

the result of scientific research and that large numbers of trained research chemists are employed.

UNIVERSITY AND EDUCATIONAL NEWS

PROFESSOR WILLIAM TRUFANT FOSTER, who holds the chair of education at Bowdoin College, has accepted the presidency of the Reed Institute, a college to be established at Portland, Oregon, through a fund given by Mrs. Amanda Reed, now amounting to about \$3,000,000.

THE board of regents of the University of Texas has approved the plans submitted by the faculty of the medical department for building and equipping a laboratory of preventive medicine and public health.

ACCORDING to statistics of attendance at the University of Chicago for the year ending in June, 1910, which have just become available, an increase is shown over that for the preceding year, the actual figure being 6,007 students for the year 1909-10, as against 5,659 for the year 1908-9.

THE London County Council has made a maintenance grant of £8,000 to the Imperial College of Science and Technology, South Kensington, and in return it secures the privilege of nominating 25 students for one year's free instruction at the college.

MR. H. O. ALLISON, for a number of years connected with the department of animal husbandry of the University of Illinois in beef cattle investigations, has been elected to the position of assistant professor of animal husbandry in the University of Missouri. His special work will be the development of the breeding herds of beef cattle and the cattle feeding experiments in the experiment station.

MR. C. M. HILLIARD (Dartmouth and Massachusetts Institute of Technology) has been appointed assistant tutor in biology at the College of the City of New York.

MR. HENRY LEIGHTON, of the New York State Museum, has been appointed instructor in mining geology in the University of Pittsburgh School of Mines.

PROMOTIONS at the Johns Hopkins University have been made as follows: Charles K.

Swartz, Ph.D., collegiate professor of geology; John B. Whitehead, Ph.D., professor of applied electricity; Edward W. Berry, associate in paleobotany; Rheinart P. Cowles, Ph.D., associate in biology; Knight Dunlap, Ph.D., associate in psychology; William W. Holland, Ph.D., associate in chemistry; Carroll M. Sparrow, A.B., instructor in physics; Donald R. Hooker, M.D., associate professor of physiology; Carl Voegtlin, Ph.D., associate professor of pharmacology; George H. Whipple, M.D., associate professor of pathology; Eliot R. Clark, M.D., associate in anatomy; Herbert M. Evans, M.D., associate in anatomy; John H. King, M.D., associate in pathology; Arthur H. Koelker, Ph.D., associate in physiological chemistry; Milton C. Winternitz, M.D., associate in pathology; Charles R. Essick, M.D., instructor in anatomy; Thomas P. Sprunt, M.D., instructor in pathology.

DISCUSSION AND CORRESPONDENCE

THE PROFESSORIAL QUESTION

IT seems unfortunate that so important a contribution as that of Mr. Chapman's should appear at a time when professors, on vacation bent, are trying to dismiss the professional aspects of their vocation. Yet the charge of timidity and weak concern for their closest interests, which is made with incontrovertible pertinence, is pertinent at any time. Mr. Chapman devotes his article particularly to calling attention to the unjust and unwise set of scruples that seem to stand in the way of the proper assertion of his rights on the part of the professor. I am similarly convinced that a combination of timidity and a distorted scruple is responsible for the reserve in question. Indeed, I agree so cordially with each one of the positions assumed that I find little to add except by way of enforcement of detail. In my opinion Mr. Chapman has not alone pointed out one of the most serious menaces in the educational situation, but so far as he goes, indicates correctly a few of the steps which seem promising in "unwinding this boaconstrictor" which is strangling scholars and their interests. The first step is to make it good form and a meritorious and generously commended act when a professor speaks of his

class interests, boldly, frankly, proudly; rather than have it looked upon, as it too commonly is looked upon, as a rather ill-advised expression of a personal grievance or of opposition to constituted authorities.

The natural custodians of education in any age are the learned men of the land, including the professors and schoolmasters. Now these men have, at the present time, in America no conception of their responsibility. They are docile under the rule of the promoting college president, and they have a theory of their own function which debars them from militant activity.

Mr. Chapman applies these criticisms particularly to the common situation of an injustice done to a member of the faculty, which his colleagues do not resent, against which they do not protest. All this is true and serious; but it may be regarded as but a single though common illustration of the more fundamental evil: the fact that matters of this kind are decided by college presidents and not by the faculties. In this aspect the presidents need not be specifically censured. They are personally not much to blame except as personally they aggravate a situation inherent in the nature of the position which they have helped to create. I can state the point unambiguously by using a colleague's cynical phrase: that any man who would accept a presidency and exercise the authority which it implies thereby adequately proves that he is not the right man for the place. The danger is in the office rather than in the man; for it seems unmistakable that the office changes the man. Professors become presidents and lose the academic attitude with surprising and regrettable alacrity. All this is a part of the administrative peril in education. There is entertained a totally false view of the dignity, worth and necessity of the administrative function in education; of this the president is the acute expression, and in some measure likewise the cause.

