Faculty of Laws.—David Murray Scholarship (International Law)—Charles Cave Brehaut. Prize Prizes—Charles Cave Brehaut, Ian Buttrose. Elgin Lovedon Stevens. Prize Scholar—Ian Buttrose.

Faculty of Medicine.—Elder Prizes—First Year, Annie Winifred Clark and Donald James Robert Sumner (equal); second year, Esmond Frank West. Deakin Research Scholarships—Third year, George Eldon Hills; fourth year, Leonard Charles Edward Linden. Everard Scholarship—Fifth year, Raphael West Cilento and Richard Langford Harold Grant (equal). The Dr. Charles Cowe Medal in Ophthalmology—Kenneth Willoughby Bellen.

Board of Commercial Studies.—The Joseph Fisher Medal of Commerce—Patrick William Rooney.

The Argus.

MELBOURNE.

"I am in the place where I am demanded of conscience to speak the truth, and therefore the truth I speak, impugn it whoso list."

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

Every letter must be accompanied by the name and address of the writer, not necessarily for publication, but as a guarantee of good faith. Correspondents are requested to inform the Editor if their letters have also been sent to any other paper.

Rejected letters will not be returned. Correspondents are advised to keep copies of their letters, as this rule will be adhered to strictly.

SATURDAY, MARCH 16, 1918.

The death of Sir John Madden raises the question of the University—its organisation, its management, its place in the community. Sir John Madden was both Chief Justice and Lieutenant-Governor. As such he was known, and as such he appeared before the people. Who knew, and who cared, that he was also Chancellor of the University? That last position to the public mind was a mere extra in his life, a mere *parergon* in his duties. It was the same with Bishop Moorhouse. To some he was the Bishop of Melbourne; to others he was Dr. Moorhouse, an eminent, if not a famous, leader in the spiritual life of the nation. But who knew, and who cared, that he was also Chancellor of the University? His position at the University was a mere "side-show," which was of no interest to the city or to the State as a whole. That is not as it should be, but it is symbolical of the position the University holds in the life of the people. The head of the University should be that and nothing else. He should be an administrative head, the general manager of the life of the University, representing the University before the world, a man of great ability and recognised position, and receiving a commensurate salary. If, in addition to such a man in such a position, there be also an annual election by the graduates of a lord rector who would deliver an "inaugural" to which the whole community listened—well and good. But that is a matter more of advertisement than of administration. With a permanent salaried Principal of ability and personal power, and with a competent staff of professors and lecturers divided into faculties, the whole life of the University could be guided and managed in a simple, efficient, and business-like way. The senate and the council might indefinitely go into retirement, or might meet annually for purposes of appointments and elections. Were there some such change as this, then it might be possible for the University to become visible and tangible as part of the life of the people.

It is much easier to point out defects and failures than to see what should be the goal. It is also more easy to discern a goal than to discover means of attainment. All who really care for the University feel that it does not play the part it should in our national life, or even in our civic life. We can all see that the present position is quite unsatisfactory. In a vague kind of way we can realise that the University should come out of its seclusion, its academic retirement, its rigid routine of vocational training, and come down into the life of the people and lead the whole community in the pursuit and application of knowledge. But how to [illegible] lack of money, as well as lack of vision [illegible] lack of method, suppresses all possible development. The University has become content to minister to the training of the professional middle classes, providing doctors and lawyers and teachers [illegible] other similar people with the "bread-and-butter" knowledge necessary for their business in life. This [illegible] grown into a mere professional

routine is just as much due to lack of funds as to lack of initiative, although which is cause and which is effect it might be difficult to say. From the one cause or from the other, or from both, the University is not attracting the people and leading the people in the pursuit of knowledge. If men in Melbourne want knowledge outside the mere professional routines they must fight out the battle themselves alone. They get no help from the University.

