

Columbia must open wide the flood gates of knowledge, but it must not sully the stream of education. It must be no mere department store for the delivery of intellectual commodities; there are bargain-counters for that elsewhere. Graduate or undergraduate, liberal or professional, male or female, every holder of a Columbia degree must be stamped with a hallmark of genuineness; must be sterling, or at least exactly as represented, if we are to serve the community which maintains and supports us.

Finally, though our task be a very hard task indeed, the hardest of all tasks, the task of setting a good example, let us still take courage. The history of our country is not one of degeneracy from noble origins. We are not like the potato, with the best of us underground. Just as our tasks have become more and more complicated and our responsibility heavier and heavier, our wits have grown keener and our shoulders broader. Never yet have we shirked when Apollyon offered us battle. Sound money, the civil service, the emancipation of the slave; these are some of the problems which the fathers bequeathed and we solved. Our Anglo-Saxon universities have made the new Japan, the new Egypt, the new Balkan kingdoms; at least their makers were men with the inspiration of either English or American universities—and other men of like training seemed destined to regenerate the whole Orient. At home the great offices in church, state and industry are held in the main by those who are trained to the flexibility of the university mind, men who, with the few exceptions which emphasize the rule, practise at the same time the firmness, toleration and moderation which have been our theme. What others have done and are now doing we may do in even higher measure; but only by keeping the fountain pure. If we are to deliver to New Yorkers the goods

which New Yorkers need, we must not stand nor recede, but improve both the quantity and the quality; we must make them attractive and trustworthy; we must label them as they are; and as we succeed or fail, we show our viability or our unfitness.

Platitudes are a stumbling block to the shallow novelty hunter, and axioms are a weariness to the multitude; but to the earnest they are the renewal of wisdom every morning; they rekindle and illuminate the common sense of humanity which at times burns very low. Those which we have considered are among the most helpful. Three things are vain in our university life: faith without works, morality without religion, and precept without example. All our investigating and teaching and professing; all our sapience and assurance and mannerisms, will go for naught without a labor which is worship, a sympathy which is self-denial, and permanent standards which we adopt only for the better realization of the ideals which they express. Complexity without confusion is essential to high living; the wonderful organism of Columbia seems made for the task of harmonizing the discords in its urban home.

WILLIAM MILLIGAN SLOANE.

---

*THE ORGANIZATION OF UNIVERSITY  
GOVERNMENT.*

THE ideals and methods of university government have received considerable attention of late, stimulated by the recent discussions at the Conference of University Trustees at University of Illinois. There have been several able presentations of different points of view respecting the relative functions of trustees, president and faculty in the control of the university. From these discussions it would appear that while the responsibility for financial and legal affairs, and, in certain emergencies,

for other matters of university administration must rest with the trustees, the general policy of development and administration should lie with the president and faculty. As to the relative shares which should belong to the president and the faculty there were developed decided differences of opinion, some, as ex-President Draper, standing for the policy of selecting a wise and strong president and entrusting him with the entire responsibility of the policy and administration, and others, as President Pritchett, favoring a policy of control by the faculty, relegating the president to a position of more limited authority. Certain facts may be considered as fairly established by the consensus of opinion of experts.

First. The trustees, usually men of affairs devoting but a limited portion of their time to university administration, are not often and can not often be experts in academic administration. While their education and experience may make them appreciative of the aims of university education, and may qualify them to administer wisely the financial and legal business of the university, their experience in university administration does not qualify them to conduct the internal administration nor the educational aims of the university.

Second. The faculty and the president, if he is, as he always should be, a university scholar of experience, are the real experts in educational policy and internal administration. They are selected because of their ability as scholars and educators and their whole attention and experience are given to the profession. They know, as no trustees can know, the needs and internal conditions of the university.

Third. It seems to be quite generally admitted that a strong, wise and experienced president with authority centered in his control is the most powerful agent for

the effective growth and development of the university.

The problem, then, is how to preserve a proper balance of power between trustees, president and faculty so that all three factors shall most effectively cooperate for the material and intellectual development of the university, how to preserve the energy and initiative of the strong president, to utilize the administrative experience of trustees and the expert knowledge and experience of the faculty.

