

# SCIENCE

A WEEKLY JOURNAL DEVOTED TO THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE, PUBLISHING THE  
OFFICIAL NOTICES AND PROCEEDINGS OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION  
FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE.

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE: S. NEWCOMB, Mathematics; R. S. WOODWARD, Mechanics; E. C. PICKERING, Astronomy; T. C. MENDENHALL, Physics; R. H. THURSTON, Engineering; IRA REMSEN, Chemistry; JOSEPH LE CONTE, Geology; W. M. DAVIS, Physiography; HENRY F. OSBORN, Paleontology; W. K. BROOKS, C. HART MERRIAM, Zoology; S. H. SCUDDER, Entomology; C. E. BESSEY, N. L. BRITTON, Botany; C. S. MINOT, Embryology, Histology; H. P. BOWDITCH, Physiology; J. S. BILLINGS, Hygiene; WILLIAM H. WELCH, Pathology; J. MCKEEN CATTELL, Psychology; J. W. POWELL, Anthropology.

FRIDAY, MARCH 8, 1901.

## CONTENTS:

<i>The Case of Professor Ross</i> .....	361
<i>The Second Meeting of Naturalists at Chicago</i> : PROFESSOR CHAS. B. DAVENPORT.....	370
<i>Annual Meeting of the New York Academy of Sciences</i> : PROFESSOR RICHARD E. DODGE.....	379
<i>Recent Progress in Geodesy</i> : DR. JOHN FILLMORE HAYFORD.....	381
<i>The San Jose Scale</i> : PROFESSOR VERNON L. KELLOGG .....	383
<i>Scientific Books</i> :—	
<i>Scott's Studies in Fossil Botany</i> : PROFESSOR D. P. PENHALLOW. <i>Howard's Study of the Insect Fauna of Human Excrement</i> : PROFESSOR D. T. A. COCKERELL. <i>Books Received</i> .....	386
<i>Scientific Journals and Articles</i> .....	390
<i>Societies and Academies</i> :—	
<i>Anthropological Society of Washington</i> : DR. WALTER HOUGH. <i>Biological Society of Washington</i> : F. A. LUCAS. <i>The New York Section of the American Chemical Society</i> : DR. DURAND WOODMAN. <i>The Western Philosophical Association</i> .....	391
<i>Discussion and Correspondence</i> :—	
<i>Crocodylian Nomenclature</i> : DR. LEONHARD STEJNEGER.....	394
<i>Shorter Articles</i> :—	
<i>Stratigraphical Note</i> : DR. H. M. AMI. <i>The Influence of Light on the Length of the Hypocotyl in Indian Corn</i> : PROFESSOR E. S. GOFF.....	394
<i>Current Notes on Physiography</i> :—	
<i>Alegany County, Maryland; The Philippine Islands; Overdeepened Alpine Valleys</i> : PROFESSOR W. M. DAVIS.....	395
<i>Botanical Notes</i> :—	
<i>Elliott's Grasses; Wood's Holl Botany; New Species of North American Trees; Selby's Handbook of Plant Diseases</i> : PROFESSOR CHARLES E. BESSEY.....	397
<i>Scientific Notes and News</i> .....	398
<i>University and Educational News</i> .....	400

MSS. intended for publication and books, etc., intended or review should be sent to the responsible editor, Prof. Garrison-on-Hudson, N. Y.

## THE CASE OF PROFESSOR ROSS.

IN view of the interest excited in academic and scientific circles by the circumstances connected with the dismissal of Professor Ross from Stanford University, we publish in full the report of the committee of San Francisco Alumni and of a committee of economists. It will be observed that they come to exactly opposite conclusions. The alumni maintain that the dismissal of Professor Ross did not infringe on the right of free speech, while the economists side with Professor Ross in his claim that he is a martyr. It may seem ungracious for men of science, who have in the past suffered for truth's sake and have won the right to free scientific investigation, not to take sides with their colleagues in sociology and economics when they unite to urge the right of academic freedom. But we can not escape the conviction that the report of the three economists is a partisan rather than a judicial document.

A distinction must be made between freedom of speech and license of speech, between the right to investigate and the desirability of using a university as a point of vantage for propagandism. Our universities should be conservative—they should

be careful in the appointment of professors and doubly careful in their dismissal. But the freedom of the individual must be subordinate to the freedom of the university. Academic freedom is the right to speak academically, and the university professor not only enjoys privileges, but also undertakes obligations.

