STANFORD UNIVERSITY, CALIFORNIA.

December 24, 1912.

Prest. Harry Pratt Judson,
University of Chicago,
Chicago, Illinois.

My dear President Judson:

Because I believe that you wish to be just I feel that I will be doing you a service in replying to your letter respecting the Questionnaire. In making up your mind finally upon the merits of that document I wish that you would consider:

1. That the Questionnaire by inviting the frank expressions of a large number of qualified persons seeks to ascertain precisely what the prevalent opinion on certain matters is. Though this opinion cannot be measured scientifically it is none the less a real social force; and, that even if it is not in accord with the facts. However, I also wish you to consider

2. That the Questionnaire represents only one phase of the investigation into the results of the war in the South. Another phase, which it seemed needless to mention in this particular Questionnaire, is an investigation of the historical facts. I have in my possession a quantity of records, vital statistics, official documents, rosters and materials from the time of the war ordinarily considered historical sources. As far as
these notes consist of memoirs, personal narratives and the like they have little if any claim to preference over the replies to the Questionnaire; for to my knowledge no law has been discovered by which one can guarantee the opinions of men uttered fifty years ago, which I have in my notes, to have greater historical value than the opinions of the same men in reply to my Questionnaire. And this brings me to ask you to note,

3. That the Questionnaire, with perhaps twenty exceptions of which you were one, was mailed to men who lived in the South and participated in the war or who have made a special study of the South and can therefore be expected to reply to the circular from the fullness of personal experience and knowledge. All other replies at hand, and there are many, indicate that the circular has been taken seriously.

It was I who sent you the Questionnaire, partly because of acquaintance, partly because a College President's table is a catch-all for mail of every description.

Though, under the circumstances it was natural for you to reply as you did, I must say that the imputation conveyed by your analogy of the school boy debater, that we seek one-sided expressions and will suppress damaging statements is unjust, and, I venture to believe, undeserved.

However, your letter has done us a service. The Questionnaire will be re-phrased to remove from it certain obscurities which it seems to have.

Yours very sincerely,

[Signature]

LFS
Chicago, December 30, 1912

Dear Mr. Krehbiel:

Your note of the 24th inst. is at hand. I have read with care your comments on the matter. I am sorry if in any way what I said hurt your feelings. At the same time questionnaires express opinions, which I said before I think never seemed to me to result in anything of any special value. It is facts and not opinions which count. I really was not aware that I implied that you "would suppress damaging statements."

With best wishes, I am,

Very truly yours,

H. P. J. — L.

Professor Edward B. Krehbiel,
Stanford University, California.
Dear Mr. Thompson,

Thank you for the letter.

I have been able to gather some information on the weather. I am sorry if the forecast is not very accurate.

I understand your concern, and I am willing to consult with you further.

I hope to hear from you in the near future.

Yours truly,

[Signature]

[Date]
Dr. Harry Pratt Judson, President,
University of Chicago,
Chicago, Ill.

Dear President Judson:--

Mr. Robertson has probably told you that I attempted to see you on my way through Chicago, but that you left for New York at practically the same hour that I reached Chicago. I had been asked to see you by Mrs. Black of New York, and when I learned that you had gone to New York I telegraphed her in the hope that she might see you. Mrs. Black has gone abroad and I have not heard whether she succeeded in seeing you or not, and for that reason I am now writing to you in regard to the matter under consideration.

Dr. Jordan and I for the past two years have jointly been giving a course on International Conciliation. This course has met with favor here, and in Columbia University where I gave it this last summer. It has also met with the favor of Mrs. Elmer Black of New York, who has verbally agreed to finance an attempt to introduce it into several selected universities of the country, and has chosen me to give the course if the arrangements can be made. For the moment the plans have not been completed, but I am verbally authorized to take up the project with such universities as are willing to consider it, and I am therefore enclosing a type-written statement of the same for your consideration. I have already mailed you a copy of the Syllabus to which reference is made in the appended sheets, and from this you can see what is designed. I sincerely hope that the University of Chicago will be one of the institutions which will accept a course of this nature, assuming always that the scheme as now understood is executed.

