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Dear Mr. Burton:

I understand that members of the faculty must secure the consent of the Board of Trustees or the President before engaging in educational work under other institutions. I therefore write for permission to give a series of twelve lectures on The Social Movement in English Literature of the Nineteenth Century at the New School for Social Research, New York City, between August 6 and September 15.

Most sincerely,

Robert M. Lovett

President E. D. Burton,
The University of Chicago.

The subject is an interesting and important one. I hope permission will be granted to Mr. Lovett to give the course at the School for Social Research and that he be invited to repeat it here next winter.

John M. Manly
May 25, 1943

Dear Mr. Burton:

I am forwarding herewith the report of the Faculty of Graduate Work on the Social Movement in England which may be of interest to you. I am also forwarding the report on the work of the University of Chicago on the social movement in England.

The University of Chicago

[Signature]

President E. D. Burton

The University of Chicago
in the while I reply to some of the aggrieved persons whose wrath took a distinctly and unpleasantly personal tone. I should like to say to you however that the express for the report does not belong to me; I neither wrote it, signed it, nor saw it.

Apart from this matter all the news that I have received from the University has been most gratifying. I am, I understand, making a place for himself of real usefulness. In case the English Department is to be extended next year I should

Dear President Harper:

Before leaving Chicago I spoke to you of my desire to remain abroad two years. If I remember correctly you expressed qualified approval of the plan, but did not definitely promise leave of absence for the second year. I have waited before writing about the matter until I could hear from Herrick that his schedule for next year was made up without my name.
Though I now make formal request for a year of absence without pay, I hold myself ready. Should the request be granted, to return before the expiration of the time if, in your opinion or in mine, such action should be desirable.

I have been in Florence now for three months, studying Italian language, literature, history, and art. My plan is to spend most of next year in London working particularly at the connection between Italy and England in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. I hope to send some account of my work soon to the English Department.

I have heard several times lately of a certain report bearing upon the work in English of secondary schools, especially the Chicago High Schools, which arises by common consent to have been attributed to me. From the amount of indignation excited I suspect that the report has done some good, at least in directing attention to defects in secondary work in English, and for this reason I have not thought...
like to mention again the name of Robinson, who was so highly recommended last spring by Professor Kittredge and others. Robinson's success at Harvard this year has been unqualified. As one comes he has, I am told, as pupils Professors Kittredge, March, and Sheldon. I am quite sure that I know of no one, young or old, who writes to such superb scholarship in English, a character of such disinterestedness, such enthusiasm.

I received your kind note.
just as I was leaving America four months ago. It occurs to me at this moment that I have not acknowledged it and I have not expressed Mrs. Lovett’s congratulations and my own on the birth of the little boy. Mrs. Lovett has been promising herself since we have been here to write to Mr. Harper to thank him for her kindness to me last year.

As she assures me that this promise is now on the eve of fulfillment I will leave personal
and domestic details to her. I think that the University has my address for letters etc.
To Michael Heo. - Florence. We have taken a small villa just outside of the city at Fiesole, 26 Via del Largo. I add this address in case you may know of someone coming to Florence from Chicago to whom we might be of service.

With cordial regards to Mr. Harper and yourself I am,

Faithfully yours,

Robert Morse Lovett.
Jan. 6, 1899.

[Signature]

Dear President Harper:

I have read the comments on the similarities between "The Merchant Prince of Comville" and "Cyprien de Bergerac" which you handed to me yesterday. They are not only utterly uncritical in method, but I have noticed in criticism using these methods I am quite willing to show that Rostand plagiarized Cyprien from any play that has a balcony in it — *Romeo & Juliet* for instance — if Mr. *has* or someone else will make it worth while. Seriously the criticisms, for which Mr. *has* has no doubt paid, are written in a spirit of severe complacency, and will only seem to prove that Mr. *has* ridicules should be very upon them. They seek to show that the play "Cyprien de Bergerac" was suggested fundamentally
by "The Merchant of Venice." Now M. Resnard was
almost certainly at work on "Lysano" before Oct.
19. It would be an easy matter, I think, to show
that "Lysano" was complete in the actor's hands
before "The Merchant of Venice" in its limited edition, could
have made its way so far as Paris. At all events
this point should be carefully looked up before
the scene goes further in pressing this claim.