There is no reason why as an individual Mr. Ross should not have supported by illustrated pamphlets and stump speeches free silver and Mr. Bryan in the campaign of 1896, but he should not have done so to the injury of the university. Professor Ross's methods of treating social problems may be illustrated by an extract from an article published by him the month of his dismissal. He writes in the *American Journal of Sociology*:

A predatory minority, then, presents itself at first as a governing class that by its toils, cares, and risks contrives to draw to itself the surplus goods of the governed. But, at a later stage of development, enjoyment and control are no longer vested in the same persons. The anatomy of a parasitic organization now shows at the center certain idle enjoyers surrounded by a great number of unproductive laborers who share in their spoil, and who in return busy themselves, as retainers, mercenaries, police, priests, teachers, or publicists, in intimidating, cajoling, or beguiling the exploited majority.

As President Jordan has stated, Professor Ross has many admirable qualities and his extravagances were long born with. If we understand the matter correctly President Jordan fully concurred with Mrs. Stanford in recognizing Professor Ross's disabilities, but wished to avoid the publicity which has been brought on the university. There is no doubt but that Professor Ross has shown his unfitness for an academic

position by the way he has acted since presenting his resignation to President Jordan. He said he resigned because "I am unwilling to become a cause of worry to Mrs. Stanford or of embarrassment to you." As soon as the resignation was accepted, which was done in as kind a way as possible, he does all he can to annoy Mrs. Stanford, to embarrass President Jordan and to injure the university.

The fact that Mrs. Stanford has recently given twenty-seven million dollars to the university and has retained for the present the rights that will later devolve on a board of trustees makes it somewhat easy to attack the university, but puts heavy responsibility on those who carry on such an attack. We are aware of the dangers due to the fact that many of our institutions are supported by rich men and to a certain extent controlled by them. But an impartial review of the history of university development in America shows that great tolerance has been allowed to university professors. The call of President Andrews and Professor Ross to a university supported by a State and controlled by a political party seems to be more dangerous for academic freedom than their dismissal from other universities. But on the whole there is no valid reason to criticize either our privately endowed or our State universities on the ground of suppression of legitimate freedom of speech.

#### REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF SAN FRANCISCO ALUMNI.

Your committee elected at the meeting of the association held November 20, 1900, to ascertain the confidential and other reasons

for Dr. Ross's enforced resignation begs leave to report :

That inasmuch as those interviewed, on both sides, have stipulated that the detailed information received should be treated as confidential, your committee is able to report only the ultimate facts. These are as follows :

First. Mrs. Stanford shared in the opinion general in university circles in 1896 that Dr. Ross's pamphlet entitled 'An Honest Dollar,' illustrated by political cartoons, signed by him as 'Professor of Economics in the Leland Stanford Jr. University,' and published and circulated by one of the political parties during the campaign of that year, was undignified in its form and manner of treatment, and that it was unwise in the point of the time and manner of its publication, because jeopardizing the University's right to a reputation for political non-partisanship. This incident, together with Dr. Ross's general conduct throughout that campaign, was deemed by Mrs. Stanford a symptom of unfitness for the responsible position of head of the economics department of the University.

Second. The justness of the criticism then expressed must be deemed to be conceded by Dr. Ross, since it has been admitted by him to your committee that he would not again pursue the same course under similar circumstances.

Third. Your committee is unable to find that Mrs. Stanford's objection arose because Dr. Ross's opinion differed from her own, since it is in evidence that she had at that time no opinion upon either side of the particular financial theories then in issue, and since she has not abandoned her objection to his conduct in the campaign of 1896, although his views upon the silver question thereafter radically changed.

Fourth. That from December, 1896, when Dr. Ross's chair was changed from economics to social science, until the time

of his dismissal his position in the University was probational.

Fifth. That the want of confidence engendered by the incidents of 1896 was never removed from Mrs. Stanford's mind, but was accentuated by other incidents impairing her faith in his good taste and discretion. Among these your committee has found : The use of slang in his public and classroom lectures, brought to her attention by friends present, and by lampoons in the college annuals, and reports that his classroom lectures contained references derogatory to her deceased husband.

Sixth. Your committee has been unable to find any evidence that Mrs. Stanford ever took exceptions to Dr. Ross's economic teachings.

