence, although it appears in our programme, it will not appear in the quarterly calendar. Even though he elected to give an economic treatment, I felt that he could use her powers better elsewhere. As to all the other cases, they have a purely economic raison d'être; and when first sent to Mr. Small he found no difficulty in seeing clearly the line of demarcation between his field and mine.

That the courses should fit into each other in the two departments, more than they do now, would be our wish to arrange; but I think it would be difficult to do it better.

May it not be possible that the remarks you have heard have come from people who really know very little of the actual work of the two departments? Certainly, in connection with the examinations of Mr. Cummings and Mr. Learned, Mr. Small was eminently fair scared. If there is anything more explicit than you have written me, I should be glad to hear of it.

Sincerely yours,

J. Lawrence Laughlin.
Dear Rev. Harper,

Mr. Ely has stated in Madison that he was offered the position I now hold, but refused it because the institution was supported in part by a monopolist. Do that true? Judging from what you have told me I supposed he had never had any offer from you, even to Small's chair. I expect that the trustees of the University of Wisconsin are examining Ely merely on the grounds of his beliefs—i.e., if that is a correct report. If so, he should be held to account for that unscientific method of work; if that cannot be shown, there is no case against him.

This recalls Remis. I fear the affair in Mr. Harrow's church has been a last straw to some good friends of the university, like A.A. Sprague. And in apologizing to Mr. Higginson, he is making very hard the establishment of Remis is a great railway interest in the University. And Remis is a whole, one-sided on this railway question. I have looked into it, but I could do nothing without throwing out all his railway lectures. This was some time ago. At every turn in Chicago, in July, I heard indignant remarks about Remis, and I had nothing whatever to do in introducing the subject. I know you have done what seemed best to stifle him; and Small has told me respectfully how he somewhat surprised you.
arrangement; but in my opinion, the duty to the good name of the University transcends any soft-heartedness to an individual. I do not now see how we can escape saving ourselves more easily by letting the public know that he goes because we do not regard him as up to the standard of the University in ability and scientific methods. It would have been better for him to have gone quietly. You probably know he told Small that his hold on the working classes was so strong that the University dare not drop him——or something to that effect. I believe you will find all the extreme men of my opinion——certainly Dr. Butler.

At any rate, he is no longer in my department and I understand that his economic lectures will not be announced next year by the Extension Division. The lecture subjects will be covered by Brooks. As regards the money lectures, I have a suggestion. How would it do to tie it to us in this way Prof. Kinsey, of the University of Illinois? Is it feasible? Could he not be asked to give 6 or 12 lectures on money, appear in our lists as an Extension lecture, yet hold his position at Champaign? His work is of a radically different kind from Dennis; yet he was one of Ely's men. You can also get Millar's idea of Kinsey. I quite like him; he would, I think, welcome getting closer to us. His book on the "Independent Treasury" is quite good. This is only a suggestion——just is worthless, then better no lectures at all in money than three Dennis gives.

I should be very glad to have the sheets giving the course for my baby by the end of the week, so that I can finish my work before I leave here at the end of August. During September I shall be on the go, unable to work.

Send a translation of about 140 pages to publish in the autumn on the "Indian Currency Question". Have you anything to say against Yetten's "Contract on the Ohio"? Sincerely yours, J. Laurence Laughlin.
Chicago, May 24th, 1895.

Received of William R. Harper, the sum of $990.75 as over against the payment of $900. with interest at 6% from Sept. 19th, 1893, made to Mrs. Alice Freeman Palmer in connection with the salary of Mr. R. M. Lovett.

(Signed.)

J. Laurence Laughlin.
Chicago, May 8th, 1882.

Received of William R. Hepler the sum of $2300.00 as
over against the payment of $800.00 with interest at 6% on Sept.
18th, 1880, made to Mr. Alice Meerman in connection
with the sale of Mr. R. M. Powers.

[Signature]

L. Lawrence Pennington
Hotel Sacher, Vienna,
Sept. 8, 1895.

My dear Prof. Harper,

I have received a letter from Mr. Hloben, in which he declines to do travelling lecture-work. I shall still try to see him in London.