Please give my kindest regards, and those of Mrs. Krehbiel, to Mrs. Judson.

Yours very sincerely,

P.S. On re-reading the above, I fear I have not made it sufficiently clear that this is a letter to you personally, and not to you as the Executive Official of the University. The matter cannot be officially considered until I have the expected letter from Mrs. Black. I have written the above on the assumption that Mrs. Black saw you in New York, and with a desire to place the thing before you in detail.
Dear President Jackson:

I am writing to inform you that I am transferring from the University of Cincinnati to the University of California, Los Angeles, effective immediately. I have accepted an offer to join the faculty of UCLA and will be moving shortly.

The decision to leave Cincinnati has not been an easy one, as I have enjoyed my time at the university and benefited greatly from the opportunities and experiences provided here. However, the opportunity to join such a prestigious institution as UCLA is a rare and exciting prospect.

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to you, President Jackson, and to the faculty and staff of the University of Cincinnati for their support and encouragement throughout my time here. I am confident that my experiences at Cincinnati will serve me well in my new role.

Please accept my best wishes for the success of the university and its students in the future.

Sincerely,
[Signature]

[Name]
THE PROPOSED COURSE OF INTERNATIONAL CONCILIATION UNDER THE
ELMER BLACK FOUNDATION.

1. Name. The foundation is to be known as the "Elmer Black Chair of International Conciliation."

2. Purpose. The course would aim to give an impartial and thorough discussion of matters connected with International Conciliation in the same way that subjects like pragmatism or the tariff are treated in colleges. It would not aim to make converts and would be no more of a propaganda than a course in military history. Its chief purpose would be to make International Conciliation a university subject.

3. Method. The course would consist of lectures, prescribed reading, discussion, and examinations. The lectures would be based upon a printed Syllabus which each student would be expected to have (an annotated copy is being sent under separate cover). Papers and reports might be required depending on circumstances.

4. Length of the Course. The course would consist of approximately thirty lectures, depending upon the length of the college term. It would not extend beyond one semester (counting that at approximately eighteen weeks) at any one institution. Inasmuch as it is proposed to give the course of lectures simultaneously at several institutions of a locality, it would be desirable to have the two lectures a week come on consecutive days at the beginning or end of the week if possible; as, for instance, on Mondays and Tuesdays, or Thursdays and Fridays.

5. Cost. The course would be free of cost to the institution accepting it, except as provided in the following sections.

6. Credit. The course would carry undergraduate credit in the same way and on the same terms that regular courses carry credit. To make this feasible the course would be given subject to all the requirements and under the same control as other courses of its character. It would be open to all except first year students, but would normally be limited to fifty members. However, an institution could admit more than fifty students of the above grade, provided it furnished at its own cost the necessary assistants for paper reading and quizzes to keep the course up to standard. Announcement of the course would appear in the regular schedules and bulletins whenever possible.

7. Reference Books. To make the course of the character desired the library would need to be equipped with certain reference works. The institution would be expected to purchase these, but the total amount to be invested for the purpose would not exceed $250; unless, indeed, the institution admitted more than fifty students to the course, in which case it would be expected to provide enough reference books to meet the needs of the class. A list of books to be
used in the course would be furnished in ample time in advance of the opening of the lectures to make the books available for the use of the class.

(It is hoped that the necessary works of reference can be presented to the institution; but this cannot be promised for the present and, unless it can, the institution will be expected to meet the above condition in order that the course may be made what is designed.)

8. Instructor. The conductor of the course would be the person selected by the founder of the chair. He would presumably be considered a visiting professor, or an exchange professor, to be appointed by the governing board of each institution in the regular way and subject to all the rules and regulations and entitled to all the privileges of the institution.

Yours truly;

H.H.J. - L.

