



THE COURIER

LINCOLN, NEBR., SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 2 1901.

THE COURIER,ENTERED IN THE POSTOFFICE AT LINCOLN AS
SECOND CLASS MATTER.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY

—BY—

THE COURIER PRINTING AND PUBLISHING CO

Office 1132 N street, Up Stairs.

Telephone 384.

SARAH B. HARRIS.

Editor

Subscription Rates.

Per annum..... \$1 50
 Six months..... 1 00
 Rebate of fifty cents on cash payments.
 Single copies..... 05

THE COURIER will not be responsible for vol-
 untary communications unless accompanied by
 return postage.
 Communications, to receive attention, must
 be signed by the full name of the writer, not
 merely as a guarantee of good faith, but for
 publication if advisable.

OBSERVATIONS.**Stanford.**

The trouble at Stanford is augmented by the jealousy which the foundation of the university excited. It has been an increasingly successful rival of the university of California and the vicissitudes which it is now passing through are, I fear, enjoyed by its enemies. Senator Stanford's human desire to immortalize the name of his only son induced him to found a separate institution instead of bestowing his wealth upon a university already established. Regret for the youth born to an unlimited inheritance, a poignant realization that the posterity he had hoped for, the family he had thought to found, was a futile dream; this as well as a desire to help other boys to an education induced Senator Stanford to attempt the foundation of a university. No human desire so universal and tenacious as the one which actuated Stanford. The pyramids were built for the same reason. That his seed should perish and his name be forgot in the land to which he had journeyed and which he had conquered, was bitter to the old forty-niner. The fulminations against the vanity of a man and woman who thought to make a monument out of a university ignore the primitive instincts which animated the nomad's breast before the pyramids were, and which still stir to the depths the strong man who has gone out to meet the world with his bare hands, served it, and made a mighty wage. Such men are seldom scrupulous. They have bright piercing eyes, with a light of their own like the fabled jewels that lit up caverns deep hid from the sun. Stanford used the tools he found fitted to his hands. The railroad that made Cali-

fornia accessible, would not have been built by Hamlet California would still be fifteen hundred miles overlaid away if it had not been for the fierce determined pioneers, to whom the intervening Utah desert was something to be crossed and then bridged. There are two opinions now about the right to import coolie labor. In the time of the construction of the first through line between the east and west there was but one. In the luxurious recitation room, or under the cool arcades of Stanford university the untrammled study of the California pioneer's hand-to-hand struggles with a marketable legislature is an academic temptation to which Dr. Ross yielded, all the easier because the beneficiaries of Stanford object to the monumental character of the university.

The trouble at Stanford will induce other millionaires to pause before they leave their gains, which the students are sure to be taught are illegotten, to a university. A presentable, tall dumb spire in a landscape garden cemetery, where the mounds are leveled, where a faithfully sprinkled, green turf shines responsively through the summer, and where even the inveterate lecturer's voice is still, is a wiser investment. In a cemetery there is peace, and the dead who lie there have gone to trial. They will not be tried over and over again by professors who need illustrations of wickedness for their lectures and by undergraduates, who are taught that every rich man is a robber, and that the competitive system is the code of pirates, and that excepting for the few socialists who have founded homes or settlements or written books, or resigned from lucrative jobs all the men and women who have lived and labored according to the competitive rules sinned grossly against their fellows whom they hired and bossed.

Prof. Geo. E. Howard.

There can be but one opinion in regard to Professor Howard's distinction as a historian, and his ability as a teacher. There are teachers and teachers. Occasionally there is one whose lips have been touched with a coal, who can concentrate the gaze of fifty or a hundred idly rolling eyeballs on himself, and Howard is such a man and lecturer. Besides the lesser gifts of memory and concentration of effort, he has the unteachable, unacquirable gift of inspiration. He classifies and outlines a complex subject into simplicity and breathes life into it, so that to a class, which has been with him, say six months, the study of early German institutions or Roman law seems the only vital and genuinely fascinating subjects in the curriculum. Having been fortunate enough to hear Professor Howard lecture for four years I am glad of the opportunity to testify to the soundness of his instruction and the dynamic power of his inspiration. It is a great

disappointment to his friends in Nebraska that he should have sacrificed his notable career in Stanford university out of sympathy for a man whose career and speeches do not appear to me to merit such a sacrifice. Professor Howard would be more than human if the worship of his students which followed him to California and has grown to California bulk there, should not react upon him. What he said to his class in the French Revolution after the resignation of Professor Ross had been accepted, indicates that Professor Howard has lost a part of his former sense of proportion and values. Otherwise to a class of undergraduates he could not have criticised the trustees or management of the institution of which that class was a part.

