

## Correspondence

### "Borden Versus Laurier"

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: On the principle of "hear the other side," may I make two remarks on Mr. O'Hagan's letter?

(1.) He is "quite sure that the great body of the Canadians desire to continue aiding the mother country on the European battle front." Suppose we put with this some words of the Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux, one of Sir Wilfrid Laurier's lieutenants, spoken the other day:

We have no interest on the other side of the sea. . . . We have already done enough . . . until America has put 1,500,000 men into the war.

Then, too, *Le Droit*, one of Sir Wilfrid Laurier's organs, said a few days ago that Canadian soldiers have not died for their own country, which has not been in danger, but for England and France. I confidently leave to your readers the comparison of these with Mr. O'Hagan's opinion.

(2.) He also favors a referendum. But he did not say that once before Sir Wilfrid Laurier advocated it, and yet when a vast majority outside Quebec, and a large majority all over Canada (including the Quebec figures), went in favor of it, he refused to apply it, after himself urging it and setting it in motion, because he would not coerce Quebec. Can you wonder that people in Canada remember this when he again proposes the same plan?

There are other points in Mr. O'Hagan's letter which could as easily be shown to be inaccurate, but these two will suffice to indicate the reasons why some of the oldest, strongest, and most devoted Liberals have left Sir Wilfrid at the present juncture.

W. H. GRIFFITH-THOMAS

Toronto, Canada, December 8

### The Case of Leon Whipple

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In response to your request for a statement of the facts of my dismissal from the University of Virginia, I send you the following record.

On November 20 last I delivered before the Current Events Club of Sweet Briar College an address on "The Meaning of Pacifism." The nature of the address is indicated by the following condensation:

I am a pacifist because war does not remove the menace of autocracy, make the world safe for democracy, or protect our own democracy, and we should be busy trying new, noble, even visionary, methods of securing peace. I believe to work for peace, most of all during war, is the highest humanity, and so gave money to Morris Hillquit's campaign instead of buying Liberty bonds. We can still make the United States glorious by its stand for peace, although we lost the great opportunity by entering the war. Russia had the courage and vision we failed to reveal, and will be spiritual leader of the next generation, because she has faith. Cries of treason, suppression of free speech and free press, cannot stop the peace labors. Pacifists are conscripted by taxes, and conscience cannot protect them from share in the slaughter. Democracy seems unsafe in America when women are jailed for asking the democratic first right—suffrage. We can win the war only by freeing the spirit of democracy in the Germans by good-will.

My address was not a university extension lecture, but

was given by me as an individual for a fee before the Current Events Club of Sweet Briar College—a private institution for women in Virginia. The occasion seemed fitting for one teacher to discuss the principle of peace with teachers and students of another school without the charge of inciting the young ladies against the Government. The secretary of the club wrote me: "We would be delighted to have you give an explanation of pacifism," and my subject was announced on the public bulletin board of the college. The address was received with absolute dissent, but with a kind tolerance of which the women of Sweet Briar must be very proud. The president, Dr. Emilie McVea, heard the talk, and later told the press that "his utterances were those of an extreme pacifist. None of his expressions would lead one to suppose that he sympathized with the Germans."

I sent advance copies of the address to six daily papers, with letters asking publication of the views because they should be widely known. I added the news facts that I was director of the School of Journalism of the University of Virginia, and had served the People's Council. I knew I could not dissociate myself from my official position, and any effort to do so would have seemed cowardly and insincere. I did state to the Sweet Briar audience that I represented no institution or organization, disconnecting myself for them from the University and any propaganda. For my own sake, I should have included such a statement in the press report, though it would have had no effect on the test of the principle of free speech, about which I was most concerned.