The Reminiscence matter has come faintly to my ears. Certainly a full statement should be made by us to the public. I have some definite ideas as to what should be said. How long is it to wait until my return, when I can then have his whole set of charges (which I am now ignorant of), prepare
a carefully worded statement, or
Then you give that to the public?
This, strangely enough, quite as
much a matter affecting Mr.
Small as me; since Dickens
was not in any department
when "defended" by the University

I said the 14th, shall
reach the Murray Hill Hotel
probably on the 21st, where a
letter would reach me, almost
after reaching New York.

I shall now be glad to set
back. The 28th my space home
ward tomorrow via Paris, after
a really delightful time in
Venice there.

With my cordial good wishes
Sincerely yours,

J. Lawrence Laughlin
Dear Prof. Harper,

After getting Mr. Hillis's telegram, I telegraphed him to go on, believing there must be some misunderstanding.

This morning I have this strange account (which enclose) from him of what took place between him and Mr. Rusk & Dr. Goodspeed. I question whether it is well for a student going from our graduate school abroad where they will compare notes with those from other institutions to have such stories of their treatment at Chicago to recount. If our officials were uninformed as to all the facts, they should at least have been.
polite in refusing Mr. Willis. You know Mr. Willis to be conscientious, and so I send you his side of the matter.

Then, also, I question whether it is well to have officials use insulting language regarding their instructions to students who have done credit to our University. Mr. Lovett may be only a hired clerk &c., &c., but I do not see the wisdom of informing Mr. Willis on that point. Nor do I see the propriety of officials exhibiting their private enmity towards one in their business relations to students in my department. That should be a matter between the officials and one.

This is only one of a kind of thing which has become pretty well known in the University, and it is doing us no good.

I suppose you are resting at Chautauqua. Do take care of yourself.

Sincerely yours,
J. Lawrence Laughlin.
June 25, 1879.

My dear President Harper,

I decline to serve on the Congregation committee to consider Prof. Chamberlin’s motion, because (1) it does the University infinite harm to have it known that such a matter is really open to discussion; and (2) because it seems to be a curt attack on those persons who have recently expressed opinions on public questions who hold official connection with the University. I can see no other meaning in the resolution but a reflection on either the President, the Dean of the Graduate School, or the President’s Secretary; and I am unalterably opposed to being a party to any such absurd proceedings.

I am sure, in your own way, you can make it known to the Congregation that my name was printed on the programme without waiting for my acceptance, and quite by inadvertence.

Very truly yours,

J. Lawrence Laughlin.
Laughter

Infield, N.Y.
Cori Hugh Boy's
July 22, 1907

Dear Fred Harper,

I learn with some mortification, by a note from New York, that Mr. Isador Strauss (care R.H. Macy Co.) never received any acknowledgment of his cheque for $600 which I turned over to the University; nor did I know that it came to the notice of the University. I beg of you to see that his generosity gets some reply from the University, but in such a way that it will compensate for the seeming discourtesy.

I have a word from Mr. Mitchell that he has accepted your proposal. I have written him, giving him full work of two courses each quarter.

The history department problem is no clearer to me. I am inclined to go slowly; but at the same time I see how we suffer by delay. I still prefer Turner; but I know too little of Mr. Laughton to speak of him. All
I have heard in his favor. His executive ability has been especially well spoken of; but I know nothing as to his capacity as an instructor. His scholarship seemingly is high; although anyone after von Hobt looks small in that respect.

I am getting some rest mixed with some writing. It is incomparably quiet and restful here; and if I accomplish nothing it will be my own fault.

Faithfully yours,
J. Laurence Langham

Pres't M.R. Harper.
Chicago.
My dear Prof. Harper,

My own preferences, from present knowledge, are for Dr. Jameson as against Professor McLaughlin. The former has been said to be zealous for unimportant details; but I should be inclined to weigh that lightly until strong evidence for it was obtained. As editor of the Historical Review, he seems to me to have shown considerable power to manage affairs and men; he has seemed deliberate and tactful. But my judgment is worth little, because I have not known him personally.