In the 'seventies, before the Working Men's College was thought of, the Trades Hall used to conduct all kinds of evening educational classes. Boys and men whose hands were hard with manual labour used to swarm up there by the hundreds to get knowledge. But the University did not help. The Trades Hall was wiser than the children of light. To-day, in Melbourne, the inquirer will probably find that such subjects as these are being studied in our city: Spanish, Italian, Esperanto, Japanese, Gaelic, Chinese, Arabic, Hebrew, Hindustani, Sanskrit, Cuneiform, hypnotism, hieroglyphics, astronomy, socialism, astrology, architecture, conchology, accountancy, history of art, logistic, phonetics—and many other matters of research, to say nothing of such practical things as are taught at business colleges and under special apprenticeship. Yet in all these things the learner must get private help or go alone. The University does not help, and does not feel it ought to help. It smiles at such pursuits. It rigidly confines itself to the routine of the middle-class professions. Now, suppose another kind of university, a university that was really a "universitas," and trying to help all the people in the pursuit of knowledge. It rents a building in Flinders street, furnishes about 20 classrooms, and says to the whole people: "Whatever you want "to learn, come to me. I'll provide a "classroom, and the best teacher I can "find in Melbourne. Even if there be "no teacher available, there shall be "a class got together, and you can help "each other. The fee shall be so small "as not to exceed 1/ per lesson." Would not such a university swarm with students in three months? Would it not be a hive of intellectual effort, which would appeal to every class in the city, and appeal also both to City Council and to Parliament for help?

Again, take the popular lecture. Any man can lecture to students, or read an essay to them, or help them. But the popular lecture is a real task. It must be vivâ voce: it must be by an expert who has a mass of knowledge behind all that he is going to say: it must be instructive yet interesting, critical and yet suggestive. It is not just playing the showman, throwing an awful picture of hell on a screen, and saying "Ladies and Gentlemen: This picture "is a drop of Yan Yean water." People will not go to such a lecture as that—or, at least, they will not go twice. But why cannot the University run a course of weekly popular lectures in the city for, say, 20 weeks in the year? Picture shows are very good in their way, and they have done much to educate and amuse the people. But there are thousands who would prefer something more instructive than picture shows, and at the same time something less academic and retired than Public Library or Austral Salon lectures. Can it not be done? Cannot the University come out of its seclusion, and come down into the city, and try to lead and instruct the people in some kind of popular "universitas" of knowledge? Why, there has not even been a course of popular lectures on the war; yet popular lectures followed by questions and answers might do more to unite the people than either Parliament or press can do. It is easy to criticise and point out faults. It is not so easy to make suggestions. But it all comes back to this: Get a man at the top who has ideas, and whose whole business in life is to work them out. Pay him well. Give him a free hand. In a few years the University should be as much in the heart of the people as it is now in that of a few of its old graduates.

UNIVERSITY AND NATIONAL LIFE.

A REPLY TO "THE ARGUS."

By PROFESSOR HARRISON MOORE.

Sir John Madden for nearly 40 years of his life gave himself unsparingly to work upon the council of the University of Melbourne, and during his long term as vice-chancellor and chancellor rendered services which in the best sense are inestimable. It was therefore with a deep sense of pain that large numbers of persons would read in a leading article in "The Argus" on Saturday the epitaph, "Who knew and who cared that he was chancellor of the University?" This was then made the text of an indictment of the University, which, to speak plainly, could have been drawn only by someone whose seclusion was something more than academic, for whatever knowledge he may have of "the seventies"—in which I do not venture to compete with him—he is singularly ill-informed as to what has happened in, let us say, the last quarter of a century. If he reads what follows he will be—to use the happy phrase of a lamented member of our bar—"perhaps not wiser, but at any rate better informed," and will no longer "realise in a vague kind of way" things which are quite unreal in fact.

And first of Sir John Madden himself. Sir John was both Chief Justice and Lieutenant-Governor. "As such," we are told, "he was known, and as such he appeared before the people." Exalted as these positions are, I venture to say that Sir John Madden was to the people of Victoria more than either or both of these offices made him. He was a great personality, with qualities which drew to him the attention and regard, and ultimately the affection, of the whole country. When he was sought to help in any public movement, when he spoke from any platform or through the columns of the press, it was not the Lieutenant-Governor nor the Chief Justice that we sought or saw or heard—it was Sir John Madden. And when we mourn his death, we are thinking little of the great offices which he leaves vacant, and a great deal of a very noble, brave, and warm-hearted man, whom, unsparing of himself wherever useful work was to be done, a whole generation of Victorians has delighted to honour as the first of their fellow-citizens.