Touching The Courier's editorial of three weeks ago, Professor Howard says in a letter to the editor: "The charge that Dr. Ross has ever attacked or criticised Senator Stanford in his class-room is entirely false. It arose in the lie of a boy employed in the office of an interested lawyer in San Francisco and it was repudiated with indignation by the alumni body of that city in formal assembly. Dr. Jordan has not publicly accepted or rejected the charge. In fact, it was, at once, dropped by the enemies of Ross; and has no credence here. It is not now mentioned unless secretly. It is astonishing that the State Journal and The Courier should have gone to lower extremes in repeating false charges and disregarding all the admitted facts, than perhaps any other newspapers in the country; and I have some five hundred clippings on the Ross case. Of course, you must have been misled. From enclosed clippings, events since November may be traced. Ross' statement of November 13 is absolutely accurate (reprinted on page 3 of the Courier). I know this from documents some of which have not been published, and from the substance of Dr. Jordan's conversation with me on the evening of that day wherein he admitted the truth of every detail of Ross' statement.

It is a clear case of punishing free speech. Ross' private character is admirable and irreproachable. He is one of the ablest, most original economists and sociologists in the country. You are entirely mistaken as to his being 'wild-eyed.' He is a calm and earnest thinker. He has been one of the most popular professors, greatly beloved of his pupils, though severe in his requirements. After Dr. Jordan began to shift his ground, and to try to breach the real issue, he accused Ross of breach of confidence in making the statement of November 14. This he retracted to Ross and then sent me a letter dated November 17 (four days after Ross' statement) saying, "I wish, after conversation with Dr. Ross to withdraw anything I may have said, implying that he had knowingly used confidential material, or in any other way violated personal properties in

making his statement." Is this not by implication an admission of the truth and fairness of that statement? Is it not also by implication an admission that the commercial influences, mentioned by Ross were probably the real influence, determining Mrs Stanford's action? On Wednesday evening November 14, Dr. Jordan told me that he believed that certain men of San Francisco had influenced Mrs. Stanford to take an unwise course.

George E. Howard."

Professor Howard's letter is printed here, in order that those who read the editorial he refers to may read his side of the case, as conspicuously placed as the criticism.

Book learning.

It is generally accepted that learning acquired from books is more worthy of respect than that acquired from the experience of accomplishment. It is a far cry from the middle ages, when to write, was only the mean accomplishment of a clerk, to the beginning of the twentieth century when nearly every one can read and a few can spell and some can take a language apart and put it together again correctly. For four hundred years the profession of scholar has been growing in dignity. We have not progressed from the feudal contempt of the man who works with his hands. The laborer is now as he was when he belonged to the soil, a hind. Edward F. Adams, editor of the San Francisco Chronicle, says in regard to the Ross incident in Stanford university, that "In the second place there is here exhibited the degrading conception of a university professor as a common hired man. Such men as Ross and Howard do not receive favors from universities. They confer them. They are not dependent on any one university for their living, nor do they owe to any university their standing in the world." This paragraph correctly estimates the arrogance of the scholar towards an ignorant world. Other men, outside of universities must earn their living under all the conditions of a competitive system in active and unrestricted operation. A brilliant, learned man like Professor Howard or Professor Ross, who is occupying a life position at the head of a department of history or economics is not influenced by competition and the effect of his isolation from the system which circumscribes the actions and speech of other men is apparent in the defiant resignations at Stanford.

Among other virtues the competitive system teaches consideration and toleration for all men and their opinions. Every man, is after all, no more than "a hired man." He serves, and his services are paid for at the rate established by commercial rules. He serves the public, a corporation, or one man, it does not matter whether it is one man or many. He serves, from the time he begins to earn his