Seventh. That her ultimate demand for his resignation was not due to opinions expressed in his speeches on 'Coolie Immigration' and the 'Twentieth Century City,' but was because she deemed that her original estimate had proved correct, and that he was redisplaying, after three years of trial, those qualities found objectionable in the instance of her original action.

In passing upon the question whether Mrs. Stanford's action involved any abridgment of the right of free speech, your committee has considered very carefully the published statement of Dr. Ross, and the proofs upon which it is founded. In deliberating upon these, however, your committee has been unable to escape the force of the following facts :

First. Dr. Ross was not in the position of one able to remain in the University who chose to resign, but of one who, willing to remain, was forced to resign. His statement, therefore, necessarily attempted to tell Mrs. Stanford's reasons for forcing him out and not his own for going ; hence it cannot have the probative force of his own reasons for his own acts.

Second. Dr. Ross's statement ignores the

criticism arising from his conduct during the campaign of 1896; notwithstanding that he knew at the time of publishing his statement that it was one of the operative reasons for his dismissal.

Third. The established fact that Dr. Ross desired to remain at Stanford, notwithstanding Mrs. Stanford's criticism, is inconsistent with the theory that he really regarded those criticisms as involving any abridgment of his right of free speech.

Fourth. The admission of Dr. Ross to your committee that he would not regard a university rule against the participation in politics by a university professor of economics during the progress of a political campaign as impairing the proper right of academic freedom, disposes of his contention that the criticism of his conduct in 1896 is capable of that construction.

From the foregoing facts and upon the testimony as a whole, your committee concludes that the action of Mrs. Stanford in asking the dismissal of Dr. Ross involved no infringement of the right of free speech.

#### REPORT OF A COMMITTEE OF ECONOMISTS.

The committee, appointed at the meeting of the economists in Detroit, December 28, 1900, to enquire into the cause of the dismissal of Professor Ross from Leland Stanford University, has earnestly endeavored to learn the facts of the case. In addition to a careful examination of the statements made in the newspapers, we have asked Professor Jordan for a full and frank statement of the causes which led to Professor Ross's removal, and have obtained the replies printed in the appendix, in which Professor Jordan declines to give specific information in regard to them. We have also in our possession copies of letters bearing upon this case from various persons, including letters from Professor Ross, as well as from President Jordan, not only to Professor Ross, but also to others.

The following facts are, we believe, undisputed:

It is customary for professors in the Leland Stanford University to be reappointed early in May of each year. Professor Ross failed to receive his annual reappointment early in May, 1900. He was, however, reappointed on June 2d. On June 5th, he handed to President Jordan his resignation as follows:

*Dear Dr. Jordan:* I was sorry to learn from you a fortnight ago that Mrs. Stanford does not approve of me as an economist, and does not want me to remain here. It was a pleasure, however, to learn at the same time of the unqualified terms in which you had expressed to her your opinion of my work and your complete confidence in me as a teacher, a scientist and a man.

While I appreciate the steadfast support you have given me, I am unwilling to become a cause of worry to Mrs. Stanford or of embarrassment to you. I, therefore, beg leave to offer my resignation as professor of sociology, the same to take effect at the close of the academic year, 1900-1901.

This resignation was not acted on until November 12th, when it was accepted by President Jordan in the following letter:

I have waited till now in the hope that circumstances might arise which would lead you to a reconsideration. As this has not been the case, I, therefore, with great reluctance, accept your resignation, to take effect at your own convenience. In doing so I wish to express once more the high esteem in which your work, as a student and a teacher, as well as your character as a man, is held by all your colleagues.

On November 14th, Professor Ross authorized the publication in the newspapers of a statement setting forth the causes of his resignation and its acceptance, attributing it to a dissatisfaction felt by Mrs. Stanford with his expressions of opinion on questions of public policy, particularly Coolidge Immigration and Municipal Ownership of public service corporations. On the following day, President Jordan wrote Professor Ross to the effect that, in view of his published statement, it was desirable that

his connection with the University should terminate immediately.

The evidence which we have been able to obtain indicates clearly also the following facts :

1. The causes which led to the dismissal of Professor Ross existed in May, 1900.

2. Although the dismissal of Professor Ross may have been occasioned by his published statement of November 14th, his resignation was practically forced by the wish of Mrs. Stanford. This fact is distinctly stated in the report of the Alumni Committee of Investigation which report apparently has the full endorsement of the University authorities.