I return the papers herewith.

Very truly yours,

Robert Moses Lovett.
seventh. And Chandler at once gained a great deal of prestige. His oration is expected to be as remarkable as his record has been as a speaker and debater, during the two years he has been at Harvard.

These four men represent more than simply the talents of the students at Harvard; they represent the potential of the institution itself.
another Daly.

Of the other officers, the orator, who is generally a varsity debater, is the most prominent. On the coming class day the 1901 oration will be made by H. P. Chandler. Chandler first became widely known by making the Yale debating team in the fall. But he has since won the gratitude of a large number by the masterly way in which he captained Harvard to victory in the Princeton debate. Sending an untried team to Princeton was risky in view of Princeton’s known strength this year. Many in Cambridge picked up the morning paper half expecting to see the series of six unbroken wins come to an end. It was a pleasant surprise to read of a
The
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H. P. CHANDLER, Clay Orator.
"I warn..." he said threateningly.
My dear President Harper,

Since I have been in the last I have looked about somewhat with a view to finding a man to fill Mr. Mann's place. Mr. Menck was especially anxious to obtain a man whose ability and training fitted him to take charge of and develop the work in debating and argumentation. The best candidate I have discovered is Mr. H. P. Chandler, who graduated from Harvard this year. Mr. Chandler was at Leland Stanford for a time but has been in the last three years at Cambridge. He is one of the best debaters that Harvard has had, and has shown great ability in developing the teams of the past year. He is warmly recommended by Mr. Baker and other men of the department. He intends to study law but will be of the department. He intends to study law but will

be of the department. He intends to study law but will take a position in two years, possibly three. He would take a position in two years, possibly three. He would
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come to Chicago for $1,000 possibly in $1,500. I receive a

come to Chicago for $1,000 possibly in $1,500. I receive a

come to Chicago for $1,000 possibly in $1,500. I receive a

come to Chicago for $1,000 possibly in $1,500. I receive a

come to Chicago for $1,000 possibly in $1,500. I receive a

come to Chicago for $1,000 possibly in $1,500. I receive a

come to Chicago for $1,000 possibly in $1,500. I receive a

come to Chicago for $1,000 possibly in $1,500. I receive a
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picture of Mr. Chandler, and some account of his work. If you wish, I will make a definite offer to Mr. Chandler.
it would be well to telegraph me at once, and report
tried on Wednesday morning, June 12. I was disappointed
in failing to get Mr. Murray's judgment on the case, owing
to his early departure from Providence. I talked the matter
over with him, however, and understood that in a general
way he approved of appointing Chandler. I will write
him of the facts so that in case there is no time
for his departure to arrange matters he can take
charge of the negotiations.

Even if Chandler should be appointed I think that
without doubt there will be work for an additional
man. Two men, Damon and I, do not spell lack,
and I understand that there is obvious need. Having my
name in letters of reference, Murray is about to offer to
J. F. Flint for the year, devoting to his salary half of the
funds appropriated for miscellaneous readers. I have
written to Mr. Murray my opinion in regard to this matter,
but have as yet heard nothing from him. As between
Flint and Chandler I believe that so far as the ordinary
work of the required course goes there is little to choose.
Chandler is decidedly the older man but he has had no experience. This value will be more decidedly felt, however, in the course of debate and argument.

You will perhaps be interested to hear that the Harvard faculty defeated President Eliot’s proposition to reduce the amount of work required for the A. B. degree, so as to favor the three-year man. Several years ago substantially the same scheme was rejected, but by so small a majority that the authorities thought it unwise to carry it out. Since then this majority has dwindled year by year until last week it disappeared altogether.

As this letter must be a sort of bear-taken for a lay audience, may I offer my best wishes to yourself and to the University.

Very truly yours, P. M. Lowell.

