

Chicago, September 17, 1912

Dear Mr. Dodd:-

Thank you very much for the copy of your paper on the war with Mexico. I have read it with great interest, and instruction. One question I should like to ask. On page 1 you refer to McKinley's having shared in precipitating the war with Spain in order to avoid difficulties at home. I should be much interested to know the evidence for that.

Very truly yours,

H.P.J. - L.

Mr. W. E. Dodd,  
The University of Chicago.

Chicago, September 17, 1912

Dear Mr. Dodd:-

Thank you very much for the copy of your paper on the

war with Mexico. I have read it with great interest, and instruc-

tion. One question I should like to ask. On page 1 you refer to

McKinley's having shared in precipitating the war with Spain in

order to avoid difficulties at home. I should be much interested

to know the evidence for that.

Very truly yours,

H.P.L. - L.

Mr. W. E. Dodd,  
The University of Chicago.

Sept. 18, 1912

My dear Mr. President,

I am very glad you  
found my address worth the read-  
ing and in the next few days  
will send you definite refer-  
ences for the opinion ex-  
pressed as to McKinley's  
resemblance to Polk, Bis-  
marck and Napoleon III.

But it is only an opinion



up" a war with France, Jefferson  
tried to offset the unpopularity  
of his administration by the seizure  
of West Florida and the precipita-  
tion of troubles in that quarter,

Gen. Q. Adams undertook to do  
the same thing with reference to  
the Texas question when Polk  
was sent to Mexico and you  
now, all know, how Lewis thought  
to bring on war with England in 1861-  
62 to make South America a  
common field. (Bancroft's life of Lewis)!

My inference and suspicion in re-  
gard to McKinley's policy is just and  
I think few of us would place him  
as a man or statesman above those named.

Yours sincerely Wm E. Dodge

set down by <sup>way</sup> of general intro-  
duction to the study as a whole.

<sup>However,</sup>  
Read Admiral Chadwick's, "Relations  
of the United States and Spain", Chapters  
XXV to the end, and a constant  
reading of the Nation during  
the period and since was  
in general my source;  
and, I will add, the frequent read-  
ing of the diplomatic correspondence  
of our State Department bearing  
on this expansion policy: in 1908  
Hamilton's reply to Orsen and non-  
plus the opposition by "Gettling

Chicago, September 19, 1912

My dear Mr. Dodd:-

Thank you very much for your note of the 18th inst. I shall examine with pleasure the references to which you refer. I should want some very definite evidence to convince me that I have been completely mistaken all these years in my opinion as to President McKinley's attitude toward the war with Spain. Whether he stands higher or lower as a man or statesman than the list of others you suggest of course has no bearing on this particular question, nor do the facts relating to preceding men in Washington have any bearing on it. The only question is the specific question as to whether Mr. McKinley did or did not <sup>wish to</sup> bring on the war with Spain or oppose it.

With best wishes, I am,

Very truly yours,

H.P.J. - L.

Mr. W. E. Dodd,  
The University of Chicago.



Chicago, September 19, 1912

My dear Mr. Dodd:-

Thank you very much for your note of the 18th inst. I shall examine with pleasure the references to which you refer. I should want some very definite evidence to convince me that I have been completely mistaken all these years in my opinion as to President McKinley's attitude toward the war with Spain. Whether he stands higher or lower as a man or statesman than the list of others you suggest of course has no bearing on this particular question, nor do the facts relating to preceding men in Washington have any bearing on it. The only question is the specific question as to whether Mr. McKinley did or did not bring on the war with Spain or oppose it.

With best wishes, I am,

Very truly yours,

H.P.L. - L.

Mr. W. E. Dodd,  
The University of Chicago.

The University of Chicago

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

77

September 20, 1912.

*Dodd, W. E.*  
My dear Mr. President:

Yours of the 19th. received and I get the point you object to more clearly. Since writing you the other day I have looked more closely into Chadwick and on the question whether the McKinley administration preferred war to peace at the critical moment seems to me clearer still. See what is said of the appointment of John Sherman as Secretary of State on pages, 490-91; also what is said about the sending of the Maine to Havana, <sup>and the whole of Chapter 29 is illuminating</sup> pages 533-38. The discussion of the attitude of the President is temperate and when I read it for review at the time of its appearance I was certain that this would be the final verdict; but, of course nothing is final in history. We are always getting new evidence and your surprise at the statement in my paper causes me to re-examine the subject, though I feel certain that I am right.