Professor Edward B. Urwick,
Inland Stanford Junior University,
Stanford University, California.
Dear Mr. Krehbiel:

Your favor of the 13th inst. received. I was sorry not to see you when you were here, and regret still more that I did not see Mrs. Black in New York. I have heard nothing from her or from you before on this subject.

Your syllabus I received the other day, and examined with much interest. The plan is one that I should like to see carried out, and if it could be adjusted here should be glad to recommend it to the Board. As you are aware, we are not much in favor of two-hour-a-week courses. Could you not arrange the matter in such a way as to give a four-hour course throughout the entire quarter? I realize of course the difficulty of adjusting that with other institutions, but that would be far more to our purpose, if it could be done.

With cordial regards and best wishes, I am,

Very truly yours,

H.P.J. - L.

Professor Edward B. Krehbiel,
Leland Stanford Junior University,
Stanford University, California.
October 16th, 1932

Dear Mr. Kappel:

I have been out of the city for several weeks and have not had a chance to see how you are getting along. I am happy to hear that you are in good health. I have been feeling quite well myself.

I appreciate your concern about my health and welfare. I hope that you are also well.

Best wishes,

Yours truly,

[Signature]

Professor Kappel

Department of International Relations

Stanford University
During the past summer the World Peace Foundation, founded by Edwin Ginn of Boston, began an investigation into the ultimate consequences of war. The purpose of the undertaking is to determine as correctly as possible the effects of war on the life, health, prosperity and morals of both the victor and the vanquished. The preliminary investigation which sought to ascertain what means and methods should be adopted to achieve this end, was conducted in several parts of the South (of the United States) by David Starr Jordan, President of Stanford University and Chief Director of the World Peace Foundation, Edward B. Krehbiel, Professor of Modern European History in the same institution, Harvey E. Jordan, Professor of Anatomy in the University of Virginia, and Laurence L. Hill, who acted as Secretary of the Commission.

The results of this preliminary study seem to justify the continuation and expansion of the work. In order to do this to the best advantage it seems desirable to ask the opinion and advice of a considerable number of the leading men in various sections upon the matters indicated below. The questions upon which information is desired are, as far as possible, put in the form of expressions by persons who have been interviewed.

Naturally, the best results will be attained if each recipient of this questionnaire states whether he agrees or disagrees with these expressions, or any of them, and why; and gives any additional pertinent and useful information that he may possess.
Four of the World Peace Foundation's founders...

...have joined the board of directors of the United States Peace Foundation. The Washington Post has reported that the foundation was formed in part to promote the interests of the United Nations.

The foundation's objectives include the promotion of international cooperation and the prevention of war. The board consists of prominent figures from various fields, including business, academia, and politics.

The United States Peace Foundation was established in 1948 with a mission to encourage and support peace efforts around the world. The foundation's work includes funding research, organizing conferences, and publishing books and reports on peace initiatives.
Replies will in all cases be regarded as confidential and will not be used in any way that could be prejudicial to the individuals involved. They should be directed to David Starr Jordan, Stanford University, California, or to Edward B. Trebbiel, Stanford University, California.

1. The leading young men of the South were a part of select companies of militia and these companies were the first to enlist.

2. "The flower of the people went into the war at the beginning, and of these a large part died before the end."

3. War took only the physically fit; the physically unfit remained behind.

4. Conscripts, though in many cases the equal of volunteers, were on the average inferior to the latter both in physical and moral qualities and made poorer soldiers.

5. Considerable numbers of men fled to the hills and other places to escape conscription ("bushmen"), and others deserted from the ranks and joined them.

6. The volunteer companies, having enlisted at the beginning of the war, lost more heavily than the companies of conscripts which entered the war later. ("Those who 'fit' the most survived the least") The deserters suffered practically no loss of life, however much inconvenience.