P.S. I ought, perhaps, to explain why I have delayed so long writing about this appointment in rhetoric. I have been busy writing about the appointment in rhetoric. I have been reading another man—an instructor at Harvard whom I once worked for. As far as I know, he has not yet given me any answer.
but the effect is today, and in the negative, RNB.

In the course of one's studies and research, it is important to maintain a healthy balance between theoretical knowledge and practical experience. This involves not only reading and analyzing literature, but also engaging in hands-on practice and experimentation. The ability to integrate theoretical concepts with practical applications is crucial for achieving success in any field of study.

When faced with challenges, it is essential to maintain a positive attitude and persistence. By approaching problems systematically and breaking them down into manageable parts, one can effectively overcome obstacles and achieve desired outcomes. It is important to remember that setbacks are a natural part of the learning process and should be viewed as opportunities for growth and development.

In the context of one's professional and personal life, maintaining a balanced perspective is crucial. This involves recognizing the importance of both work and leisure, as well as striking a balance between personal relationships and professional responsibilities. By prioritizing self-care and maintaining a healthy work-life balance, one can achieve greater overall well-being and fulfillment.

In summary, the key to success and well-being lies in the ability to maintain a balance between theoretical knowledge and practical experience, as well as the ability to approach challenges with a positive attitude and persistence. By recognizing the importance of balance in both personal and professional life, one can achieve greater success and fulfillment in all aspects of life.
Lake Zurich, Ill.
May 17, 1904.

Dear President Cooper:

I should prefer to say that Mr. Mansly came to Chicago last Friday.

My dear Mr. Lovett:

I am much obliged to you for your kind note of May 17th and the information which it contains. This is surely very gratifying. I feel that we all owe you a great debt for your interest in this particular matter and your devotion to the cause.

With much appreciation of your courtesy and kindness, I remain yours very truly,

W. R. Harper

Lake Zurich, Ill.
Mr. Wade:

I wish to thank you for your kind note of

May 12th and the information which it contains. This is meant only

to acquaint you that we have a great deal of your interest.

In both particular matter and your contribution to the cause.

With much appreciation of your courtesy and kindness, I remain

Yours very truly,

W. H. Harbes

Mr. Wade,

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]
Lake Zurich, Ills.
May 17, 1907.

Dear President Harper:

I should first like to say that Mr. Manly came to Chicago last Friday, spent the day and night with me, and returned to Geneva on Saturday. I went back with him and had a conversation with the Stearns in the course of which he expressed himself as entirely satisfied with the progress which Manly is making.
I myself thought that it would be extremely well. Dr. Barnes thought that it would be perfectly safe for Manly to take up his work by the end of July, though I assumed him that if necessary he should keep his patient until the 1st of Oct.

I feel there is ample ground for hoping that we are on the right track at last, and I trust that the extraordinary patience which the Ministry has shown, and the personal interest which you have

Taken in Manly's case will be justified. We lacked up several hundred volumes and I should think several hundred thousand reference cards and innumerable notes for Manly's private work, which is coming on well.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

[Name]
I miss Wellingham. I keep thinking about the time you spent there. It's so serene and peaceful.

I remember those days very fondly. The weather was always perfect, and the people were so kind. I wish you could see it again, maybe one day.

I feel the same way about the town. I think it's the most beautiful place I've ever been. I can still see your face in my mind's eye.

I hope you're doing well. I miss you so much.
set of the troops: the tranquil splendor of the moon, "the red life-blood oozing out from heads or trunks or limbs upon that green and dew-cool grass."

Tremendous as a poetic record of human character, the power of friendship and grief unassuageable, the wide course of the "old, peerless, passionate, great cause," Specimen Days is more valuable to us as the tale of an art of service adjusted with insight. Its wisdom and its sense of large issues should be known to all those patriotic women who are practising rifle-shooting and those who have determined to knit woolen-garments whether the quarter-master wants them or not.

Life is different from language, and from journalistic expectation. On the morning of the sixth of June we learned that there had been no "riot against conscription" in Chicago. Our registration day in the second city of the Western World ended under the enfoldling veil of one of the most beautiful lake-mists Chicago has ever seen. The enrollment continued after midnight, and until we turned to watch other days "rise from their fathomless deeps."