The reason I cited the attitude of earlier Presidents is that I feel, as does the judge in a trial, that precedents count for much in guiding one to a correct decision. If men have almost invariably acted in a certain <sup>way</sup> under given circumstances they are apt to act that way in a future case where the circumstances are similar; and this I think is good historical method.

I have not, with the faulty index of the Nation, been able to locate the documents which first gave me my opinion. But I enclose a clipping from my files which may be of interest. Hold it for me, please.

Yours Truly  
William E. Dodd



September 20, 1912.

My dear Mr. President:

Yours of the 19th received and I got the point you object to more clearly. Since writing you the other day I have looked more closely into the matter and on the question whether the McKinley administration preferred war to peace as the critical moment seems to me clearer still. See what is said of the appointment of John Sherman as Secretary of State on pages 190-191; also what is said about the attitude of the Maine to Havana, pages 232-233. The discussion of the attitude of the President is temperate and when I read it for review at the time of its appearance I was certain that this would be the final verdict; but of course nothing is final in history. We are always getting new evidence and your authority at the statement in my paper causes me to re-examine the subject, though I feel certain that I am right.

The reason I cited the attitude of earlier Presidents is that I feel, as does the Judge in a trial, that one's verdict count for much in giving one to a correct decision. If men have almost invariably acted in a certain manner in an emergency they are apt to act that way in a future case where the circumstances are similar; and this I think is good historical method.

I have not, with the Faculty Index of the Nation, been able to locate the documents which first gave me my opinion. But I enclose a clipping from my files which may be of interest. Hold it for me, please.

Yours truly,  
William E. Miller



September 20, 1912.

have something beyond the mere opinion of that paper. In other words, I had supposed that a historical inquiry would rest on substantial facts. The attitude of earlier presidents impresses me as absolutely irrelevant to the question at issue. The historical method to which you refer will lead to interesting writing, no doubt, Dear Mr. Dodd:-

Thank you very much for your note. Herewith I am returning the enclosure. It has been my settled opinion ever since the war that President McKinley was dragged into the war very much against his will by the opposition in Congress, which forced the matter through, and that if he had been let alone he would have brought the thing to a peaceable settlement at an early date. That the McKinley administration preferred war to peace I have never for a moment supposed to be true. Of course if there is any tangible evidence to the contrary it will weigh with me, but the evidence you suggest so far as I have seen it is of the slightest possible character. The newspaper clipping which I return would have not the slightest weight with me in itself. It would simply be a suggestion for further inquiry and for substantial evidence. I am too well informed as to the notorious inaccuracy of alleged interviews to put any reliance on them. I will of course look into Chadwick. So far as the "Nation" is concerned, I should want to

Chicago, September 21, 1912

Dear Mr. Dodd:-

Thank you very much for your note. Herewith I am

returning the enclosure. It has been my settled opinion ever since the war that President McKinley was dragged into the war very much against his will by the opposition in Congress, which forced the matter through, and that if he had been let alone he would have brought the thing to a peaceable settlement at an early date. That the McKinley administration preferred war to peace I have never for a moment supposed to be true. Of course if there is any tangible evidence to the contrary it will weigh with me, but the evidence you suggest so far as I have seen it is of the slightest possible character. The newspaper clipping which I return would have not the slightest weight with me in itself. It would simply be a suggestion for further inquiry and for substantial evidence. I am too well informed as to the notorious inaccuracy of alleged interviews to put any reliance on them. I will of course look into Chadwick. So far as the "Nation" is concerned, I should want to



The University of Chicago

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

-2-

September 20, 1912.

have something beyond the mere opinion of that paper. In other words, I had supposed that a historical inquiry would rest on substantial facts. The attitude of earlier presidents impresses me as absolutely irrelevant to the question at issue. The historical method to which you refer will lead to interesting writing, no doubt, but is absolutely useless when it comes to a question of fact which can be determined one way or the other by direct evidence.

Very truly yours,  
H.P.J. - L.

and the whole of Chapter 29 is devoted to the discussion of the attitude of the President is temperate and when I read it for review at the time of its appearance I was certain that this would be the final verdict; but, of course nothing is final in history. We are always getting new evidence and your surprise at the statement in my paper causes me to re-examine the subject, though I feel certain that I am right.