Now as to the University. It is charged in various forms of expression with limiting itself to "mere professional routines," "the routines of middle-class professions." We are told that those who want other knowledge must "fight out the battles themselves alone;" and judgment is pronounced that it is "lack of vision and lack of method" which as much as lack of money "suppress all possible development." I have not space to quote more than a few passages from the article in question; but let those of your readers who are interested read the article again, and ask themselves if the writer can ever have heard of the University movements that I will refer to.

In the first place, as to the war. We are told that "there has not even been a course of popular lectures on the war." Well, in 1915 a course of 14 lectures on as many phases and aspects of the war was arranged by the University, and delivered within a few yards of "The Argus" office. Of course, the lectures may not have been "popular"—that is a slippery term—but the audiences filled a large hall, and a firm of publishers thought them so far likely to interest the community as to publish each lecture separately, and to issue the whole in a substantial volume.

Then as to the nature and scope of University studies. To what "professional routine" do the University courses in arts belong? And for those whose grievances "The Argus" most plaintively voices, has the writer never heard of the University Extension Movement? I have before me the syllabus of the Extension Board. It offers lectures—from the single lecture to the course of nine lectures—in agriculture, anatomy, anthropology, architecture, bacteriology, biology, botany, chemistry, education, engineering, geography, geology, history and political science (including economics), literature (including Greek, Latin, English, French, and one course on Russian novelists), meteorology, music, ornithology, philosophy, physiology, veterinary science. Under nearly all of these very wide descriptions there is a wide selection both of lectures and of subjects. It is true that the list does not include all the subjects of the rather quaint list furnished by "The Argus," and perhaps the writer of the article is not far wrong when he visualises a corporate University smile at such studies as "astrology" (why not witchcraft, phrenology, and palmistry?). But the Extension Board is not limited by its list, and does what it can to meet any request for a course or series of lectures. At the present time, for instance, it is, in conjunction with a group of business men, arranging a course for the psychological study of some problems in business. So far is it from being true that "the University does not help and does not feel it ought to help." And these are not things of yesterday: the University Extension movement has been [illegible] for nearly thirty years.

And more recent and [illegible] the tutorial class m[illegible]

...e significant is ...vement, which is asso... ...orkers' Educational Asso... ...may be fairly claimed that the ...itative of this movement, so far as Australia is concerned, belongs to the University of Melbourne, since it was through the efforts and patriotism of Sir James Barrett that the means were available to make it known in Australia. For four years the University of Melbourne has established tutorial classes in history, literature, and economics. It has co-operated with the W.E.A. in providing "popular" lectures; and the 1917 syllabus, which I have before me, shows that last winter a series of lectures on the fundamental sciences was delivered by the Master of Ormond College and the professors of geology, chemistry, physics, biology, and physiology. All these were notified to the public in the ordinary way by advertisement in the press, and if they did not attract swarms of hearers "The Argus" speaks of, they did draw, at any rate, appreciative audiences.

Members of the University staff have been active in making the tutorial class movement known in the community, and in seeking to gain support for it. The council of the University joined forces with the W.E.A. and the Trades Hall, in seeking to get the financial help from the Government which would enable the University of Melbourne to undertake the work under similar conditions to those existing in the other States in Australia. At the end of 1917 our efforts were successful; we obtained the means to appoint a director of tutorial classes, and Professor Meredith Atkinson was appointed. Let me add that this University, which (as "The Argus" puts it) "does not help, and does not feel it ought to help," has been, so far, anxious to give to this essentially non-vocational and non-middle class education a firm and influential place in university work that it has gone beyond any other university in the Empire in assigning to the director of these studies the functions of dean of faculty and the position and title of professor, thus ensuring him a weight in the counsels of the University equal to that of any other department. That the organisation of this department should have been so long delayed has been due not to any lack of effort on the part of the University or of sympathy on the part of Government, but in the main to the attitude of the Melbourne daily press towards education in general and the influence it has exerted to hinder all educational development which involves the least expenditure of money.

I will not enter into a contest with "The Argus" writer as to the qualifications required for a popular lecture and a university lecture respectively. Of course, "any man can lecture to students," just as any man can preach a sermon, or write a leader. That is to say, he may do it in such a way that it is useless to anybody, as assuredly it will be if it fulfils the implications of "The Argus" writer, who appears to consider that it is only the popular lecture which must be "instructive, yet interesting, critical, and yet suggestive," demanding the "expert who has a mass of knowledge behind all that he is going to say." But with lectures offered to a wider audience than a class of students proceeding to a degree, and "popular" in every sense that is not invidious, or unworthy, the University and its staff are associated not frequently but constantly. Probably not a week passes without some professor or lecturer coming "out of his seclusion" to deliver a public address in city or suburbs; often there will be several such addresses in the same week. If the public hears little of them the fault lies less with the University than with those upon whom the community depends for its news of the day.