EDITH WYATT.

Richesse Oblige

MR. PRESIDENT and Gentlemen: There aren't any reporters with us tonight, thank God. That leaves each of us free to say whatever he likes. It leaves me free to say to our funny toastmaster that he is making a big mistake when he refers to this gathering as the Society of Protective Plutocrats. In one sense we are plutocrats. We are all more or less rich. All of us are either successful or else had successful fathers. We have property to defend against the demagogues who are trying to take it away from us. That is all true, but I don't see the point of calling us Protective Plutocrats. This thing is far too serious to joke about. We men who have property are being put more and more on the defensive in this country. People seem to have forgotten that in us they have the strongest possible proof that America is the land of opportunity for industry and thrift.

Let me tell you an experience I had the other day. I had been in the west, looking over a little property out there that I inherited from my good father. On the limited from Chicago I got talking with a man of about my own age. He too was on his way back from the west where he had been inspecting a mine he had been asked to reorganize. Before long it came out that we had been in the same class at college, where, of course, he had known me by sight and by name. But for the life of me I couldn't remember ever having seen or heard of him before in my life. At college he had been a grind. He had belonged to what they call the submerged tenth, though if you ask me I think seven or eight or even nine-tenths would be nearer the mark. Naturally I didn't ask him such an embarrassing question, but for all I know he may have belonged to the Y. M. C. A. Yet to-day that man not only feels as we do about income taxes and labor questions, he looks and acts and talks just like one of us. He is one of us. When another man we met on the train, a very third-rate sort, actually showed us his wife's picture, my old classmate was every bit as surprised as I.

A career like that ought to be an inspiration to every boy in the United States. It used to be in the good old days. It never will be again unless we are prepared to fight for our rights after this war. You gentlemen all know what I am alluding to—To the graduated tax on incomes. People tell us this tax is a war measure, and to a certain extent that is true. But it would never have been thought of if there were not a lot of men in this country, all the down-and-outers and the uplifters, who believe or pretend to believe we have got more than our share of this country's wealth. They forget that what we have got we created. For them the war is merely a pretext. They have the sort of patriotism which doesn't shrink from the expenditure of any amount of money that isn't theirs. Their object is to take away from us in time of war what they intend us never to get back in time of peace. The public need is their opportunity to change the good old system of distributing property, a system, gentlemen, which gave the biggest share to the biggest brains and the biggest effort, and under which this country grew to be that ideal which we are all of us ready to fight for and die for. Scratch the income tax and you find social revolution.

The question for us is what we are going to do about it. And the answer as I see it is plain. This time we are going to do nothing at all. It is too late. But we must look ahead, we must keep our eyes on the future, we must be ready next time. We must make a record in this war. We must prove that there are no better patriots in the United States than the men who have been sneered at as plutocrats. The way to prove this is the way so many of us have taken—by volunteering. Every man of military age who is physically fit, and whose capital is large enough for his wife and children to live on what the demagogues leave of his income, every man who answers this description ought to volunteer.

Volunteering is our tradition. At the schools we went to we didn't sit round with our hands in
our pockets waiting for somebody to put us on one of the school teams by drawing our names out of a hat. We tried our damnedest to make the crew of the eleven or the nine. We volunteered. We were taught to volunteer. And I believe everybody here will agree with me when I say that we were also taught physical courage—not to be afraid of being tackled hard, not to back away from the plate when we faced a pitcher whose control was so poor that he was likely to bean us, not to be spike-shy if we played second or short or third. Don’t misunderstand me, gentlemen. Courage is not the exclusive possession of any one class. Even after all these years of arbitration treaties and all the rest of the pacifist twaddle there are brave men all over the United States, even though they have not had our advantages. We ought to be brave. No other class has been taught courage for so many years, six at school and four at college, by such competent teachers. All I ask is that we seize this God-given, war-given opportunity to show that we have learned our lesson, that we are at least as ready to get wounded or killed as any other class in this country.