7. The result of this was that the men of the highest character and equality bore the brunt of the war and lost more heavily than men of inferior quality. This produced a change in the balance of society by reducing the percentage of the better types without a corresponding reduction of the less desirable types; a condition which was projected into the next generation because the inferiors lived to have progeny and the others did not. (Thus in the "Stonewall" company from Lexington, Virginia, forty-eight of the seventy-six who were Alumni of Washington and Lee University lost their lives or were seriously wounded in the thirty-two battles from Manassas to Appomattox. Of the one hundred and six non-alumni in the same company forty men were lost.)
8. "Eighty per cent. of the best blood of S—- was lost in the war." -- "I believe in blood in men as I do in horses."

9. "We can only judge of those who died by the success of others." -- "We would have accomplished a great deal more in these fifty years if we could have had the help of the men who fell in the war."

10. "Widows of soldiers suffered great hardships and most of them never remarried; the death rate among them was unusually high for the first ten or fifteen years after the war."

11. "The sweethearts of many a victim of the war never married; with the elevation of the middle class and the lack of men of their own class, many girls of the aristocracy married men beneath them in station."

12. "The farmers now are of a lower type than before the war."

13. "All over the State the class of men attending court does not measure up in intelligence or in ideals with those before the war." (Opinion of a Judge)

14. "The public men of the South do not measure up to those of old times."

15. "After the war the best of the middle class, -- farm managers and commercial men, -- rose to equality with the remnants of the old aristocracy."

16. "The Civil War destroyed the cream and stirred up the dregs." -- "The men who got themselves killed were the better men."

17. "The present deterioration of human qualities is due to lack of schooling rather than to impoverishment of blood."

18. "Loss of spirit (at financial ruin) was a greater damage than the loss of blood."

19. "One element of deterioration came from the people of the North who for commercial reasons sought the conquered districts."

20. "Whiskey was the curse of the Southern aristocrats." -- "The aristocratic failures were mostly hard drinkers."

21. "Cousin marriage may have been in some degree a harmful element." -- 

22. "Emigration has harmed the South as much as the war."
23. "The strong fell first in battle, but the weak fell in camp; so that the balance remained about the same."

24. "Inestimable damage was done by the war in the South by preventing men from securing a proper education."

25. "The war could have been avoided if patience and good sense had been shown."

26. "The democratic equality of the high born and low born in the camp was good for both, the pampered sons were helped by the democratic severity of their work, the ignorant by contact with good manners and culture."

27. "Social lines vanished during the war, and have not reappeared."

28. "The war made men work, and this alone has been a great blessing to the South."

29. "The South is the better by far for the spread of education, for the willingness to work, for the loss of slavery, for the establishment of the Union, and for the development of business. But for war, as war, there was no redeeming feature, no benefit to anyone."

The names of persons qualified to give information in the above matters will be very much appreciated.
My dear Mr. Krehbiel:

To-day I am in receipt of the circular of the 21st of November enclosing a questionnaire relating to the results of war. I suppose that what you want is frank opinions so I might as well tell you just what I think about the entire scheme. It seems to me about the most futile method of ascertaining truth that could readily be imagined. Nothing could result from any such questionnaire but a collation of the opinions of a great many people. These opinions must in the main be of practically no value at all. The statements are mostly generalizations which could have no value unless based on an accurate observation and collation of a great number of facts. If what you want is to ascertain the truth, and not merely to find out what a good many more or less intelligent people
Office Hours End, 1:00 P.M.

My dear Mr. Kredipol,

To-day I am to announce a change in the staff of the Kredipol School of Art. I suppose you are aware that I have been in charge of the school for some time now and that my decision to resign was made some weeks ago. I have now decided to take up a position elsewhere.

I have consulted with the faculty, and they have agreed that I may remain until the end of the term. The faculty has also expressed the hope that I may be able to continue my work at the school.

I appreciate your understanding and support during my tenure as director. I have enjoyed my time at the school and believe that it has been a rewarding experience for both students and faculty.

Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns.