It is then the fact, regret it as we may, that the university president gets to think in administrative terms; that the professorial interests are not expressed by him or through him; that indeed in many aspects the presidential aspect and the faculty aspect of policy and

measures are quite opposed. The injustice and the danger is enhanced by reason of the fact that the president is in the position of vantage and places measures before the board of trustees or regents, with whom he stands in direct relation; and thus the administrative policy is enforced and the professorial interests sacrificed. It would be foolish not to mention in the plainest words that the authority which the president exercises in the way of fixing salaries and promotions is the most serious obstacle to a removal of the ills as well as to the proper expression of protest by the professors themselves. This is one of the sources, and a most natural one, of the timidity of which the professor stands convicted.

It so happens that the same issue of *SCIENCE* which brings Mr. Chapman's notable contribution contains an extract from President Hadley's report in regard to the mode of fixing professors' salaries. The matter may be cited just because of the exceptionally high standing of President Hadley and his well-known sympathy with the professorial interests, and his approval of the largest democratic privilege enjoyed by any faculty—that of Yale—in participating in the elections and promotions of its own members. Yet the issue is discussed from a purely administrative point of view, the question of the benefit of the academic situation or the personal preference of the professors being wholly neglected. And in this issue I believe emphatically that the actual solutions of the salary question as an academic one and as an administrative one are quite opposed. A very large uniformity of salary, automatic promotion, a complete unwillingness to use salaries as a means of reward (or punishment by withholding advances) or as a differentiation of merit—this is the academic solution. Yet this issue it is not necessary here to discuss, only to point out that this is a question upon which the professorial and the administrative attitudes are likely to lead to opposite conclusions; that, at present the danger is great, almost a certainty, that the administrative side will prevail and the professorial remain unheard, because of the timidity of the professor, and the fear of misunderstanding his motives. I

am prepared to admit that in many issues the administrative and the academic decisions will agree. In those cases I shall still regret that the right decision is reached for the wrong reasons, or that an unwise precedent is enforced by giving decisive weight to minor considerations. Everything that makes for the importance of the administrative function in the higher education is, to my thinking, bad, especially when it gains its prestige at the sacrifice of the professors' interests.

I go back but a few issues in *SCIENCE* to find another illustration. Vigorous protests appeared in *SCIENCE* and elsewhere against the summary action of the Carnegie Foundation in cutting off the privilege of retirement after twenty-five years of service, which had been definitely agreed upon as one of the two main purposes of the foundation. That this action was unwise and unethical has been made clear; and it is certainly most important that the foundation modify it at its next meeting. For the moment that is not the issue. The pertinent matter is again that in reaching this decision the academic interests were insufficiently considered. It is inconceivable that if the board of the foundation were composed, as it should be, of professors (with one or two presidents to represent the necessary administrative side of things) such an action should have been taken. It is another case of the conflict of the two interests and the unwise and unjust arrangement whereby the administrative side prevails and the professorial side is not officially represented.

I agree lastly with Mr. Chapman's contention, that as things are, the most hopeful procedure is for the professors to appeal directly to the boards of laymen who control affairs. I have every faith in the fairness of the lay boards. I believe that they have been largely misled by the over emphasis by the president of the administrative side of affairs, by the natural assumption that he was really representing faculty sentiment when he could not vitally do so. This will not be a radical measure, only a temporizing one, it is true; but it is practical. The only radical measure will be one that rearranges the authority of pro-

fessor and president and minimizes in every respect the administrative function, making the administrative officers, what they should be and be satisfied to be, the convenient mode of expressing the will of the faculty and of preserving the energies of the faculty in behalf of academic purposes. I am aware that the suggestion has a danger of its own; that of inducing the board to take a hand in educational matters. In principle that is unwise, and is most subject to abuse. But the good to be gained is well worth that risk. Moreover, I believe that the good sense of lay boards will be and in the end must be the only safeguard against their unwise interference with the prerogatives of the faculty. Furthermore, the division between educational and financial questions is quite artificial and has as a fact been used to throw the authority where it is desired. Just as soon as professorial opinion makes itself felt, it will be respected. It is certainly regrettable that the situation demands this form of solution; but practically I see no other as promising. A far better solution would be the natural decline of the administrative temper in the higher education, by a refusal on the part of men elected to such positions to exercise it.

Be the solution what it may, and the temporary steps such as in each situation the best wisdom and the kindest consideration of all interests may suggest, this remains certain: that no one will respect those who do not respect themselves and stand boldly and proudly for their rights. The timidity and the unwise reserve of the professor stand as the most serious obstacle in the way of the removal of the evils in the professorial situation.

JOSEPH JASTROW

CHESTER, NOVA SCOTIA,

July 9, 1910

SCIENTIFIC BOOKS

Rara Arithmetica. A catalogue of the arithmetics written before the year MDCL with a description of those in the library of George Arthur Plimpton, of New York. By DAVID EUGENE SMITH, of Teachers College, Columbia University. Boston and London, Ginn and Co. 1908.