People are fond of saying nowadays that talk about military glory is hot air, that the conditions of war have changed. Perhaps they have. I can tell you more about that in a few months. But one condition has not changed. In this war, as in every other war that was ever fought anywhere in God’s green earth, or on the seas, a liking for danger is a mighty useful thing for a soldier. Gentlemen, we have been taught to like danger. Why do you suppose men and women hunt? Would they enjoy it half as much if they ran no risk of breaking their necks taking a fence? Would shooting rapids, ugly rapids I mean, be half the fun it is if there were any way of playing the game quite safe? The danger you run into in war is not all to the bad, not by a long chalk.

One word more. This time our incomes are going to be conscripted. We can’t help ourselves. But when the war is over, when we have shown the whole country what stuff we are made of, let us go to Congress and ask it to let us have what is our own. And if there ever should be another war, which God forbid, let us say what we shall be in a position to say: “We are a class of volunteers. We have proved it. But we value the privilege of volunteering as highly for our incomes as for our bodies. And it is a privilege we know how to use. Did any class in this or any other country ever give on such a stupendous scale as we plutocrats gave to the Red Cross? In exchange for the sacrifices we made in 1917 and are ready to repeat now, we ask you to let the men who volunteer pay a volunteer income tax, and to confine conscription of income to the incomes of men whose bodies have to be conscripted.” That is my programme for the future defense of our rights as a class, gentlemen, and I ask you whether anything could be fairer?

CORRESPONDENCE

Good Citizenship in War

Sir: Since presiding at a mass meeting in Chicago, called for the purpose of representing the opinion of many citizens that the government should take the lead in formulating terms of peace, I have received so many letters with reference to my position, both from people who approved and those who condemned, and in particular from those who misunderstood, that I am asking the use of your columns to make a personal explanation. I recognize that my views as a private citizen are unimportant. I have reason to know, however, that they are shared by many others, who have not had the same reason for expressing them as I have.

1. In the first place, I am not a pacifist. I believe thoroughly, however, that the present war on the part of the United States is a war for peace. I understand this from a reading of all President Wilson’s utterances to Congress, none of which he has withdrawn and some of which he has distinctly re-affirmed. I am not at present concerned with the questions whether we had sufficient cause to engage in a punitive war, or sufficient reason, in the law of self-preservation, to enter a military and financial combination with other nations involving territorial aims which are not primarily ours. I believe that our government is in honor bound to the nation which elected it to maintain the war on the highest ground as a national war for world peace. This is not only a matter of honor—it is further a matter of urgent public policy. Only on this ground, in the long run, can this war be made acceptable in a democracy such as ours, and continue to inspire the people to the necessary sacrifice. I, therefore, believe that the discussion of peace as the object of the war, and the definition of such terms as will make this object the end of the war, and possibly the end of all war, are wise and patriotic. It is needless to say that I do not sympathize with any attempt to hamper the government in enforcing measures duly taken under law for carrying on the war—such as conscription, taxation, loans, control of food and prices, etc. I do not believe that the way to universal peace lies in the direction of a German victory.

2. I am not a “conscientious objector.” I am quite willing to concede that in this matter I live on a lower moral plane than many whom I profoundly respect and admire. My atrophied conscience would not justify me in refusing any service to the government which I could render. But I feel that it is in the spirit of noblesse oblige on the part of such tough-minded people as myself to protect so far as may be the scruples of others. I believe that the war can be fought effectively only by those who are physically and morally ready to fight—that just as in the process of conscription many will be exempt from war service for physical reasons, so others should be exempt for moral reasons. And I believe that such exemption should in neither case be made a subject of persecution or ignominy. I believe that this course is the way of honor and also the way of wisdom.

3. While I am a democrat, hitherto I have merely ac-
cepted democracy as the order of things under which I was born, and I have seen probably more to criticize than to applaud in it. But I am resolutely opposed to the change of that order of things under stress of war. It has been the usual course of democracy in a struggle for existence to transform itself into autocracy. Obviously tendencies in this direction are appearing in our own state. If I were sure that our government could, by the use of the force at its command, bring about peace within a few weeks or months I should be less concerned at such tendencies. They might be passed by as merely incidental, and, as they often are, accidental. But suppose the war goes on another year.