There is experience to justify the opinion that when trustees assume to manage the university and to control the policy of president and faculty, disorganization and weakness result. There is experience also to justify the opinion that a faculty uncontrolled by a strong guiding hand is not an effective governing body and that eventually control is assumed by the trustees or the president selected by them. This is particularly true with respect to such regulation of the personnel of the teaching force as is necessary to preserve a proper effectiveness and proportion in university development. Among other reasons for this are the fact that there is a divided responsibility, and a 'professorial courtesy' which stand in the way of needed reforms, and a dislike to take the initiative in personal discriminations which are sometimes necessary.

The most successful university administrations in this country are those in which a strong president has been legally vested with large powers of administrative control, or, because of his personal force, has been tacitly given and has used such control. Unquestionably government by a strong president who keeps in sympathy with his faculty and consults freely and frequently with its members and who also keeps in sympathy with and has the confidence of his trustees, is the most effective government and most economical of the

time and energy of the whole university.

But the organization of the university should make provision for less ideal conditions, so that taking trustees, president and faculty as they are likely to be, the system of government may tend to utilize to the fullest possible extent the wisdom and energy of all, and prevent the possibility that the influence of any one of these factors may be overridden or ignored.

The plan of government now established in Stanford University endeavors to conserve these ends in the following way.

The authority is vested in:

First. The trustees, who, in addition to the management of financial and legal affairs, make all appointments to the faculty and fix their compensation, but have delegated to the president all nominations for appointments or promotions and recommendations as to salaries.

Second. The president, in whom by the deed of trust is lodged the authority to prescribe the duties of instructors, to remove instructors at will, and such other powers as are necessary that he may be held justly responsible for the efficiency of teaching and the competency of teachers. In addition to these duties, by the acts of the trustees, the president is made primarily responsible for discipline in the university, is ex-officio chairman of the academic council and of its executive committee, and the official medium of communication between the faculty and the trustees, and between the students and the trustees. The president has also the initiative in all matters of appointments and fixing of salaries, subject to the approval of the trustees. By these provisions is sought to be maintained the effectiveness in administration due to the initiative of the president.

Third. The faculty—in which is vested through the *Academic Council*, consisting of all professors, associate professors and such

assistant professors as have been in the service of the university for three years, the power to initiate and decide upon all matters of academic character—such as requirements for admission or graduation, advanced degrees, curricula, general university regulations, policies of all standing committees of the faculty and of departmental faculties—subject, of course, to such control by the trustees as is necessary for the proper exercise of their responsibilities.

The influence of the faculty upon such administrative matters as belong to the responsibilities of the president or the trustees is exerted through the *Advisory Board*, a body of nine professors elected by ballot without previous nomination, three each year, by the academic council. Of these nine members, one is elected by the whole council from each of five departmental groups into which the departments of the university are divided, and the remaining four are elected without reference to their positions in any such group. Each member must receive a majority of all votes cast for election. The members of this board are elected presumably on the basis of their qualifications as safe and wise counsellors of the president or the trustees. The duties of the board are to act as confidential adviser to the president upon matters which are not under control of the academic council, but belong to the executive responsibilities—to pass approval or disapproval upon all nominations for appointments, promotion, dismissals, the creation or abolition of chairs or departments. It is provided, however, that no recommendations for appointments, promotions or dismissals, or the fixing of salaries, shall originate with the advisory board. The initiative in these matters must come through the president. This provision had for its object protection against pressure brought to bear on the board by colleagues or others, and the pre-

vention of any development in the board of an influence in such matters which might unnecessarily disturb the relations of the members of the board to their colleagues or to the president or trustees.

On the other hand in matters of university policy in general the board is privileged to make such recommendations to the president as it may decide to be expedient. To further the full and free discussion of all matters which may come before the board, and to assure independence of judgment, it is provided that while the president of the university shall have free access to the board for purposes of information and consultation, he shall not be a member of it, and all conclusions of the board are discussed and formulated in executive session.

Decisions of the advisory board are communicated directly to the president and to no other university authority, and the president communicates them to the trustees in connection with his official recommendations. The trustees may at their discretion take cognizance of any differences of opinion between the president and advisory board thus brought to their attention.