3. Mrs. Stanford's wishes in the matter were expressed as early as May, 1900.

4. The delay in the acceptance of Professor Ross's resignation was due to an effort on the part of Professor Jordan to overcome Mrs. Stanford's objections.

The question in regard to which we have been called upon to express an opinion is : What were the reasons which led Mrs. Stanford to force Professor Ross's resignation ?

Two classes of reasons have been alleged :

1. Dissatisfaction on the part of Mrs. Stanford with Professor Ross's expressions of opinion on questions of economic policy, notably in regard to the free coinage of silver in the campaign of 1896, and more recently in regard to coolie immigration and municipal monopolies.

2. It has been asserted or suggested that Professor Ross had made statements before his classes reflecting upon Senator Stanford, that he had shown himself selfish and lacking in loyalty to the University, that he was erratic and frequently overstepped the bounds of academic propriety in the manner of giving expression to his opinions, that his publication of November 14th was a violation of confidence, and that

there are facts which, if disclosed, would reflect upon his personal character.

While it is, of course, impossible for us definitely to determine what facts, or reports of supposed facts, may have weighed with Mrs. Stanford, the evidence in the possession of the committee seems to justify the following conclusions :

1. There is no evidence to show that Professor Ross gave occasion for his dismissal by any defect in moral character. On the contrary, President Jordan states in his letter of February 7th to the committee : " No ground exists for any interpretation of his dismissal reflecting on his private character."

2. There is no evidence to show that Professor Ross gave occasion for his dismissal by incompetence. On the contrary, President Jordan stated in a letter of May, 1900, that 'he was a 'careful thinker and a patient investigator'; 'a constant source of strength' to the University and 'one of the best teachers, always just, moderate and fair.'

3. There is no evidence to show that Professor Ross gave occasion for his dismissal by any unfaithfulness in the discharge of his duties. On the contrary, President Jordan stated in a letter of May, 1900, that 'he has been most loyal, accepting extra work and all kinds of embarrassments without a word of complaint,' and that he was 'a wise, learned and noble man, one of the most loyal and devoted of all the band' at the University.

4. There is no evidence to show that in his published statement of November 14th Professor Ross violated any confidence reposed in him. On the contrary, in a letter of December 24th, President Jordan states : "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 proprieties in making his statement."

5. Concerning the point that Professor Ross gave occasion for his dismissal by remarks derogatory to Senator Stanford, your committee finds in a statement by Mr. C. F. Lummis, in *The Land of Sunshine*, dated Christmas, 1900, the following passage :

The precise words Professor Ross may have used I do not know, but I do know that he has stated in his classes in Stanford many things which his students understood to be reflections on Senator Stanford, and I know also that Mrs. Stanford firmly believes that he did slur her husband's memory.

In *The Independent* of February 7, 1901, Mr. Lummis repeats this charge, quoting Mrs. Stanford's reasons for his dismissal :  
' \* \* \* He has called my husband a thief.'

The committee also finds that President Jordan in a letter of November 16, 1900, states :

Mr. Keesling informs me that he and others of the alumni have heard you in your classes condemn the means by which Mr. Stanford became rich in such a way as to make it clearly a personal reference, and that some time last year Mrs. Stanford was told this by a prominent alumnus, Mr. Crothers, if I understood correctly.

In a letter of the next day, however, President Jordan retracts this by saying "Mr. Crothers tells me that he has never mentioned the matter in question to Mrs. Stanford. I was not sure that I understood my informant to say so."

Professor Ross, moreover, at the time, unqualifiedly denied all such charges, and insisted that statements to this effect were 'a thorough-paced falsehood and a disingenuous attempt to befog the real issue.' In another place he says : "The charge from any quarter that I have ever made remarks derogatory to the character of Senator Stanford is false—absolutely without foundation." In a subsequent letter he states : "I have never referred in a derogatory way to Senator Stanford, nor have I reflected upon the manner in which he accumulated his fortune. Both my sincere respect

for the Senator and my sense of the proprieties of my position forbade anything of the kind."

Moreover, that this charge could not have been a determining cause in President Jordan's acceptance of Professor Ross's resignation, is shown by the fact that in a letter of November 16th, two days after his dismissal, President Jordan says, in reference to these charges : "I never heard anything of the sort before."