The reason I cited the attitude of earlier Presidents is that I feel, as does the judge in a trial, that precedents must for much in guiding one to a correct decision. If men have almost invariably acted in a certain manner under given circumstances they are apt to act that way in a future case. The University of Chicago, as are similar; and this I think is good historical method.

I have not, with the faculty index of the Nation, been able to locate the documents which first gave me my opinion. But I enclose a clipping from a paper which may be of interest. Hold it for me, please.

have something beyond the mere opinion of that paper. In other

words, I had supposed that a historical inquiry would rest on  
substantial facts. The attitude of earlier presidents increases

me as absolutely irrelevant to the question at issue. The historical

method to which you refer will lead to interesting writing, no doubt,

but is absolutely useless when it comes to a question of fact which  
can be determined one way or the other by direct evidence.

Very truly yours,

H.P.L. - L.



48

The University of Chicago

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

September 23. 1912.

Good M E  
My dear Mr. President:

While I relied wholly on Admiral Chadwick's work for my introductory statement to which you make objection, and it was merely introductory, I have read, since receiving your last note the Diplomatic Correspondence, or, to be more accurate, House Documents No. 1. for 55th. Cong. 3d. Sess., covering the whole period, especially pp. 746-750. And I find, as I expected to find, that Chadwick had not, so far as I can judge, overstated the case. I do not see how I could conscientiously change my statement.

But I have always thought that McKinley was personally opposed to war. This however is merely an opinion that must be held subject <sup>to</sup> change whenever the private correspondence shall be published. How differently Polk appears now that his Diary and private correspondence are available. So I have not suffered myself to speak of the President's personal views or purpose, but only of his official attitude. On the personal and, I believe, on the official side you and I are entirely at one—so I interpret your last letter.

I hope I have not appeared dogmatic at any point. If I have it was not my intention. I have <sup>no</sup> view or opinion as a historical student which I am not ready to revise; in fact I have to revise my most careful presentations to my class-

September 22, 1911

My dear Mr. President:

While I called briefly on Admiral Gatchew's  
work for my introductory statement to which you make objec-  
tion, and it was merely introductory, I have read, and re-  
ceiving your last note the Diplomatic Correspondence, or, to  
be more accurate, House Document No. 1, for 55th Cong. 2d Sess.,  
covering the whole period, especially pp. 745-750. And I find  
as I expected to find, that Gatchew had not, so far as I can  
judge, overstated the case. I do not see how I could want-  
only change my statement.

But I have always thought that Mackinlay was  
personally opposed to war. This however is merely an opin-  
ion that must be held subject to change whenever the evidence  
correspondence shall be published. How differently this ap-  
pears now that his Plan and private correspondence are a-  
vailable. So I have not suffered myself to speak of the Pres-  
ident's personal views on purpose, but only of his official  
attitude. On the personal side, I believe, on the official side  
you and I are entirely at one - so I interpret your last let-  
ter.

I hope I have not appeared hostile at any point.  
If I have it was not my intention. I have a view on opinion as  
a historical student which I am not ready to revise; but  
I have to revise my most careful presentations to my class-



The University of Chicago

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

es every year. But it seems I have not been able to make clear to you what I mean by resorting to precedent action in order to understand perfectly the meaning of such a step as that taken by President McKinley when he sent in his war message. What I meant in my notes to you, as in my estimate included in the statement in my address, was the same that Mr. Rhodes shows forth when he undertakes to explain the Buchanan policy with reference to Cuba or that John Quincy Adams resorts to when <sup>he</sup> gives us his review of Jackson's conduct of the Texas problem - in the famous Braintree address of September 1843. I do not mean that any precedent decides a thing, but only helps to explain a document, which is sometimes of itself quite inadequate. The point I have in mind is well expressed in one of Minister Woodford's last dispatches to the State Department; you have probaly <sup>been</sup> seen it.

