

### MELBOURNE UNIVERSITY

#### Chair of Economics Filled

#### PROF. COPLAND'S CAREER

HOBART, Today.

Douglas Berry Copland, who has been appointed Professor of the Chair of Economics, which is being established at the University of Melbourne, is a native of New Zealand and comes of farming stock. He attended Canterbury College, Christchurch, from 1913 to 1915, and studied economics under Professor J. Hight. He took first-class honors in economics in 1915 and presented a thesis on wheat production in New Zealand, which was very favorably commented on by the examiner, and subsequently published in 1916. He was in charge of agricultural statistics in Government statistical office in Wellington.

It was in 1917 that Professor Copland came to Tasmania on his appointment as lecturer in history and economics at the University of Tasmania. Largely through his keenness and enthusiasm the work expanded rapidly, both in the University and Workers' Educational Association tutorial class movement. With the active co-operation of business men of the city he took a prominent part in the inauguration of courses in commerce at the University in 1919. In this connection he has done admirable work, and he has maintained confidence of the business men interested in the commerce courses, which has not been mentioned are probably more extensive than any of their kind in the whole of Australasia.

So much did the economic side of the University activity develop that in 1920 the Chair of Economics was established to which Professor Copland was appointed. In the same year he was also appointed director of tutorial classes and placed in charge of this work throughout the State. Professor Copland has developed special attention to research in currency and finance in Australia, and has published a number of papers dealing with these topics, mainly in "The British Economic Journal."

In 1921 he was honored by an invitation to give the Joseph Fisher lecture on commerce in the University of Adelaide, and he chose as his subject "Currency and Prices in Australia," handling it with his customary ability. He has been a contributor to the press on articles on State finance, exchange and kindred subjects, and he published a pamphlet on the public finances of Tasmania.

Professor Copland was president of the economic section of the recent Australasian Science Congress at Adelaide. He is now taking a leading part in the establishment of an Economic Society for Australia and New Zealand, of which he is provisional secretary.

News 9-9-24.

Professor H. G. Chapman, of Sydney University, who reached Outer Harbor this afternoon by the Moldavia, during his visit to Great Britain, made exhaustive enquiries into the latest methods of cancer treatment. He also acted on behalf of the Australian Meat Council, and portion of his mission was to convince British authorities of the harmlessness of the Bullock meat preserving process, whereby meat is submitted to carbon dioxide fumes and safeguarded against deterioration for many months.

Sir George Brookman, after an absence from the State of eight months, returned to Adelaide today by the Mongolia. He visited Great Britain and the Continent. The trip was made both for business and pleasure reasons. Lady Brookman, who accompanied him, will return to South Australia later.

To take the chair of Agricultural Chemistry at the Adelaide University in connection with the Peter Waite bequest Prof. J. A. Prescott arrived by the Moldavia today. For eight years he has been stationed in Egypt, making a special study of cotton and maize, in addition to research work.

Advertiser. 17-9-24.

Our London correspondent telegraphs: Dr. Herbert Heaton, of Adelaide University, leaves for Canada on September 23. He will lecture on Australian economics in the Canadian and the American Universities.

At a meeting of the Adelaide division of the Institution of Engineers, Australia, held at the University on Friday evening.



PROFESSOR J. A. PRESCOTT, M.Sc., who arrived this week to take up his appointment as Professor of Chemistry at the Peter Waite Research Institute.

Register Sept 13.

### CONSERVATORIUM CONCERTS.

#### TO BE BROADCASTED SHORTLY.

A treat is in store for listeners-in. For some time arrangements have been proceeding with a view to regularly broadcasting the splendid Conservatorium concerts and University extension lectures from the powerful amateur station of Mr. E. J. Hume, Park terrace, Parkside, which is well known at 5 Don N.

Recently a committee of University men, including Professor R. W. Chapman and Dr. E. Harold Davies, both of whom have been heard from 5 Don N., were appointed to look into the matter, and it is understood that they have arranged for the laying down of a land line, on which is to be carried the music and speeches from the University to Mr. Hume's station. This will probably take some time, but we may hear "Varsity calling" in the not far distant future. Mr. Hume offered to place his station at the disposal of the University Council, and they have accepted and expressed great appreciation for his generosity and public mindedness. Mr. Hume, who some time ago applied for a B class (or non-revenue earning) station, has not yet received it. Things seem to be moving very slowly in the offices of the Federal authorities, and the delay is irksome, not only to those desiring transmitting licences, but also to listeners-in, and particularly so in this instance. Mr. Hume would like to increase the power of his output, so that listeners-in farther afield may benefit; and there is reason to believe that he will leave Adelaide either on Monday or Tuesday next week for Melbourne, to have a talk with the authorities there in regard to "wireless" matters.