6. There is no evidence to show that in the opinion of the President of the University, Professor Ross, in his utterances on the silver question, on coolie immigration, or on municipal ownership, overstepped the limits of the professorial propriety. On the contrary, President Jordan stated in May, 1900, that his remarks on coolie immigration and on municipal ownership were in accord with the drift of public sentiment on those subjects, and that even on the silver question 'he never stepped outside of the recognized rights of a professor.'

7. There is evidence to show :

(a) That Mrs. Stanford's objections to Professor Ross were due, in part at all events, to his former attitude on the silver question, and to his utterances on coolie immigration and on municipal ownership; and

(b) That while the dissatisfaction of Mrs. Stanford due to his former attitude on the silver question antedated his utterances on coolie immigration and municipal ownership, her dissatisfaction was greatly increased by these utterances.

As to (a). This is shown by the fact that President Jordan at first attempted to deter Mrs. Stanford from taking any action for such reasons, stating in a letter of May, 1900 : "I feel sure that if his critics would come forth and make their complaints to me in manly fashion I could convince any of them that they have no real ground for complaint." President Jordan, moreover,

intimated that to dismiss him for such reasons would be improper in the extreme, for 'no graver charge can be made against a University than that it denies its professors freedom of speech.'

As to (b). This is shown by the fact that not until immediately after the delivery of the coolie immigration speech did Mrs. Stanford force Professor Ross's resignation as well as by the fact that in a letter of June, 1900, President Jordan stated: "The matter of immigration she (Mrs. Stanford) takes most seriously."

In the same letter, while Mrs. Stanford's objection is declared to be due to the fact that the reputation of the University for serious conservatism is impaired by the hasty acceptance of social and political fads, it is added, that these 'local criticisms' which weighed with Mrs. Stanford 'unfortunately are based on chance matters and *obiter dicta* not at all upon your serious work.'

We have not deemed it wise to publish in full the letters upon which we have based our conclusions, but we stand ready to publish them if such a course is necessary to establish the truth in this matter.

We are aware that, owing to the failure of President Jordan to give definite replies to all our questions, there may be important facts with which we are unacquainted. On the other hand, we cannot but feel that a refusal to furnish specific information in a case of such importance—in which it is charged that the freedom of speech is at stake—is itself a fact of significance, which, to say the least, is much to be regretted.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

EDWIN R. A. SELIGMAN, Professor of Political Economy and Finance, Columbia University.

HENRY W. FARNAM, Professor of Political Economy, Yale University.

HENRY B. GARDNER, Professor of Political Economy, Brown University.

February 20, 1901.

The undersigned have examined the evidence submitted by the above committee, and believe that it justifies the conclusions which they have drawn.

HORACE WHITE, Editor of the *Evening Post*, New York.

JOHN B. CLARK, Columbia University.

HENRY C. ADAMS, University of Michigan.

FRANK W. TAUSSIG, Harvard University.

RICHARD T. ELY, University of Wisconsin.

SIMON N. PATTEN, University of Pennsylvania.

RICHMOND MAYO-SMITH, Columbia University.

JOHN C. SCHWAB, Yale University.

SIDNEY SHERWOOD, Johns Hopkins University.

FRANKLIN H. GIDDINGS, Columbia University.

WILLIAM J. ASHLEY, Harvard University.

CHARLES H. HULL, Cornell University.

DAVIS R. DEWEY, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

HENRY C. EMERY, Yale University.

HENRY R. SEAGER, University of Pennsylvania.

#### APPENDIX.

DECEMBER, 30, 1900.

PRESIDENT JORDAN,

*Leland Stanford Junior University,  
Palo Alto, Cal.*

*Dear Sir:* In behalf of a considerable number of economists, recently assembled in Detroit and much interested in the resignation of Professor Ross from the Leland Stanford University, we venture to address you on the subject. We understand from the public prints as well as from other sources, that Professor Ross was asked to sever his connection with the University owing to the loss of confidence in him by Mrs. Stanford, and that this loss of confidence was due primarily to the opinions expressed by him in a lecture on the subject

of coolie immigration as well as to incidental remarks on the problems of municipal ownership.