"Why," we are asked, "cannot the University run a course of weekly popular lectures in the city for, say, 20 weeks in the year?" Well, last year a course of 22 lectures was delivered in Collins street on British political institutions—open to all, at a fee rather less than half "The Argus" ideal of 1/ per lesson. How far they were "instructive, yet interesting, critical, and yet suggestive" is a question I must leave to others. Arrangements are now being made by my colleague, Professor Meredith Atkinson, to deliver a similar course of public lectures on a number of social problems, for which the charge will probably

by even less than that fractional part of 6d. per lecture at which the former course was offered.

Moreover, it is not necessary to remind "The Argus" that the lecture hall and the platform are not the only methods of enlightening the public. Are we not sometimes told by journals less modest than "The Argus" that the true university of the people in these times is a great newspaper? Whether this is sound doctrine or not, the opportunities which the newspaper offers of imparting knowledge or expressing opinions are amply availed of by university professors and lecturers. The frequency with which their names appear at the head of articles or at the foot of letters occasions much good-humoured chaff and some ill-natured backbiting. In addition, we are all of us members and usually officers of more boards, councils, institutes, and societies (learned and otherwise, without the University and within) than we have time for. I have had to delete so much space to refuting the statements in "The Argus" article that I have little space for other matters. The appointment of a permanent salaried Principal is a matter which has been for years the declared policy of the council, though I am afraid that a head of the University, who was "that and nothing else," would hardly realise the great things you look for, while from the blighting influence of one by whom "the whole life of the University could be guided and managed in a simple, efficient, and business-like way," good Lord deliver us! As to the scope of University teaching, I would say a few words. The prominence of professional and other "bread and butter" schools in the University is no peculiarity of Melbourne. It is a growing characteristic of the modern university, and the extent to which it prevails is usually to be measured by the influence which non-university forces have been able to exercise on universities. The danger of these schools to the humaner studies was foreseen by the universities themselves, and was the main cause of the opposition in the older universities to the professional schools. The old scholarly ideals of education for life rather than for a living have a hard struggle in the conditions of to-day. If civilisation is to endure—or shall we say, to be achieved?—a place must be found for both. But no one can have been engaged in the miscellaneous activities which war imposed without being impressed with the need in Australia for an increased number of persons, more highly trained in more specialised branches of work—a need not by any means confined to the several applications of physical science or to distinctively war work, but extending to every kind of human effort. It is certainly not any diminution in the attention given to bread and butter studies that we shall be able to afford, if we are to repair the devastation of war.

What the University can do, and has done, in the case of those vocations whose training it has in keeping is to resist the forces which would press these schools into the "mere professional routine" that "The Argus" writer imputes to us; to see to it that the vocational training itself is made an instrument of liberal culture. The more this influence can extend to other vocations the greater the service the University will render to the country. No culture is deeper or more real than that which a man takes to and draws from his daily work, and one of the greatest problems of our day is to bring this culture into an ever-increasing circle of employments. No culture will be national which provides merely for leisure and recreation.

Two other matters must be borne in mind in considering the scope of university teaching. The first of these is that the proper function of a university is higher education, and the fact that the subject is an out-of-the-way one (e.g., Gaelic or Chinese instead of French or German) is no reason why a university should provide elementary teaching in it. In the second place, a university is bound, if not in conscience, at least by a regard for its own good name, to make no pretence of teaching subjects, however important, for which it is not equipped, and which it cannot maintain at a standard consistent with its claim to be a place of learning. It is equally bound to ensure that the tasks imposed upon its staff do not impair the primary work of teaching its internal students. Unless it is strong here, the supply of men and women to extend its influence beyond its walls will fail at the source.