Very truly yours,

J. Lawrence McLaughlin
Dear Mr. Smith

I have your note, but I am afraid I have mislaid the details of our conversation.

The date was the 2nd of July, and the location was the Chicago Public Library.

Unfortunately, I cannot recall the exact context of our discussion, but I do remember expressing interest in your project.

I will try to find the notes I took during our meeting and get back to you as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Dec. 5, 1901

Dear Sir: Harper,

Some time ago the "History of the Latin Union" by H. T. Willis, prepared in my seminar, was submitted through you to Macmillan & Co. with a view to publication (probably in connection with some future arrangement between them and the University). It was returned with a report from their reader that it was "unsatisfactory." The MSS was returned to them by me.

This opinion, and its tone, was unmistakable. It suggests that the reader was incompetent, and that Macmillan & Co. were misled. It seems to me, in the interest of all concerned, that the real character of the work should be ascertained by impartial and competent judgment. Therefore, I enclose to you copies of reviews of the work by Horace White Esq., editor of the N. Y. Evening Post, and by M. de Forville, long director of the French Mint, and a high authority on monetary subjects. They could not be two more competent judges, looking at the subject from widely different experiences.

Very truly yours,

J. Lammie Laughlin.
503 Monroe Ave.
Friday

Dear President Harper,

This is just a message to show you that you are in our thoughts more than you know. I understand, of course, that it is the greatest kindness not to intrude on you while you are recovering; I hope, however, that you may care to have a little dash of color in your room to remind you of your friends.

I have just received a kindness at your hands in the form of the new book, "The Trend in Higher Education." How interesting it looks! And what a
fine piece of book-making it is. I fancy you have many inward flashes of satisfaction over the fine work of the University Press.

I shall read The "Friend", in order to know when I am coming out. Just at present, the "Friend" in our department looks hopeful. We have an unusually strong list of applicants. Sending from Massachusetts to Daestah. And my friends have added some funds enough to give three or four additional fellow. Don't that fine?

Besides the two doctors coming up in June, we have fourteen soon coming up for the Ph. D. And this in spite of the Law School!

We are glad on your account that you are going off for a complete rest. Your courage and grit
My dear Mr. Laughlin:

You may or may not have been informed about the Pan-American Scientific Congress to be held in Santiago, Chile, on the 25th of December next. I know you will remember that we appointed Mr. Michelson delegate from the University. Now we want another delegate. The seventh section of the work of the Congress covers social science, including American history, international law and policy, and political economy. Under the latter they take up history and criticism of the subject, commercial and custom-house questions, financial questions, and general themes.

I am wondering whether you could arrange to represent the University in this field. We shall provide the expenses, which we estimate at about $1200. What I should like would be to have you represent also one of the commercial associations in the city. I am discussing that matter through Mr. Herriman, and have no doubt that it can be arranged. It would afford an opportunity to make

Harbor, New Hampshire.
then an important report on commercial questions. With yourself and Michelson I should feel that the University is adequately represented.

With sincere regards for Mrs. Laughlin, I am,

Very truly yours,

Mr. J. Laurence Laughlin,
Sawyer Cottage,
Marlboro, New Hampshire.
With sincere regards for your kindliness I am,

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

[Handwritten note: "The year of (?)"]

You can do not to share your information with the honoring faculty, continuous to keep it to yourself. I know you will understand that the opportunity in education will help you by putting yourself in the correct cadre. You can even know how to organize your thoughts and develop your career. Give the student a chance to produce and maintain your own position and preferably in your own voice. I am sure that your efforts will assist you in your actions to improve your career. I am looking forward to hearing more about your progress.
March 8, 1917

Dear President Judson:

On receiving the notice of the Spring Convocation, I woke up — like a bear in his cave — hungry for some word from you and the Chicago home. It hardly seems possible that a whole year has passed since I was allowed to trumpet forth as Convocation Orator.