The United States cannot, as England has done, transform its government constitutionally by a coalition ministry and deferred election of Parliament into a permanent committee of public safety. Our rigid system prescribes national elections every two years. I, therefore, feel that it is a matter of the highest state-manship on the part of our government to remain responsive to the system of democratic control to which it owes its existence; for only in this way can it claim to be truly representative. And surely it is a matter of honor as well as policy to keep faith with the American people, to whom that government must look for increasing support and sacrifice.

4. Especially I feel it the part of good citizenship to protest against the unauthorized and sometimes illegal acting of individuals who conceive that by violent interference with human or constitutional rights they are fulfilling a patriotic duty. The action of a prominent citizen of Chicago the other day who caused the arrest of three men two of them neutral aliens for remaining seated during a performance of a national song, the action of the judge in publicly scolding these men who had suffered a night of illegal imprisonment, and the action of other citizens leading to the dismissal of the two aliens from their positions and their black-listing—all this, I say, seems to me willfully and stupidly unpatriotic. The action of soldiers in the service of the nation or of the several states in interfering with the right of citizens to assemble peacefully and go about their business legally seems to me a betrayal of the flag under which those soldiers serve. Some days ago a soldier shot and killed a saloonkeeper in New Jersey for obeying the law which forbade him to sell or give liquor to men in uniform. This seems to me a graver dereliction from duty than the classic offense of the sentry who sleeps at his post—for which offense he is proverbially shot. It belongs to society and to the press, especially to those elements which are most strongly imbued with a sense of the righteousness of the war, to deal with the first kind of fake patriotism. It belongs to government, national, state or local, to deal with the second.

There are several qualities which are earnestly to be cultivated in the interest of national unity at such a time as this. The first of them is confidence. The people must trust each other as citizens and trust the government; but, on the other hand, the government should set an example by trusting the people. The efficient national secret service and the loyal newspapers which daily confront us with discoveries of German plots might consider whether public welfare at this time is not to be served rather by discretion than by exaggeration. The second is frankness. The government should give no cause for suspicion that its purposes are subject to reservation and concealment. Even in foreign relations President Wilson has committed himself to "open diplomacy." And, on the other hand, I venture to think it an obligation resting on citizenship for the people to be frank with the government—open and above board in expressing their desires and views. And to this end I believe it their patriotic duty to be especially zealous of any infringement of the right of freedom of speech. And finally there is tact—that between citizen and citizen, tact as between press and government on the one hand and individuals on the other. The good citizen will exercise reserve in flinging such epithets as disloyal and traitor to his fellow from whom he differs in opinion. The government and press should recognize the terrific strain, moral and physical, which this people is undergoing. They should be cautious in qualifying hesitation, question, even criticism as treason; and instead of exaggerating the offense of those who are in honest opposition to the dominant tendency, even as expressed by law, they will treat such cases with sympathetic understanding.

Now, at the beginning of this war, we have an opportunity to establish such standards of social and human tolerance as will in the end make of our country not only a stronger, but a wiser, and, in the human sense, a richer nation; we have an opportunity to insure something in the way of spiritual inheritance which within our own borders will be in some sort a compensation for the monstrous losses of war—and which cannot fail to be a part of our contribution to the new law of nations, and the new world system, to which it is our sustaining faith to look forward.

ROBERT MORSE LOVETT.

Japanese Lose Hope for Germany

SIR: Assuming that it is not a ruse designed to be carried out in collusion with the German high command and for the ultimate success of the German cause, the late move by which Japanese forces have been sent into European waters in support of the Entente is the most sinister and convincing episode of the warlike situation in Europe since the failure of the assault on Verdun. Sinister, that is to say, as seen from the German point of view. Assuming always, as has just been said, that it is not a ruse undertaken by Oriental statecraft in collusion with the quasi-Oriental statecraft of Berlin, it plainly signifies that the statesmen of the Far-Eastern empire have cast up the account to date and have concluded that there is no gain to be had for Imperial Japan by further playing fast and loose with the European belligerents and keeping open a chance of alliance with Imperial Germany at the close of hostilities or at any opportune stage in their further prosecution. The statesmen of Imperial Japan have evidently reached the conviction that the chances of ulterior gain for Japan by eventual use of an offensive alliance with Germany are no longer worth serious attention, as against the certainty of a hostile attitude on the part of the nations of the Entente toward any further schemes of Japanese aggrandizement.