In the case of the University of Melbourne these conditions set very severe limitations upon its work. Its equipment, as compared with that of a great modern university, is meagre indeed. To illustrate from my own department—law. In the greater American universities you will find as many professors in the law school alone as there are in the whole University of Melbourne. Some of the most important fields of modern life and thought, concerning the deepest matters of our social life, are absolutely unprovided for. Our "junior staff," which includes men of distinction with 30 years of service in the University, and some of our heads of departments, are so wretchedly paid that we shall be at our wits' end to fill vacancies as they occur. And the University, perhaps, stands alone among our public activities and institutions in that its cost per head of the population to the government of the country is less to-day than it was 60 years ago. It may interest your readers to know that the Government grant per head of population, which began in 1850 at the munificent amount of 3.3 pence, stood in 1917 at 4.8 pence, with the difference also, that while in 1856 it was fixed and permanent, the greater part of to-day is precarious and temporary.

asked Professor Harrison Moore to reply to our criticism. In the interests of public discussion of a very important matter we are glad to be able to publish his views. He has misunderstood what we said about Sir John Madden. We entirely agree with what he has written regarding the great services and high position of the late Chancellor, and, with due respect, we would add that Professor Harrison Moore's fine eulogy is but an echo of the biographical and leading articles which appeared in these columns the day after Sir John died. Professor Harrison Moore agrees with us that the University lacks money and lacks a Principal, but not that it needs a bolder policy than is pursued at the present time. We ventured to connect these disabilities. He does not admit the connection. We think that a bolder policy on the part of the University would compel recognition of its claims, and for the initiation of such a policy we look to a Principal. Professor Harrison Moore thinks its boldness is all that could be desired, and that all that is necessary is more money. Why, then, does he desiderate a Principal? If the present position is good enough, why change? At the same time those who, like Professor Harrison Moore, are untiring in their splendid efforts to bring the University into touch with the life of the city are deserving of the highest praise. The University may be stagnant, yet there may be most active and most energetic minds within it, and these minds may be doing their utmost to wake up the corporation to which they belong, as well as the whole community, to the need of change. It is a pity, however, that no reform, even of method, can be suggested without the criticism being treated as if it were an attack upon individuals.—Ed. "A."

REPAIRING A ZEPPELIN.

GERMAN MECHANICS FEAT.

Chief-Mechanic Heinrich Fey, in charge of the starboard motor of a Zeppelin, has been awarded the Iron Cross of the first class for repairs carried out under fire while over England (writes Mr. F. W. Wile in the "Daily Mail," of which paper he was formerly Berlin correspondent). The official version of the sky Hun's feat—published broadcast in Germany in accordance with the system of advertising the achievements of the flying forces—reads:—

"Chief-Mechanic Heinrich Fey, of Rastorf, County of Lauenburg, took part in a cruise to England on the night of November 27-28, 1916. During the trip the cooler apparatus of his motor got out of order, and in the inky darkness Fey was unable to put it right. He tugged and tugged at it, but, not being able to see, was properly baffled. When the Zeppelin, about 10 p.m., reached the English coast south of the Flamborough Head, it was 'picked up' by English searchlights and held in an ellipse of light amid the heaviest gunfire. The ship, after dropping bombs, tried to escape by zig-zagging, and while doing so came under the strong fire of motor-car guns and later of defensive batteries on the Humber.

"Suddenly, to their astonishment, the crew discovered Fey in the midst of the bombardment, taking advantage of the illumination by clambering outside his gondola and calmly working on his cooler-curtain. He remarked to a mate as he climbed out: 'This is a fine opportunity to bring this verfluchten (damned) thing into shape;' and, suiting his action to the words, the chief mechanic accomplished his object as unperturbed up there in the tremendous altitudes as if he were in a hangar at home—thanks to the help given him by English searchlights.

"Fey won the Iron Cross of the second class some time ago. Now the premier Iron Cross bedecks the bosom of this daring, unterrified air sailer."

guished as the Maximalists. Others feel for the moment a minimum programme and are the Minimalists. The Extreme Socialists are practically extreme Social Revolutionaries. They believe in a libris of organisation throughout the State, but that all property should be equally divided and all wages equal. They are almost identical with the Maximalists of the Social Revolutionaries. The Anarchists picture a delightful Arcady wherein everything belongs alike to all, and there is no law or State organisation, it being supposed that everybody will do the right thing by everybody else. The fertility of ideas in their political outlook is not evidence of a high plane of general mentality. A more educated people in such a crisis as this would settle down to either of two issues