Yours sincerely,

[Your Name]
think to be true, you will go to get the facts themselves. By careful collection and collation of facts it may be that you could reach some generalizations of value. The proceeding which I am criticizing, however, reminds me too much of what high school boys are in the habit of doing when conducting a debate. They send out papers to a great number of people asking their opinions on the question which they are debating, and then they solemnly enumerate the people who favor their side of the case. In other words, I should suppose that the best way to get at this thing would be to follow the ordinary methods of scientific investigation.

With sincere regards, I am,

Very truly yours,

H.P.J. - L.

Mr. Edward B. Krehbiel,
Stanford University, California.
With sincere regard, I am

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

Mr. Henry D. Kempf

Senior University, California
Dr. Harry Pratt Judson,
University of Chicago,
Chicago, Ill.

My Dear President Judson:

I am thoroughly delighted to learn from your letter of September 17th that you think well of the idea of extending the Peace Course, and I am sure it will give me great satisfaction to give such a course in the University of Chicago. I note what you have to say about the desirability of its being a four-hour course, and shall attempt to meet this desire. I think it will be possible.

I have not to date heard anything further from Mrs. Black, and until I do nothing more can be done. Just as soon as I have further instructions you will hear from me again.

With cordial regards, I remain,

Yours very truly,

Edward B. Kreymbold.

Stanford University, Cal.,
Sept. 23, 1912
Dear Professor Johnson,

University of Chicago,

Dear Professor Johnson,

I am writing to request your assistance in coordinating a seminar at the University of Chicago. I believe I can provide the necessary expertise to conduct a seminar on the Peace Corps, and I am sure it will give me great satisfaction to do so. I note that you have been involved in the Peace Corps, and I am sure it will add to the diversity of the seminar.

Please let me know if you have any suggestions for the seminar. Thank you for your assistance.

Yours very truly,
Chicago, October 3, 1912

My dear Mr. Krebsiel:—

Your favor of the 23d of September I find on my return from an absence of some days. As soon as I hear from you further we can take the matter up.

Very truly yours,

H.P.J. = L.

Professor Edward B. Krebsiel,
Leland Stanford Junior University,
Stanford University, California.
December 22, 1914.

Dear Sir:

The enclosed statement will presently be published, through the press and otherwise, in order to furnish in brief form for popular use some of the simplest and most cogent arguments against an increase of armaments by this country at this time, for which there is at present an extravagant and groundless agitation. Hon. Theodore E. Burton, Hamilton Holt, President Faunce, Hon. Albert E. Pillsbury, Frederick P. Fish, Jackson H. Ralston, Col. Homer B. Sprague, Prof. George H. Blakeslee, Oswald G. Villard, Rev. John Haynes Holmes, Wilbur F. Gorby, Judge Robert F. Raymond and many others unite in signing the statement; and the committee will highly value your signature.

Commending the matter to your kind attention,

I am

Yours truly,

Edwin D. Mead

for the Committee.
Dear Mr. Wilson,

I am writing to request permission to use the World Peace Foundation for our organization's event. I understand the importance of maintaining a respectful and inclusive environment, and I am confident that our event will align with the values of the foundation.

I would be happy to provide any additional information or support needed to ensure a smooth experience. Please let me know if there are any concerns or requirements I should address.

Thank you for considering our request.

Yours truly,

[Name]
We desire to record ourselves as unqualifiedly in support of the President’s declared policy of restriction in regard to naval construction at this time and, in accordance therewith, to emphasize the inadvisability of any present increase in our naval program. It is our conviction that no change of program involving increased construction as a result of current European conditions would serve any present purpose or conduces to future safety. The reasons for urging these considerations are the following:

1. No immediate need of defense commensurate with our present armament can possibly arise within the period to be affected by the forthcoming program. All the naval powers peers of the United States are engaged in warfare, except Italy. Their armaments are being reduced by the stress of battle; and they themselves will be concerned strictly with their own affairs during the course of the campaigns, the period of peace negotiations and a necessary additional period for recovery. Even admitting the probability of a war in which the United States should be engaged—an assumption against all reason—that war could not occur within a time sufficiently close to demand preparation for it at the next regular session of Congress. All possible antagonists of a strength nearly equal to the United States will have to recuperate a long time before they are on a par with this country. At present they are all sedulously cultivating American friendship, they are greatly indebted to us, and after their own affairs are rearranged on a peace basis they will necessarily continue to cultivate our friendship until world conditions become approximately normal. We need no new construction to maintain our proportionate strength relative to other powers.