Immediately President Alderman repudiated my utterances both personally and officially; fifty-five members of the faculty signed an unofficial petition to the president condemning my disloyal teaching; the Visitors and the president were overwhelmed with demands for my instant dismissal, such demands coming from the press, the public, individual alumni, alumni organizations, and public men. These demands were met with academic dignity by the faculties and the president, who refused to suspend me; so that I was insured all personal protection and courtesy by the University. The general faculty, after hearing a statement of fact from me, passed a resolution condemning and repudiating my views, and declaring that I had "abused and distorted" the right of free speech. The faculty did not suggest my removal, but it was very clear that their idea of the rights of free speech was very different from mine.

At a meeting of the Board of Visitors, on November 27, President Alderman laid the facts before the Board, together with the following comments and recommendation:

In the performance of his normal duties as a teacher here, Professor Whipple has exhibited energy, capacity, and attention to duty, and in many external ways has been a very useful member of the faculty. As a student and teacher, I have always had for him feelings of kindness and good will. The sacred right of freedom of speech so closely bound up with our University spirit has been freely accorded to Professor Whipple, as to all members of the teaching staff, but manifestly there is a limit, in law and reason, to this right, and Professor Whipple has plainly abused and distorted that right. In my judgment and in the judgment of all his colleagues the address of Professor Whipple herein submitted, however sincerely held or sincerely uttered, constitutes in its totality and in its specific utterances a document of disloyalty, a counsel of national dishonor, a frank incitement to inactivity in the presence of aggression, a condemnation of the Government and of national leadership, a plea for the impairment of the nation's spirit and energy in the face of grave internal peril and foreign war, a disparagement of

those who are willing to die to win a peace based on freedom rather than to accept, without struggle, a peace based on servitude.

Holding this judgment of Professor Whipple's utterances, and knowing that he not only believes what he says, but feels in duty bound to propagate his theories everywhere within his power outside of his classroom, I reach the conclusion, with deep personal regret, that Professor Whipple cannot longer discharge the duties of a professor in this University, which is committed to the necessity and righteousness of this war and is proudly sending its sons, graduate and undergraduate, to the battle line. It is, therefore, incumbent upon me to recommend to the rector and visitors that they declare the appointment of Leon R. Whipple as adjunct professor of journalism to be rescinded, and the chair of journalism to be vacant from this date.

(Signed) EDWIN A. ALDERMAN, President.

I received the opportunity to defend myself, and read before the Board of Visitors a formal statement upholding freedom of speech and conscience and declaring:

I deny that, in speaking the truth so far as it can be revealed to one human being's mind and heart, I injure the real and noble ideals of this nation, dim the glory of this university, or am less fitted to teach its students. I deny that I have endangered the true greatness or safety of this nation, for its single greatness and its single safety is the right of truth to prevail. I deny that I have harmed an institution founded by a great lover of human liberty, Thomas Jefferson, in order that the democracy of this State might seek and learn the truth wherever it might lead.

The six members of the Visitors present voted unanimously to declare my chair vacant forthwith.

Freed of verbiage and confusion, the issue was simple: Can teachers in our universities, of admitted sincerity, effectiveness, and good social intent, state publicly any difference of views on the present war from those held by their colleagues, the university governors, or the public, without paying the price of their position and all opportunity for usefulness therein? It is plain that the teacher cannot dissociate himself and his views from his official place and work—nor should he. The net result must be either to kill the expression of all minority opinion in our universities or to remove from their faculties those men who can at least claim initiative and courage.

I add that the Government of the people of the United States with a wise tolerance, usually to be more readily anticipated in seats of learning than in political bodies, has as yet refused to question my loyalty.

LEON R. WHIPPLE

Richmond, Va., December 8

## President Duniway Replies

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In your issue of November 1 you publish a letter from Homer E. Woodbridge under the heading, "The Controversy at Colorado College." Fair-minded persons who wish to form correct judgments on the subjects treated by Mr. Woodbridge cannot rely upon his presentation for completeness or candor. He writes concerning matters on which he has been and is an active partisan.