And on the subject of the value of newspaper evidence I venture the reference to Rhodes: Essays, page <sup>81</sup> and on. Though I had the misfortune <sup>only</sup> ~~on~~ last year to be scandalously treated by a Hearst newspaper, misquoted outrageously, I try not to condemn newspaper evidence when there is no motive for misrepresentation. And I suppose you feel the same way. One thing is certain I have never taken such evidence at quite as high a value as Mr. Rhodes has done in his great history. I mention this author so frequently not because I think him infallible, but he is I believe our latest and highest authority.

as every year. But it seems I have not been able to make  
clear to you what I mean by resorting to precedent action  
in order to understand particularly the meaning of such a step  
as that taken by President McKinley when he sent in his war  
message. What I meant in my notes to you, as in my estimate  
included in the statement in my address, was the same that  
Mr. Rhodes shows forth when he undertakes to explain the  
Buchanan policy with reference to Cuba or that John Quincy  
Adams remarks to whom gives us his review of Jackson's war-  
time of the Texas problem - in the famous Buchanan address  
of September 1845. I do not mean that any precedent decides  
a thing, but only helps to explain a document, which is some-  
times of itself quite inadequate. The point I have in mind  
is well expressed in one of Minister Woodford's last dis-  
patches to the State Department; you have probably seen it.  
And on the subject of the value of newspaper evidence  
I venture the reference to Rhodes: History, page 101. Though  
I had the misfortune on last year to be occasionally cross-  
ed by a hostile newspaper, misquoted outrageously, I try not  
to consider newspaper evidence when there is no motive for  
misrepresentation. And I suppose you feel the same way. One  
thing is certain I have never taken such evidence as that  
as high a value as Mr. Rhodes has done in his quest history.  
I mention this author so frequently not because I think him  
infallible, but he is I believe our latest and highest auth-  
ority.



The University of Chicago  
DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

I am sorry to have occupied so much of your time, but it seemed impossible for me to make myself understood in fewer words. And I thank you for your interest in my work even though you dissent from some of my conclusions; but this only shows that you take time to read the work of the men in the teaching chairs.

I am very sincerely yours

William E. Dodd

P.S.

As soon as Mr. Thompson returns I will get from him the name and address of the gentleman who offered the other \$50. on the Mareks lecture fund and send them to you.

I am sorry to have occupied so much of your time, but it  
seemed impossible for me to make myself understood in fewer  
words. And I thank you for your interest in my work even though  
you dissent from some of my conclusions; but this only shows  
that you take time to read the work of the men in the depart-  
ment.

I am very sincerely yours

Frederick C. Poole

P.S.

As soon as Mr. Thompson returns I will get from him the  
name and address of the gentleman who offered the other \$50.  
on the Works' Lecture fund and send them to you.



insurgent minority of the Republicans in Congress, combined with the Democrats. Perhaps he could have been as pugnacious and rugged as Jackson and Cleveland.

Chicago, October 5, 1912

Of course I fully understand your references to the attitude of Mr. Dodd. On the matter of newspaper clippings,

there is so much. Thank you very much for your comments of September 23d. I have read Admiral Chadwick's chapters to which you refer. Of course I have not read the House Document #1, 55th Congress, Third Session, - at least not recently. It seems to me, however, that nevertheless your statement in the article is an overstatement. My own opinion as to Mr. McKinley's attitude is based, I confess, not so largely on the documents in the case, which of course you have consulted, as on direct personal knowledge of the opinions of those directly connected with his administration as to his attitude, and on my own personal conference with him on a single occasion. At the time of the war I was strongly opposed to radical action, and believed that the action finally taken was precipitate. General Woodford I knew was convinced that the whole thing could be settled without war, as indeed was made plain by his despatch, quoted on pages 574 and 575 of Chadwick. It is still my belief that Mr. McKinley was driven into his final attitude by the pressure of the

Chicago, October 2, 1912

Dear Mr. Dodd:-

Thank you very much for your comment of September

23d. I have read Admiral Chadwick's chapters to which you refer.

Of course I have not read the House Document No. 25th Congress, Third

Session, - at least not recently. It seems to me, however, that

nevertheless your statement in the article is an overstatement. My

own opinion as to Mr. McKinley's attitude is based, I confess, not

so largely on the documents in the case, which of course you have

consulted, as on direct personal knowledge of the opinions of those

directly connected with his administration as to his attitude, and

on my own personal conference with him on a single occasion. At

the time of the war I was strongly opposed to radical action, and

believed that the action finally taken was precipitate. General

Woodford I knew was convinced that the whole thing could be settled

without war, as indeed was made plain by his despatch, quoted on

pages 274 and 275 of Chadwick. It is still my belief that Mr.

McKinley was driven into his final attitude by the pressure of the



September 23, 1912.