Much water has been running under the bridge since then. In a small way I have been busy, if not in digging potatoes, at least in wasting printer's ink, in fo-
tato hills. There is the economic lesson. That occasionally there is one in which there is a single big fellow attended by a dozen tiny failures, while in most of them there are fifteen solid, nourishing tubers all of good size. So much for the "trusts."

In occupying the printer, for fear you may not believe me, I am sending you by today's post one of the witnesses of my "retiring disposition in the volume of "Satur-Dy Problems". Inasmuch as you have made such a whopping success of the new medical plan, you are refined from all punishment in reading the book.

My book on the European war moves with halting gait. Indeed, I found myself so far spent in the last few years that I needed more rest than I supposed before I could induce ideas to flow. There is now about half of the book in a first draft. If it does not die a-borning, it will probably be called "Crush of the Nations." Not until it is finished shall I have any self-respect, or feel that I can read a novel; for I promised it to the Scribner's two years ago. But what do we care for a scrap of paper?

The mountains and the whole country side are yet deep in winter snow, but above there is a warm sun and lollers up spring. My garden seeds are ordered. Do you and Mrs. Judson come to keep me out the results. Instead of romo's, potatoes will begin as pages. I am often homesick for Chicago.

Ever faithfully yours,

J. Laurence Laughlin
Chicago, March 14, 1917

My dear Mr. Laughlin:

It gave me great pleasure to receive your good letter of the 8th inst., and thus to be informed as to your progress. Surely many things have happened since you gave the Convocation address last year, and I am glad to know that your bucolic enterprises are not occupying your entire time. The book came yesterday, and it will give me great pleasure, I am sure, to read it. I shall be much interested in the other book, on the European war, which I hope will be in hand not far in the future. We have been very busy here during this winter with the medical fund. We set out in November to raise in new money $5,300,000. The pledges now foot up $5,133,500, and I secured today a virtual additional pledge of $20,000, so that the end I think is in sight. I envy you the freedom which you have. As you know, anyone in
My dear Mr. Leader,

I was very much pleased to receive your kind letter of the 8th instant and prone to believe your good natured remarks are exactly as they appear to be. I am informed that your progress is satisfactory. I trust that your health remains unimpaired since you gave the Concession to Britannia last year.

I again beg to know that your magazine, the "Book of Knowledge," not occupying your entire time, I pray that you will give me great pleasure in reading it. I am very much interested in the other books on the subject, and I hope the "Book of Knowledge" will be of great service in the future. We have been very much interested in the development of science since we saw the "Book of Knowledge" last year.

We have paid our subscription of $2,000, and I am sure you will appreciate the amount. $18,000, and I trust that you will not think it too much. I am sure you have enjoyed in reading the "Book of Knowledge" which you have.
administrative charge of an institution of this kind is a slave, although I believe slavery is supposed to have been abolished many years ago. Who is free?

With cordial regards to all the household, and best wishes from Mrs. Judson as well as myself, I am,

Very truly yours,

H.P.J. – L.

Mr. J. Laurence Laughlin
Red Brick House, Old Peterborough Road
East Jaffrey, New Hampshire
With oral Vyta Heaton and my best wishes to you.

V. K. V. Young

---

Mr. T. Lemberg, Esq.

9th Floor House, 1740 Parkham Road

East Terrace, New Hampstead
Personal

Chicago, March 13, 1918

My dear Mr. Houston:

In connection with the pending financial legislation I am wondering whether the President would consider the possible usefulness of Professor J. Laurence Laughlin, whom of course you know. Professor Laughlin retired a year ago at his own option in order that he might undertake some special literary work in the line of economics. He has during that time completed two books, one of which I think has just come from the press. I need not say to you that he is a very eminent student of money and finance. Frankly, I think his appointment to any post of that kind would not be agreeable to certain financial interests in New York, notably to such interests as are represented on the Reserve Board. It seems that his masterly ability and very great knowledge of the subject, as well as his entire loyalty, ought to be of
My dear Mr. Horner:

In connection with the pending financial regulation I am considering whether the President would consider the possibility of President Lawrence taking a year off to give another in order that the 41 Lawrence Committee, whom of course you know, President Lawrence taking a year off to give another in order that he might undertake some special financial work in the line of economics. He has written that he would like to complete the book, one of which I think he has been working on for a long time. I need not say to you that he is a very eminent economist and I think this appointment at once may enable him to speak of that kind would not be especially to complete his financial interests in New York, notably to some interactions as he has experimented on the Reserves Board. It seems that he is very anxious to do a very great service as well as the entire country, ought to be at
service where it would do the most good.