Most of the errors and misinterpretations in Mr. Woodbridge's letter it is not expedient to deal with by the method of newspaper controversy. Whether trustees of Colorado College wish to answer statements regarding their action as to Dr. Parsons—action which was taken by them before my coming to my present position—they will decide. Your

readers ought to be informed that on November 16 the following resolutions were passed by the trustees without a dissenting vote:

Be it resolved, that we, the members of the Board of Trustees of Colorado College, notwithstanding our opinion that the dismissal of Dr. E. S. Parsons in July last was justified by his conduct in collegiate matters and by his attitude toward this Board, declare our continued willingness to grant him further hearings for the presentation of any material evidence which he may wish to lay before us. Not only was this implied by our vote of August 30 to reinstate him, but he was assured in writing that he would not again be dismissed unless such action should be decided upon after an adequate hearing. Should he request it, a hearing will be expedited, to be given as promptly as it can be satisfactorily arranged. From the information now before us, it appears that Dr. Parsons does not ask or desire this Board to grant him a hearing, and therefore we take no further action on the subject at this time.

Be it also resolved, that we would be willing for the sake of conciliation to provide for full investigation by a disinterested educator as mediator, asking him to make recommendations for the wise settlement of controversy regarding the case of Dr. Parsons. The choice of a distinguished educator as mediator we would leave to agreement by President Argo, of the General Alumni Association; Dean Cajori, of the Faculty, and Mr. Irving Howbert, of this Board. To these ends, Mr. Howbert is hereby authorized to take appropriate action on behalf of the Board if it should appear to him that this proposal will be accepted by those concerned.

Regarding my acts and policies as president, Mr. Woodbridge makes serious misrepresentations. On two points only do I desire to make specific answers. The reinstatement of Dean Parsons as recommended by me on August 30 was made in entire good faith and without ambiguity—not as a final settlement of the case, but as a peace measure preliminary to such settlement. It is simply not true that I "cheerfully accept" a "copper-mine theory of administration"—if any definite meaning attaches to that branding phrase.

Whatever may be believed or disbelieved regarding "the case of Dean Parsons," there is no justification for thinking that the administration of Colorado College will be either immoral or reactionary. The ideas of radicals and revolutionists are not likely to prevail, but progressive measures of practical character will be favorably considered. The trustees have unanimously adopted the following resolution on my recommendation:

Be it resolved, that the President of the College is hereby authorized to appoint a joint committee of three Trustees and three members of the Faculty, to act under his chairmanship, to study and report recommendations for improvement of the organization and administration of the College.

C. A. DUNIWAY

Colorado College, November 19

## Thomas Chandler Haliburton

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: May I ask through your columns for the use of any material your readers may have in the way of unpublished letters, journals, or reminiscences of Judge Thomas Chandler Haliburton, of Nova Scotia (1796-1865), the creator of "Sam Slick"? I am working on a critical biography of Haliburton, and should be grateful for any intimate personal detail concerning him.

V. L. O. CHITTICK

Columbia University, October 27



## BOOKS

Another Instalment of Channing's  
History

*A History of the United States.* By Edward Channing. Vol. IV, Federalists and Republicans, 1789-1815. New York: The Macmillan Company. \$2.75 net.

IN the fourth volume of his admirable work, Professor Channing deals with one of the most critical and formative periods in the history of our country—a period which saw the establishment of our national government and the solution of many perplexing problems that arose out of our relations with the Old World.

Beginning with March 4, 1789, the date set for starting operations under the new Constitution, the narrative presents first of all certain characteristics of the time, when, "living and the ideas of life" were "far removed from ours, materially, morally, and mentally," and then passes on to recount the details of government under Washington and Adams, touching upon politics, the Cabinet, office-seeking and holding, credit and finance, commerce, foreign policy, the rise of parties, and the eventual downfall of Federalism. About the middle of the volume, the author reaches the "Revolution" of 1800, which to him was not a revolution at all, but an accident of politics, and deals at length with the Jeffersonian programme, the purchase of Louisiana and what it involved, including the story of Burr, Wilkinson, and the treason charge, which he rightly reduces to its proper terms. He then reaches the intricate tangle of foreign relations, which enmeshed the country in the bonds of the embargo and other commercial devices, led up to a situation that became embarrassing and almost unbearable, because of the demands of the Napoleonic wars and the Continental System, and finally emerged in the War of 1812, to which Professor Channing devotes about a fifth of his volume. In a final chapter he treats of the peace negotiations, finding a place there, oddly enough, for an account of the Hartford Convention, and in closing announces that he has, for the time being, finished with the East, and in his next volume will concern himself with the time when "the American nation, with its back to Europe and its face to the West, addressed itself to the solution of the problem of the nineteenth century." Volume five will, therefore, treat of the West.