-2-

Dear Mr. President:

I relied wholly on Admiral Chadwick's insurgent minority of the Republicans in Congress, combined with the Democrats. Perhaps he could have held out if he had been as pugnacious and rugged as Jackson and Cleveland.

Of course I fully understand your references to the attitude of previous presidents. On the matter of newspaper clippings, there is so much to be said that it is not worth while perhaps now as to discuss it.

I do not see how I could conscientiously change my statement.

Very truly yours,

But I have always thought that McKinley was opposed to war. This however is merely an opinion that must be held subject to change whenever the private correspondence shall be published. Now differently Polk appears now that his Diary and private correspondence are available. So I have not suffered myself to speak of the President's personal views or purpose, but only of his official attitude. On the personal and, I believe, on the official side you and I are entirely at one - so I interpret your last letter.

M. W. E. Dodd,

The University of Chicago.

I have not appeared dogmatic at any point. If I have it was not my intention. I have given or opinion as a historical student which I am not ready to revise; in fact I have to revise my most careful presentations to my class-

insurgent minority of the Republicans in Congress, combined with the Democrats. Perhaps he could have held out if he had been as vigorous and rugged as Jackson and Cleveland.

Of course I fully understand your reference to the attitude

of previous presidents. On the matter of newspaper clippings,

there is so much to be said that it is not worth while perhaps now

to discuss it. I am sure that your attitude is right and proper.

Again thanking you for your comments on the matter, I am,

Very truly yours,

W. E. DODD

W. E. Dodd is as to Mr. McKinley's attitude in 1897, I cannot say

as largely as the documents in the case, which all showed you have

examined, as an direct personal knowledge of the opinions of those

directly connected with his administration as to his attitude, and

as my own personal acquaintance with him as a single occasion. At

the time of the war I was strongly opposed to military action, and

believed that the nation finally taken was precipitate. General

Woodford I have now convinced that the whole thing could be settled

without war, as indeed was said plain by his daughter, quoted as

M. W. E. Dodd, The University of Chicago. It is still my belief that Mr.

McKinley was driven into his final attitude by the pressure of the



5757 Blackstone Ave.,

November 30, 1920.

Dear Mr. President:

Yesterday when I spoke with you about your possible acceptance<sup>ance</sup> of an invitation from the President of Randolph Macon Woman's College, I had no idea that you had been appealed to by respectable people to ask the Trustees of the University to remove from the Faculty such a dangerous teacher. <sup>as I am invited to be</sup> If I had known it, I might have mentioned the subject. I am glad, however, that I did not know for it is a pleasure to know that you never raised or even discussed such a subject with me.

It all came to me in the afternoon when a reporter for The Tribune called me asking what I had to say about the matter. Since it was all news to me, I asked him to come out and I would reply if there was anything to say. At night Mr. McLaughlin called up to ask about my summer work and I then told him of the impending Tribune scandal. He then told me that he had known about it sometime and that he had talked with you about it. As I said, I am glad you did not mention it.

When I was at Randolph Macon College, Colonel George L. Christian, a fine old man, chairman of the local organization of the Confederate Veterans, more than once undertook to have the Trustees of the college ~~to~~ remove me for teachings about the South's part in the Civil War which the Veterans could never approve. He even made a newspaper campaign. But the college never took notice of it at any time. And the trustees took particular pains to make known to me that they were not in sympathy with that sort of effort to interfere with what they were pleased to call earnest, honest teaching. And many of the trustees had been Confederate soldiers. The freedom I had there was one of the ties that we broke with





best difficulty; and that and still other ties have still held to the extent that I have been <sup>urged</sup> again and again to return. That sort of reward is about the best that can come to a teacher.

Now, I had no other thought that you would act exactly as you have acted; and I believe the Trustees will view the matter exactly as you have viewed it. May I say that my knowledge of your attitude and my belief that the Trustees of the University are of the same opinion have been among the highest satisfactions of my ten years service with you.