2. The inhibition of naval increase is no less strong in respect to technical construction. Naval armaments are developed in time of peace and become with its long continuance more or less fixed as to type along theoretical lines. Every new experience prescribes fundamental changes in construction. The dreadnought type was the technical lesson of the Russo-Japanese war; and recently so acute a student as Sir Percy Scott published his conclusion that the dreadnought is rendered obsolescent by the submarine and the aeroplane. Besides demonstrating the degree of truth in his conclusion, the present war will prove many other things about the current standards of naval construction. Attempts to forecast the experience which will be in the hands of the naval constructors in due course are useless. It is proper to conclude that any plans thus forecasted would, if realized in steel, simply involve a waste of the public money.

3. Even from the point of view of international politics a new naval program of any sort is, it seems to us, entirely inadvisable. The whole system of militarism is on trial in Europe. The conflict will beyond question establish a new order in Europe; and there seems no reasonable doubt that in its solution provisions will be made by which the burden of armaments will be in some degree removed from the nations of Europe, and therefore of the world. American sympathies are bound up with that hope, and that it will be realized to some extent is one of the surest things that the whole tragic conflict offers as an earnest to the future. If Europe’s solution of the problem results only in lowering the level of relative defense, the proportionate needs of the United States will be lessened; and so much is as certain as anything human can be.

If, then, the United States should now plan to increase its naval armament, this could do nothing but permanent harm. Naval programs in Europe, in so far as keels have not been laid down, are at a standstill. Europe is using up its armament, and is building only for current use to meet present exigencies. It may end the war by abolishing armaments largely or altogether. The United States is not in need of current defense, and will not be for a period of years, even on the basis of the old international order. We can halt—and if we do the example will encourage Europe to go much farther in the abolition of armament than it otherwise would. If we take advantage of our peaceful condition to rush into construction of any magnitude, we shall certainly be building to a large extent for the scrap heap, and the example would discourage European efforts to lower the level of their own armament, which, by operation of the principle of proportion, has always determined the level of the world’s armaments.

If the awful catastrophe in Europe has demonstrated anything, it has demonstrated most signally the groundlessness of the argument that the way to preserve peace is for nations to pile up armaments to such portentous extent as to scare their neighbors from attack. The mad rivalry had already been well characterized before the war as “organized insanity.” Today serious men the world over see clearly that these monstrous armaments were vastly more a menace than a defense and that they were largely responsible for the ruin which has been wrought. That the war shall result in the drastic and universal reduction of armaments is therefore the imperative demand of the best European statesmanship. For the United States, safest of nations, to consider at such a time the increase instead of the decrease of her own armaments would indicate a most untimely readiness to intensify the very evil whose consequences now appall us and tend to check the great movement which all governments and all earnest men should unite to promote.
Chicago, December 28, 1914

Dear Sir:-

Your circular letter of the 22d inst. with enclosure is received. I am not able to join your movement, because I do not believe that any one of your propositions is correct. No one desires the United States to be a great military nation. It is in my opinion extremely important, however, that the military and naval power should be increased sufficiently for defense if attacked. We are not now in that position.

Very truly yours,

H.P.J. - L.

Mr. Edwin D. Head,
40 Mt. Vernon St.
Boston, Massachusetts.
Dear Sir:

Your recent letter of the 15th inst. with

accomplished, I am at liberty to join your

organization to receive the order I have already

passed that any one at your

proposition is correct. I am in my

opinion to do a great military service. I have

been to do the military

military importance, however, that the military

may not lose any service to increase significance for

generation in the case. We are not now in that position.

very truly yours.