Seen in the long and dispassionate perspective afforded by the Far-Eastern point of view, and rated quite unemotionally in terms of prospective profit and loss to the imperial establishment, the European war situation will necessarily present itself as a large question of "alternative uses." It has long been evident that the conservative, that is to say imperialistic and reactionary, statesmen who have controlled the policies of Japan have consistently taken thought to avoid any avoidable offense so as against Germany. It is similarly evident that a shrewd imperial policy, whenever a propitious conjunction may arise, should negotiate a close alliance with Germany and her follow-
ing for the purpose of making whatever gains might be made during the period of weakness and disorganization that is expected to take effect among the Entente nations on the close of the present hostilities. But such a policy presumes that the German Empire is to come out of its present difficulties substantially intact; intact, at least, to the extent of still doing business as a German Empire under the rule and policies of the Prussian statesmen. The present move of the Japanese forces would seem to signify that these shrewdest, most callous, and most watchful of all adepts in unashamed statecraft have decided that the chances of so fortunate an eventuality for the German imperial forces are now too slight to be worth serious consideration. It would signify, in other words, that in the apprehension of the Japanese imperial statesmen the German Empire is not to appear on the map of Europe as it is to be redrawn for the day after tomorrow; and it would signify also that in their apprehension there is no help for this sinister eventuality, even if the forces of imperial Japan were to be thrown in unreservedly on the side of the German Empire and its allies. The surmise also suggests itself that it may be America’s entrance into the war that so has given the outcome in this Japanese computation of “alternative uses.”

Thorstein Veblen.

University of Missouri.

Washington Explains

Sir: After citing the discrepancies in the army registration of Pacific Coast states, you asked editorially, June 16th, “Why was the error so much greater in Oregon and Washington than in California?”

Washington’s registration was 50.9 per cent of the estimate provided by the census bureau, you report. This charges the state with the possession of 100,000 slackers. Oregon registered 57.9 per cent and California 81.8 per cent.

From 1900 to 1910 the populations of California gained 10 per cent, Oregon 62 per cent and Washington 121 per cent. Evidently the census bureau did not consult local authorities in finding its 1917 figures but applied a mechanical scale of growth based on the 1900-10 increases. It credited Washington with a population gain of 60 per cent in the last seven years and California with a gain of 25 per cent.

Washington makes no claim to such a growth since 1910. During this period California has held its expositions and has experienced a phenomenal urban and agricultural expansion.

Furthermore, to place a still larger responsibility on Washington’s young men, the census bureau placed the state in the frontier classification, declaring that 13.6 per cent of its male population is between the ages of 21 and 31. I have been unable to learn what percentage it applied to California, but for Texas it figured that only 6.9 per cent of its male population is of selective draft age.

Washington is no more a frontier state in the make-up of its population than many middle western states. The census figures in 1910 credited three of its cities with a total population of 425,339 or 38 per cent of the state’s people.

Although local chambers of commerce have been delighted from time to time to point to the census bureau’s annual estimates of population, these figures are popular no longer. The state has not 100,000 slackers and if arrests of those not registered are a correct standard, it hasn’t more than 100 genuine evaders of the draft law.

Spokane, Washington.

Clough D. Hudson.

Another Reply

Sir: Professor Lovejoy’s communication published in your issue of June 16th appears to me to disregard totally the position of one group of conscientious objectors, and to beg the question between him and the other group.

The first group consists of those who would be willing to fight if they saw good reason for fighting, and who object to fighting in this war simply because they see no such reason. They disapprove not of all wars, but specifically of this war. They particularly object to forced service (which to them is indistinguishable from slavery in its worst form) in a war which Professor Lovejoy claims is a war for freedom.