At the same time I should fail of entire frankness with myself if I did not add that freedom of speech and press are all too frequently abused by people who serve themselves and not scholarship by their dogmatic assertions. And many of this class must be burdens to universities. What these people have said that I said misrepresents me only in that it is not balanced by the rest of the statement. It is not my purpose to disparage either North or South in seeking lessons from our history and in all that I have written will appear, I think, a philosophic weighing and assessing of both sides, the deeds, both good and bad, of both. I do not complain of the Loyal Legion because they did not quote in full, that would have taken too much space. What I <sup>do</sup> complain of is the disposition to ask summary removal without examining more than the smallest part of what I have published. If they read my Jefferson Davis, they will see why some Southerners felt aggrieved. My point is that I would not like to be judged in off-hand manner as trifling with my right as a teacher and as a citizen. The University's reputation is as dear to me as it can be to any of you and I have not for a moment forgotten its relation to society.

This is a long story. It falls upon you because of your manly response and my desire to show my appreciation. I love to teach in the University and would hate to be thought to jeopardize its interests.

Yours sincerely,

William E. Dodd





December 8, 1920

6757 Blackstone Ave.,

November 23, 1920.

Dear Mr. Dodd:

Yours of the 30th of November was received while I was in the East. I have said nothing about the matter of our last little chat because I did not think it worth discussing. You doubtless saw my interview in the Tribune which consists of two words. Those two were more than the whole matter needed.

Very truly yours,

Mr. Wm. E. Dodd,  
Faculty Exchange.

HPJ:JH

December 2, 1920

Dear Mr. Bodd:

Yours of the 29th of November was received while I was in the bank. I had said nothing about the matter of our last little discussion I did not think it worth discussing. You reminded me of my interview in the Tribune which consisted of two items. These two were more than the whole matter needed.

Very truly yours,

Mr. Wm. B. Bodd  
Provincy Exchange

W.B.B.



Round Hill, Virginia,  
December 1, 1924.

History

My dear Mr. Burton:

Your gratifying telegram received. It is solacing to be told that one might be missed in a great university like Chicago. I appreciate what you say.

The offer in Washington is of such a character and the circumstances are such that I must both take a little of your time for an explanation and of course ask for some considerable time before giving my answer - being here and rather bound by engagements till January.

I wrote Mrs. Dodd a week ago to think the problem through from as many points of view as arose in her mind and then, if favorably inclined, to acquaint McLaughlin of the fact that we had the matter under advisement. Fearing that he might not be well, I suggested to her that she might bring up the matter confidentially with Mrs. Burton - simply to avoid giving McLaughlin the worry that he usually takes upon himself about cases of this sort. I have since heard that he has had a set-back which distresses me both for his own sake and the added reason that I may have increased his troubles.

What's done is done. There are several bearings to the case. The Chicago climate and incurable dirt and smoke, coupled with the declining value of money and the declining number of people willing to assist in housework, have made Mrs. Dodd's part in our work burdensome beyond all expectation. My own part of the work has been slowly changing till a different situation from that joyously contemplated fifteen years ago surrounds me: a, the number of students has increased four or five times; b, the legitimate appeals of the larger community for time and service are very many: the consequence of both of these changes is that I am not a free man and student, answering telephones and writing letters requiring the better part of my time after meeting the routine duties of teaching. Of course all of this is recognized as encouraging fruit of years of toil and effort; but ~~with~~ so much of detail and attention to people's calls takes away that very thing I have wished above all to do.

The Washington proposition would cure all of this, although I know I should greatly miss the stimulus of my Chicago colleagues and students.

Round Hill, Virginia  
December 1, 1934

My dear Mr. Burton:

Your gratifying telegram received. It is so nice to be told that one might be missed in a great university like Chicago. I appreciate what you say.

The offer in Washington is of such a character and the circumstances are such that I must both take a little of your time for an explanation and of course ask for some considerable time before giving my answer - being here and rather bound by engagements till January.

I wrote Mrs. Dodd a week ago to think the problem through from as many points of view as arose in her mind and then, if favorably inclined, to acquaint McLaughlin of the fact that we had the matter under advisement. Feeling that we might not be well, I suggested to her that she might bring up the matter confidentially with Mrs. Burton - simply to avoid giving McLaughlin the worry that he usually takes upon himself about cases of this sort. I have since heard that he has had a set-back which distresses me both for his own sake and the added reason that I may have increased his troubles.