It will readily be understood that such a board will exert a powerful conservative influence upon the executive from the faculty standpoint. It would be difficult for any serious differences to exist between president and faculty without the trustees having the issues thoroughly presented. As a conservative check the influence of such a board is doubtless more thoroughly effective than that of a committee of trustees, because the board is composed of members more nearly expert on university administration and local conditions than are the trustees usually. It has been objected that a board composed of members who hold their positions in the university at the will of the president will not exer-

cise independent judgment, but this consideration will hardly have weight with those conversant with the character and temper of university faculties. On the contrary, there is much more danger that such a board with its constant sense of responsibility as representative of the faculty, will tend to be ultra-conservative in the matter of such changes in the faculty as may be needed in the interests of the effectiveness of university work.

While thus necessarily acting to a certain extent as a conservative restraint upon the president and indirectly at times upon the trustees, on the other hand the duty imposed upon the board to act as confidential adviser to the president, affords a natural and established channel for the president to keep in touch with representative faculty sentiment and to secure more carefully considered and responsible advice on certain classes of questions than is otherwise easily obtained.

The efficiency of the influence on the administration of such a board will in the long run depend upon the attitude of the trustees and of the faculty towards its functions. If the trustees systematically consider the decisions of the board in connection with the nominations or recommendations of the president, they will have additional assurance of the wisdom of the acts they are called upon to enact. If they systematically ignore the action of the board, its functions will soon become perfunctory or obsolete.

If the faculty systematically elect the members of the board with reference only to their judgment and discretion in the often difficult and delicate matters entrusted to their consideration, the influence of the faculty upon administration will be steadily strengthened. If, on the other hand, other less relevant considerations should enter into these elections, the influence of the board might easily be seriously

impaired and its conclusions discredited. The experiment at Stanford University is now in its second year, and, thus far, has met with very general approval, at least so far as the writer's knowledge goes. By this plan, the initiative of the president is sought to be preserved, but he is provided with a board of counselors, representative of the faculty, to advise him in the most important of his administrative acts. This influence can not amount to a veto unless sustained by the trustees, while it all the time cooperates with him by keeping him in constant touch with representative faculty opinion which has been carefully considered and formulated.

Certain purely administrative functions are placed under the control of the president rather than under the faculty. Such are the maintenance of discipline, the conduct of athletic, social and literary student activities, and public health. The president appoints committees from the faculty to assist him in these functions and the membership of these committees is also subject to the approval of the advisory board.

Other committees dealing with strictly academic questions are directly under the control of the academic council and answerable to the council.

*The Executive Committee* of the council is entrusted with much of the work which consumes so much time and energy at frequent and long-drawn-out faculty meetings at many universities. It consists of the president of the university, the vice-president and the registrar, as *ex-officio* members, and ten other members, two from each of the five department groups, elected by the council, much as the members of the advisory board are elected. The executive committee appoints the other standing committees of the faculty and controls their policy, subject to the approval of the academic council, and subject to instruction by the council.

The teaching force of each department of the university is organized as the *Department Faculty* under the chairmanship of an executive head appointed by the president, with the approval of the advisory board. The department faculty conducts the internal affairs of the department, subject to the control of the academic council in such matters as involve relations with other departments, and with the university at large.

The academic council thus controls through its various committees and departmental faculties the educational policy and machinery of the university, the president's influence herein being conserved by his position as presiding officer of the council and of its executive committee. Speaking generally the whole idea of the organization is to commit the business of the university in all its activities to the direction of those who are most qualified experts, to preserve the initiative and influence of the trustees, president and faculty within their respective spheres, to protect the rights and privileges of all arms of the university authority, and to insure, in so far as may be, the interests of the whole university as paramount to the interests of any one factor.

JOHN MAXSON STILLMAN.

STANFORD UNIVERSITY.

---

#### SCIENTIFIC BOOKS.

*Flashlights in the Jungle: A Record of Hunting Adventures and of Studies in Wild Life in Equatorial East Africa.* By C. G. SCHILLINGS. Translated by FREDERIC WHYTE, with an introduction by Sir H. H. JOHNSTON. Illustrated by 307 of the author's untouched photographs taken by day and night. Pp. xxii + 782. New York, Doubleday, Page & Co. 1906.

Herr Schillings's work on the wilderness of East Africa, called in its latest English edition 'Flashlights in the Jungle,' should interest a wide class of readers, but in particular