The second group, to which the communication in question is addressed, bases its position on the doubt whether oppression and violence can be effectually resisted by violence. It is this point which Professor Lovejoy takes for granted. He says that “we very well know” that such liberty as now prevails in the world has been obtained and kept only because men fought and killed for it. Surely Professor Lovejoy should know that this is a wholly un-demonstrable proposition, and that it is definitely denied by his opponents in the argument, who include some men not wholly destitute of intelligence (as the late Count Tolstoi and his followers).

This is the whole gist of such argument as Professor Lovejoy offers in his communication. Once there was no liberty in the world. Later there were wars for liberty. Now there is some liberty. Therefore, the world could not possibly have attained this liberty without war—“as we very well know.”

A clearer case of the fallacy post hoc ergo propter hoc could scarcely be devised.

Franklin Edgerton.


VERSE

The History of a Minute

I saw a lady on the stair,
And she was, oh, so strangely fair,
With a knot of butter-colored hair,
And a waiting, listening, wondering air.

She was tall as a lady ought to be,
And down she looked and smiled at me.
Her eyes were queerly brightly blue
As the bit of sky that last shines through
The gathering clouds oppressive gray
On a chilly windy Autumn day.

There she paused on the stairs and smiled
Like a child who sees another child
With whom it would dearly like to play
If it only could get its nurse away.
And I know not what divine surprise
Leapt up like fire in my eyes,
But I know her smiling suddenly stopped,
And a curtain between us blankly dropped,
And she passed me by as if I were
Something invisible to her.

Alice Duer Miller.
September 30, 1924

My dear Mr. Lovett:

Among the letters which I found waiting me on my return is yours of August 27th. I beg pardon for the long delay in acknowledging it.

I am interested in what you say about the situation at the University of Wisconsin and gratified that your own inclination is towards remaining with the University of Chicago. I believe that there is a bright outlook for us and I am sure that you can make very valuable contributions to the life and work of the University.

Though I shall be very much engrossed the coming year in the plans for the development of the University and the internal administration will fall almost wholly to Mr. Tufts and the other deans I hope I may be able from time to time to see you.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

EDMOND

Mr. Robert Morse Lovett
c/o The New Republic
421 West 21st Street
New York, New York
September 30, 1934

Mr. Dear Mr. Lasser:

Among the letters which I found waiting for me on my return to town on August 29th, I find your letter of the 8th.

I was gally to learn that you are going to continue your connection with the University of Wisconsin and to reform with the University of Chicago. I believe that these are a bright outlook for us and I am sure that you can make a very valuable contribution to life and work at the University. Though I may not be very much equipped for the coming rest in the plans for the development of the University and the internal organization of it, I feel it my duty to say to Mr. Tuttle and the other Gaelic hopes I may be able to return to time to come to see you.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

PS: Mr. Hopper wrote to me:

"The new republic is "I" that" and I think so too.

New York, New York"
Dear Mr. Burton:

Renewed mention of my name in connection with the presidency of the University of Wisconsin reminds me that I should have informed you before I left Chicago how matters stand.

I understood last spring when I talked with you that the majority of the Board of Regents desired to elect me to the office. I had previously made a condition that the election should be substantially unanimous. I learned also that President Birge had not intended to retire until 1925, at the conclusion of his fiftieth year of service to the University. Accordingly it was decided to let the matter rest for the time being. In the circumstances, I am bound to consider the matter further should the Regents desire it, but I may say that I hope this contingency will not arise. I believe that the University of Wisconsin will do better to choose a man already connected with the institution. My own personal wishes are, as they have always been, to remain in Chicago.

Most sincerely,

President Ernest E. Burton,
University of Chicago,
Chicago, Illinois.
August 29, 1924

My dear Mr. Lovett:

Your letter of August 27 to President Burton arrived during his absence. He will return from his vacation in England shortly after the middle of September. I shall be pleased to direct his attention to your letter at that time.

Very truly yours,

WES-A
Secretary to the President.

Mr. R. M. Lovett,
421 West 21st St.,
New York, N. Y.