What's done is done. There are several bearings to the case. The Chicago climate and incense dirt and smoke, coupled with the declining value of money and the declining number of people willing to assist in housework, have made Mrs. Dodd's part in our work burdensome beyond all expectation. My own part of the work has been slowly changing till a different situation from that formerly contemplated fifteen years ago surrounds me; the number of students has increased four or five times; the legitimate appeals of the larger community for time and service are very many; the consequences of both of these changes is that I am not a free man and student, answering telephones and writing letters regarding the better part of my time after meeting the routine duties of teaching. Of course all of this is recognized as encouraging first of years of toil and effort; but with no more of detail and attention to people's calls takes away that very thing I have wished above all to

The Washington proposition would cure all of this, although I know I should greatly miss the religious of my Chicago colleagues and students.



But there is another phase of the problem. A change has taken place in the University during the last fifteen years that amounts to a revolution: a, the community then fairly stable and admirably suited to the growth of a community of scholars and scientists has now ceased to be such. Our friends are already scattering; they are soon likely to be scattered over the surrounding country, as the Columbia faculties have been scattered over a wide area. This destroys the social side of our life, takes away the compensation that labor amidst smoke and dirt is designed to secure. If you but make comparison of the comparative rents, say, of 1909 with those of to-day, you will see what is doing it. I fear it is too late now to save the University on this side of its life. Nor is there any real interest in the matter among those who might lend assistance.

b, While this takes place before our eyes, there arises a powerful alumni interest that overwhelms us with their demands for grandstand performances, after the manner of eastern universities and to satisfy that longing of hearts like that which underlies, if there can be such a thing, the management of The Tribune. You must already have realized that it might easily be "millions for such vanities, not one penny" for the silent work in the social science workshops for which universities in large part were created. The way the world is now made up, it seems useless to struggle against the tide. "After us the deluge" is the inner answer to all of us who endeavor to make our case with the public that ought to understand.

These two are the general influences that discourage me. Look at our friend, McLaughlin. He is a noble example of that great number of genuine scholars whose lives have <sup>been</sup> or are now being broken upon the wheel. I shall dread greatly to make the decision when the time comes for it. One never likes to run away even for comforts, the prospect of ease in one's later years and the accomplishment of one's desire in the way of summing up of the results of one's life-long labor. One does not like to remain in a situation where helplessness is the rule of himself and colleagues. Shall one run away or shall one stay and commit himself or his children to the Terror that our great industrial life is preparing for all those who inhabit great cities? The answer is, of course, for us to make, although your greater experience of life might be of great service to us.

Of course it is not going from one complex University situation to another. That we could never, I think, do except upon compulsion. With all thanks and appreciation and readiness to assist in your work, I am

Yours sincerely,

*William E. Dodd*

But there is another phase of the problem. A change has taken place in the University during the last fifteen years that amounts to a revolution. The community then fairly stable and admirably suited to the growth of a community of scholars and scientists has now ceased to be such. Our friends are already scattering; they are soon likely to be scattered over the surrounding country, as the Columbia faculties have been scattered over a wide area. This destroys the social side of our life, takes away the compensation that labor amidst smoke and dirt is designed to secure. If you but make comparison of the conservative rents, say, of 1903 with those of to-day, you will see what is doing it. I fear it is too late now to save the University on this side of its life. Nor is there any real interest in the matter among those who might lend assistance.

While this takes place before our eyes, there arises a powerful, almost irresistible interest that overwhelms us with its demands for grandstand performances, after the manner of eastern universities and to satisfy that longing of hearts like that which underlies it there can be such a thing, the management of The Tribune. You must already have realized that it might easily be "millions for such vanity, not one penny" for the silent work in the social science workshops for which universities in large part were created. The way the world is now made up, it seems useless to struggle against the tide. "Alas, the deluge" is the inner answer to all of us who endeavor to make our case with the public that ought to understand.

These two are the general influences that discourage me. Look at our friend, Melancthon. He is a noble example of that great number of genuine scholars whose lives have been now being broken upon the wheel. I shall dread greatly to make the decision when the time comes for it. One never likes to run away even for comfort, the prospect of ease in one's later years and the accomplishment of one's desire in the way of summing up of the results of one's life-long labor. One does not like to remain in a situation where helplessness is the rule of himself and colleagues. Shall one run away or shall one stay and commit himself to his children to the terror that our great industrial life is preparing for all those who insist on great things? The answer is, of course, for us to make, although your greater experience of life might be of great service to us.

Of course it is not going from one complex University situation to another. That we could never, I think, do except upon compulsion. With all thanks and appreciation and readiness to assist in your work, I am

Yours sincerely,

William E. Dodd