May we inquire whether, as it has been alleged in some of the Eastern journals, there are any other reasons than those mentioned for the resignation of Professor Ross, and may we hope that, if such other reasons exist, you may be disposed to communicate them to us? Many university men have been led to believe that in this case the legitimate freedom of thought without which no progress in science is possible has been discouraged. As this is a matter which concerns not a single university, but the interests of scholarship all over the country, we believe that we are not overstepping the bounds of propriety in asking information which will enable university teachers to form a just opinion on the merits of the case.

We desire to add that Dr. Ross is neither the instigator of this letter nor aware of its contents. Very truly yours,

EDWIN R. A. SELIGMAN,  
Columbia University.  
HENRY W. FARNAM,  
Yale University.  
HENRY B. GARDNER,  
Brown University.

LELAND STANFORD JUNIOR UNIVERSITY,  
STANFORD UNIVERSITY, Cal.,  
January 7, 1901.

PROFESSOR EDWIN R. A. SELIGMAN,  
Columbia University, New York City.

*My Dear Sir:* In response to your kind letter of December 30th, permit me to say that in view of the importance of the matter I have referred the contents of your letter to a committee of three of our professors, Vice-President J. C. Branner, Dr. J. M. Stillman and Dr. C. H. Gilbert. They are in possession of the facts and are at liberty to answer any questions which your committee may desire to ask. For reasons

which will readily appear it has not been deemed advisable for us to state the reasons why Dr. Ross was dismissed. His statement to the press does not assign any of the true reasons. Very truly yours,

DAVID JORDAN,  
President.

LELAND STANFORD JUNIOR UNIVERSITY,  
January 14, 1901.

PROFESSOR EDWIN R. A. SELIGMAN,  
PROFESSOR HENRY W. FARNAM,  
PROFESSOR HENRY B. GARDNER.

*Dear Sirs:* Your letter of December 30th addressed to President Jordan has been referred by him to us for reply.

In your letter you say: "We understand from the public prints as well as from other sources that Professor Ross was asked to sever his connection with the University owing to loss of confidence in him by Mrs. Stanford, and that this loss of confidence was due primarily to the opinions expressed by him in a lecture on the subject of coolie immigration as well as to incidental remarks on the problem of municipal ownership."

In reply we beg to say that the dissatisfaction of the University management with Professor Ross antedated his utterances on the topics you refer to. His removal was not due primarily to what he published, said or thought in regard to coolie immigration or in regard to municipal ownership.

We can assure you furthermore that in our opinion his removal cannot be interpreted as an interference with freedom of speech or thought within the proper and reasonable meaning of that expression.

These statements are made with a full knowledge of the facts of the case.

Very truly yours,  
J. C. BRANNER,  
J. M. STILLMAN,  
C. H. GILBERT.



January 30, 1901.

PRESIDENT JORDAN,

*Leland Stanford University,  
Palo Alto., California.*

Dear Sir: We beg to acknowledge receipt of your letter of January 7th, as well as the letter of your committee of three, of January 14th.

You state in your letter that you are ready to answer all questions. May we venture to put the following:

1. In the committee's letter of January 14th, it is stated that the 'dissatisfaction of the University Management with Professor Ross antedated his utterances on the topics you refer to.' How can this dissatisfaction of the University management be made to agree with the statement of the President, speaking for himself and the faculty, and quoted in the public prints of November 14th as follows:

a.—Extract from a letter from Professor Ross to President Jordan: "It was a pleasure, however, to learn from you of the unqualified terms in which you have expressed to her (Mrs. Stanford) your high opinion of my work and your complete confidence in me as a teacher, a scientist, and a man."

b.—Quotation from a letter from President Jordan to Professor Ross: "I wish to express once more the high esteem in which your work as a student and a teacher, as well as your character as a man, is held by your colleagues."

2. In your letter of January 7th, you say: "His (Professor Ross's) statement to the press does not assign any of the true reasons." If the speeches on coolie immigration and municipal ownership did not constitute any of the reasons for his dismissal, why was the dissatisfaction, which in your judgment antedated these speeches, not manifested until immediately after the delivery of the same? Why was the reappointment so dubious and tardy while Professor Ross had no intimation of his possible non-appointment till May 18th?

