

Advertiser 14th June '07

Register 14th June '07

Register 14 June '07

The total wealth of these institutions and the universities in the United States was now about £100,000,000, about three-fifths of this being invested in endowment funds, the other two-fifths in lands and buildings. The aggregate income was now about £6,500,000. Of this about 40 per cent. came from tuition fees, 25 per cent. from endowments derived from private gifts, 20 per cent. from the State, 10 per cent. from Federal aid, and the rest, about 5 per cent. from minor sources. The State universities, which belonged to and were managed and equipped by the State, had grown through a variety of causes, the first being their distinct helpfulness to the people. In Wisconsin, for example, there was not a farmer who did not realise that the investigations of the agricultural school at the University had directly added to his personal welfare. It was at this University that the Babcock milk tester was invented, and grains, fruits, and live stock were improved by selection. With all this came the increase in material wealth due to having the industries of the State directed by trained men, and the belief that the university training gave each young man his opportunity. Rich men saw the value of training, and some gave in recognition of what they had gained through the universities, others in recognition of what they had missed. Students were usually admitted to the universities on certificates of proficiency from lower schools, and not by a matriculation examination. Dealing with American university ideals, Professor Jordan observed that the American university maintained an open door to all who could use its advantages. Nowhere else in the world, not even in Scotland, was the path from the farmhouse to the college so well trodden. The ideal of the English university system had been that of personal culture, the development of the gentleman. That of the German universities had been that of erudition. The ideal of America was individual efficiency. If this were based on erudition and adorned by culture, so much the better; but for culture which was ineffective in the conduct of life American people had little respect. One of the important functions of the American university was that of "knowing students by name," of coming into close personal touch with them. From this arose the high esteem in which the great teachers were held by their students and the deep affection bound up in the name "Alma Mater," first applied to English colleges, but naturally and appropriately adopted by American students. He never heard a German university called Alma Mater. Someone, continued Dr. Jordan, asked an alumnus of the University of Prague if he loved the university. "Love it?" he said. "No; I hate it." For the German university even at its best was an affair of State machinery. One might love its professors or some of them, but he could no more love the whole than he could a post-office or a railway-station. There must be personal effort, personal struggle, personal creation, the touch and color of character in a university, before it could be an Alma Mater.

PROFESSOR JORDAN'S HUMOUR.

One great gift which born lecturers possess is the faculty of engaging their audiences, carrying them metaphorically to any portion of the globe, and relieving the tension of the journey with apt illustrations or humorous reference. On Thursday evening Professor Starr Jordan (President of the Leland Stanford University, California) addressed a large gathering at the University, and entertained the units of which it was composed with a delightful talk concerning the methods and ideals of American universities. Not many minutes had elapsed from the opening when his hearers realized that Dr. Jordan had been blessed with the qualifications mentioned in the first sentence of this paragraph, and they did not fail to note the introduction of quaint allusions and delicate satire. They laughingly agreed with him that he acted wisely in avoiding a college with a good anatomical department, whose President was a clergyman, who wore a long coat and was strong on funerals. In describing the duties of the President of a university the professor turned the rapier on himself. In an impersonal way he said the gentleman at the head of such an institution had to be omnipresent and omniscient, with a knowledge of everything. As a teacher he was regarded as pre-eminent on all subjects which were not taught by the professors. When he added—with a twinkle in his eye—that the professors covered every class of learning which was anywhere near the truth the sides of his listeners shook with sympathetic laughter. The lecturer also had a sly dig at some of the methods in vogue in the English universities, and said the American universities held no sinecures. They did not waste their strength in paying men for work which was not done.

AN AMERICAN EDUCATIONIST.

INTERVIEW WITH PROFESSOR JORDAN.

INTERESTING OBSERVATIONS.

[By our Special Reporter.]

Picture a man about six feet in height, with massive but well-knit figure, slightly stooping shoulders, broad, intellectual forehead, and grey-white hair, and you have an idea of the personal appearance of Professor David Starr Jordan, M.S., Ph.D., M.D., LL.D., President of the Leland Stanford Junior University, San Francisco. When he entered the sitting room at the Adelaide Club late on Thursday afternoon I realized at once that I was in the presence of strength, both physical and mental. Although he had only that morning arrived direct from Brisbane, and admitted that he felt the effects of the long and wearisome journey, the professor showed no apparent signs of it. Even had the fact not been previously known to me, the moment he spoke his nationality was disclosed by his twang—it was more a burr—which, however, was not nearly so marked as in the case of some of his fellow-countrymen who have visited these shores. With the characteristic alacrity which invariably distinguishes the American people he prepared himself for the ordeal before him, and after an initiatory question rattled off at a merry pace.

—First Visit to Australia.—

"Yes, this is my first visit to Australia, and so far I have enjoyed myself immensely. I was anxious to see your country, and readily accepted the invitation of the Sydney University to come over and give a course of lectures. I landed at Brisbane on May 20, proceeded to the harbour city by rail, lectured there, returned to Brisbane, where I gave an address on 'What kind of a university Queensland needs,' and then hurried straight through to Adelaide. I propose to leave here on Saturday for Melbourne, where I am booked to give a couple of lectures, and shall afterward spend a few days at Wellington, Christchurch, and Auckland, New Zealand, whence I shall return home. An important engagement in Boston shortly compels me to curtail my stay, which I should like to be much longer."

—Free Education.—

"What impressions have you formed of Australia?"—"It appears to me that Australia has a great future before it—a future which must be made good in time, and which is now approaching that end. It is an enormously large continent, and will take a long while to occupy properly. I have been much struck by the similarity between the people of Australia and those of the United States. Of course, we have a far larger foreign population. Only approximately 60,000,000 out of 80,000,000 of our people are of British origin, while practically all of yours are British born or descendants of British folk. Australia has precisely the same problems to overcome as those which faced the United States, and in some parts still require solution. One of the explanations of our success has been the method of education. Compared with Australia we are spending three times as much per pound of wealth on our free educational system, which begins in the lower schools, and continues right up to the university. It is absolutely necessary in a new country to give practically free education. The development of the higher education strengthens all forms of the lower. It has been proved conclusively that education moves from above downward. Free education enables the talent that exists in a country to make the most of its opportunities. Every dollar spent on education in the United States has made it a hundred times the richer, and we are continually reaping the reward of our expenditure. As a direct result of the free educational system the young men are highly trained for whatever pursuit in life they desire to adopt. I suppose there is scarcely a man in the Roosevelt Administration who was not trained in a university in political

Advertiser 14th June '07

STUDENTS WHO WORK THEIR WAY.

Lecturing on American universities at the Adelaide University last night, Professor Jordan asserted that the best students turned out in America came from the homes of farmers, the next best from the homes of professional men, and the worst from the homes of rich men. The small fees charged by American universities were, he said, one of the main reasons why they turned out so many strong men, for promising youths from any class of society were able to get a university education. No student was looked down upon because he earned his own living whilst studying at the university. It was a common practice for students who had not means, to wait at table, or do house or garden work. One young man paid his way by trapping animals and birds and sending them to the London Zoological Gardens. Out of 1,200 students at Stanford University 200 had nothing but what they earned.