With cordial regards, I am,

Very truly yours,

H.P.J. - L.

Hon. D. F. Houston
Secretary of Agriculture
Washington, D. C.
service where it might go the most good.

With heartfelt regards, I am

Very truly yours,

... ... ... P.

... ... ... P.

Hon. D. M. Houston
Secretary of Agriculture
Washington, D.C.
680 Madison Ave,
New York, Apr. 7, 1918.

Dear President Judson:

I have the reply from Secretary Houston you sent. It is evident the War Finance Corporation has not entered his mind in this connection. So be it. If I have not the health to take up such tasks, there are many other things to do. Even if I had the health, this administration would not appoint me, I feel sure.

From many sides I have been asked about my mission to England. Very soon I knew I had again been confiding with A. E. H. Leighton. He will be a great success with English audiences. George Adam Smith, whom I saw last Thursday, spoke of my coming, but I was able to dissuade him. Sir George bore the marks of tragedy in his face. He is very gray. His spirit, however, is fine and lofty as ever. His daughter is with him.

I gave myself the pleasure of sending you, as an old friend and true, a copy of my last book, Credit of The Nation. Do not let it wring your time. It comes as a beacon of good wishes and to recall the pleasant memories of many years spent together.

Very sincerely yours,

J. G. Samuel. Leighton

President A. P. Judson
University of Chicago.
To Professor H. W. C.,

November 5, 1912

I am writing to express my gratitude for the thoughtful letter which accompanied your prize. It is a great pleasure to have received such an honor, and I feel very honored to be recognized in this manner.

The prize will undoubtedly contribute to the advancement of my research, and I am grateful for the opportunity it provides. I am committed to continue my work with dedication and passion, and I look forward to the opportunities that this recognition may bring.

Thank you again for your kind words and support. I hope that we may have the chance to work together in the future.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

[Address]

[Department of Chemistry]
Mr. Harry Pratt Judson,
President, University of Chicago,
Chicago, Illinois.

Dear Mr. Judson:

For our confidential use, would you be willing to give us the names of the two or three men, who, in your opinion, might be regarded as the foremost currency experts in this country; men who are informed as to the various systems of the world and whose breadth of understanding would include the effect that a proposed change in a currency system would have on the economic condition of a country.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]
Vice President.
Mr. John F. Behrens
President, University of Chicago
Chicago, Illinois

Dear Mr. Behrens:

For our confidential use, may we
be willing to give you the name of the two or three
men who, in your opinion, might be regarded as the
foremost economic experts in the United States and
who have been active in the consideration of the
money
and whose speeches of monetary policy include the
 effects that a proposal change in a constitutional
amendment
would have on the economic condition of a country.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

[Name]
Chicago, November 24, 1917

Dear Mr. Abbott:

Your favor of the 23d inst. is received. In my judgment the foremost currency expert in this country is Professor J. Laurence Laughlin, for many years Head of our Department of Political Economy in the University of Chicago, but now retired. He is living at East Jaffrey, New Hampshire. In my opinion his judgment on all these questions is worth that of any other ten men.

Very truly yours,

H.P.J. - L.

Mr. John Jay Abbott
Continental and Commercial Trust and Savings Bank
Chicago
Chicago, November 28, 1914

Dear Mr. Applegate,

Your favor of the 28th instant is receivind.
In my judgment, the forward committee should in the company to Professor J. Lawrence Langmuir, for many years Head of the Department of Political Economy in the University of Chicago, and now residing in New Haven, for an opinion in this important as to whether

Department of Work, that of any other two men.

Very truly yours,

H. T. J.

Mr. John T. Applegate

Commercial and Commerce, Trust and Savings Bank

Chicago