3. In saying that Professor Ross does not assign any of the true reasons for his dis-

missal, do we understand you to deny the truth of Professor Ross's published statement, containing quotations from your remarks to him:

a.—That "he (Dr. Jordan) had heard from her (Mrs. Stanford) just after my address on coolie immigration."

b.—That "quite unexpectedly to him (President Jordan) Mrs. Stanford had shown herself greatly displeased with me (Professor Ross)."

c.—That "he (President Jordan) was profoundly distressed at the idea of dismissing a scientist for utterances within the scientist's own field."

d.—That "he (President Jordan) made earnest representations to Mrs. Stanford."

4. What are the real reasons for the dismissal of Dr. Ross? In your letter of January 7th, you say: "For reasons which will readily appear, it has not been deemed advisable for us to state the reasons why Dr. Ross was dismissed." Will you pardon us for saying that we fail readily to recognize any such reasons? If the reasons are that you fear to injure the personal reputation of Professor Ross, may we venture to suggest that nothing that you could do would be more calculated to injure Dr. Ross than the insinuation that there are some secret reasons which cannot be divulged. It is just because some such innuendoes have been printed in the papers that our committee addressed itself to you, in order to ascertain the true state of affairs. While we regret to prolong this correspondence, you will readily see that unless we can give the members of the American Economic Association some explicit reasons for Professor Ross's dismissal other than those assigned by him, they will naturally adhere to the opinion based upon the statements first made in the public press. A mere denial of the truth of the statements made by him will not be apt to satisfy gentlemen who are not willing to believe that any of the parties concerned in the question would intentionally make a false statement, and facts alone will enable them

to reconcile assertions that would otherwise seem contradictory. It is for that reason that we venture again to express the hope that a more explicit answer may be given to our questions.

Very truly yours,

EDWIN R. A. SELIGMAN,  
HENRY W. FARNAM,  
HENRY B. GARDNER.

LELAND STANFORD UNIVERSITY, CAL.,

February 7, 1901.

PROFESSOR EDWIN R. A. SELIGMAN,  
PROFESSOR HENRY W. FARNAM,  
PROFESSOR HENRY B. GARDNER.

*Gentlemen:* Your letter of January 30th is at hand asking further information as to the reasons for the dismissal of Professor Ross. When I expressed my willingness to answer further questions I did not mean to indicate that I would enter into any circumstantial description of events leading to or following from Professor Ross's dismissal. Nor do I consider it expedient or proper to go into a discussion of extracts from my letters or conversations or of my statements or alleged statements, or those of others, as published in the newspapers. There are, however, certain assurances which it is within the privilege of the public to ask, and which it is my desire to furnish, that the public may be assisted in forming a judgment as to the position of the University upon important questions. It seems to me that I shall answer these questions best by certain plain statements which involve the important facts concerning the University. It will be necessary for you to assume my knowledge of all the facts, also that the interpretation herewith presented is authoritative from the University standpoint.

First. Professor Ross was not dismissed on account of his views on Oriental immigration nor on account of his opinion on any economic question.

Second. Professor Ross was dismissed

because in the judgment of the University authorities he was not the proper man for the place he held. The responsibility for the correctness of this judgment belongs to the University authorities and to them alone.

Third. No ground exists for any interpretation of his dismissal reflecting on his private character, of which your letter seems to imply a fear.

Fourth. The judgment that Professor Ross was not the proper man for the place he held is not incompatible with my appreciation of many good qualities he possesses, nor with my wishes or efforts at any time to further his prospects. I have been neither ignorant of his professional shortcomings nor inappreciative of his good qualities. Of such appreciation Professor Ross has himself adduced several expressions from my letters.

In the hope that you may find in the above a substantial answer to the questions involved in your inquiries, I remain,

Very truly yours,

DAVID S. JORDAN.

#### *THE SECOND MEETING OF NATURALISTS AT CHICAGO.*

THE committee appointed by the meeting of 1899 issued a call for a second meeting of Naturalists at Chicago, December 27th and 28th. About one hundred naturalists were in attendance or three times the number present last year. Among those present in addition to the Chicago Naturalists were Messrs. Folsom, Hart, Holferty, Mills and Frank Smith of University of Illinois; Professors Locy and Charles Hill of Northwestern University; Needham of Lake Forest; Atherton, Birge, Juday, and Timberlake of Wisconsin; Densmore, and Grant Smith of Beloit; Lee, MacMillan and Nachtrieb of Minnesota; Osborn of Hamline; Nutting and Shimek of Iowa; Kelly of Cornell College; Thorn of Missouri; Ward of