This history is no re-threshing of old straw: its pages are everywhere characterized by freshness, originality, and novelty, both in the information furnished and in the opinions expressed. Professor Channing has gone his own way and worked out for himself the period and its problems. He has examined anew the large body of available material which, in print and manuscript, has been accumulating rapidly during the last twenty-five years, and, using not a little of it for the first time in a general treatise, has made up his own story, without much regard to what his predecessors have done. Though he frequently refers to secondary authorities, such as Henry Adams, Admiral Mahan, and others, he uses them chiefly to check up his own conclusions, and refers to them in order that the reader may know where to go for additional facts. His notes and bibliographical comments are full and always interesting, performing a useful and necessary function in a work which is designed to impart

information and elucidate historical difficulties; and his frequent acknowledgment of the assistance received from others, some of them doubtless his own students, is unusually generous. This history has been wrought by hard labor from the raw material or from material that has been only in part worked over, and it has been shaped with the art and cunning of a practiced hand into a masterpiece true in every line to the plan and purpose of the workman. If we accept Professor Channing's ideas as to what a history ought to be, we have only praise for the results accomplished; and even if we are not satisfied with his product as a model of historical craftsmanship, we recognize to the full the fairness, good sense, and shrewd wit that the author displays in his rendering of the history of the period.

A writer is entitled to his own opinion as to how his history should be written, and a reviewer is privileged to say wherein, for the purpose in hand, he deems the results incomplete. Professor Channing is writing the history of the United States, and not, apparently, of the American people. He is, therefore, probably justified in devoting the first half of the volume to an account of the working of the Federal Government, in terms of the men who composed it, and the second half to a record of diplomacy and war, as conducted by those who were entrusted with their respective missions and commands. Interspersed are chapters or portions of chapters dealing with such supplemental issues as the slave trade, the Florida question, the Barbary war, commerce in its manifold forms, and the effect of governmental policy, diplomacy, and war upon trade, prices, prosperity, and conditions of life generally. These accounts are made up of concrete statements drawn from individual careers or experiences, and of figures and estimates extracted from the gazetteers and newspapers of the day. In these sections we have some of Professor Channing's best work, accurate, informing, and generally to the point. The selection of topics, however, though not arbitrary, is somewhat haphazard, governed by preference rather than logic, for the sequences are without other nexus than that of convenience in grouping subjects that seem in a way related to each other. Professor Channing has not a logical mind, and probably does not believe that logic has anything to do with the writing of history.

When it comes to the business of presenting his subject, Professor Channing shows himself an analyst rather than a synthetist, and makes no effort to correlate the two mental processes. He always walks with his feet on the ground, observing, testing, recording. What he wants are the facts that can be associated with definite persons, for such facts only are to him capable of proof. He is interested in individuals and not in groups or masses, and he seems to care nothing for institutions, movements, or mental and social forces, because these are too vague and indefinite to be chronicled. He prefers men, their personalities, motives, likes and dislikes, successes and failures, and has little or no regard for precedent or tradition or such manifestations of popular sentiment and emotion as cannot be pinned down and labelled. Inevitably, therefore, his narrative runs very much along the surface, as would the account of a contemporary observer, and rarely looks to the past or anticipates the future. The idea of progress or development does not enter into his pages, and so restricted is his field of observation and small the stage upon which his characters move that we should hardly imagine there were seven million people living in the country the history of which he is narrating.