#### BROADCASTING.

### PUBLIC NOTICES.

#### THE UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE.

#### PUBLIC EXAMINATIONS.

The last day of entry for the Intermediate, Leaving, Leaving Honours, Angas Exhibition, and Commercial Examinations is Wednesday, the 1st October.

Forms of Entry may be procured from the Secretaries of Local Centres or the University Office.

257, 61, 4, 71 F. W. EARDLEY, Registrar.

#### S. A. FIELD SHOOTERS' ASSOCIATION.

... attend the annual ...

### CHAIR OF ANTHROPOLOGY.

#### NEW SOUTH WALES GOVERNMENT OFFER.

SYDNEY, Tuesday. Following upon the recommendation of the Australasian Association for the Advancement of Science, during the recent congress at Adelaide, that the Federal Ministry should establish a Chair of Anthropology at one of the Australian Universities, the New South Wales Cabinet has decided to contribute to the cost of such a chair, provided the other States will share the expense.

Register Sept 17-24.

### TRAGIC ART AND MELODRAMA.

#### PROFESSOR STRONG'S LECTURE.

The difference between tragedy and melodrama has proved difficult of definition by the layman, but Professor Archibald Strong, in the course of a lecture in the Public Library lecture room, North terrace, on Wednesday evening, explained the matter in a characteristically lucid manner. The address was the fifth arranged by the Victoria League of South Australia. Mr. Russell Booth presided over a good attendance, which included Lady Bridges, who was attended by Capt. Hambleton.

In opening his lecture the speaker asked his audience why it was they took pleasure in seeing tragedy lived on the stage, suffering of a kind which in ordinary life would give them pain? Leaving that question for fuller discussion at the end of the lecture, he passed on to the distinction of what was tragic in ordinary life and tragedy on the stage. Many things, like death, or some forms of accidents, were commonly called tragic, but the result was merely an accident, and could never be tragic in the dramatic sense of the word, where suffering was invariably the outcome in some sense or other of character. He then passed on to the question of the difference between tragedy and melodrama. Many people, when asked this question, replied that melodrama dealt largely with violent and lurid incidents, with battle, murder, and sudden death, which tragedy, either avoided, or used comparatively sparingly. This was, however, not a true distinction, for an examination of the greatest Greek and Shakespearean dramas showed that they certainly dealt more lavishly in violence, sudden death, and appalling crime than did the average melodrama. The fact was that tragedy faced all the terrors and horrors, and crimes of life, in the performance of a specific function. Professor Strong made a slight digression in order to discuss the function of tragic art, and art generally. He pointed out that the function of art was not to elevate by selecting beautiful subjects from life, isolating them from all or most that was ugly, and holding them up to the admiration of mankind. Its function was to take its subject from all sides of life, including, besides the beautiful, the terrible, the gross, the sinister, and the ugly, and to interpret its subject with such mastery as to give the beholders a keener and a more poignant sense of the meaning of life.

#### Avoiding Ugly Subjects.

It was no part of art's function to avoid ugly subjects, continued the speaker, nor was the beauty of art the same as the beauty of subjects or of Nature. The beauty of art lay in expression, and might co-exist with ugliness of subject. The hideous dwarfs that Valasquez loved to paint were good examples of this. Falstaff was an example of a gross subject beautifully handled. Many of the novels of Balzac dealt with the sinister, with but little alleviation from what in life would be called beautiful, and the novels of Balzac were masterpieces of art. Tragic art shrank from no extreme of terror, nor even of violence. Nothing could be more horrible than the blinding of Gloster in King Lear. Its function was to show the conflict of the human spirit against circumstance, and against every fate, however terrible the circumstance might be. It had no business with so-called poetic justice, where the punishment fitted the crime. In tragedy the suffering which men and women underwent, was out of all proportion to their original deserts. This was so in life, and it was part of life's mystery. It was no part of art's function to solve that mystery. It was art's function to state it, and to do so with the greatest intensity and power. Its object, as Aristotle pointed out, was to effect a purification of the human soul, by awakening the emotions of pity and fear. If these emotions were not awakened somehow, in human beings, their spiritual nature was starved, but if they were awakened in ordinary life by the sufferings of those near and dear to the beholders, the effect was painful. It was here that art came in, and supplied an outlet for those natural human emotions by a process in which a lofty kind of pleasure took the place of pain. The human beings whom they saw presented by tragic art were near enough to common humanity to arouse those feelings, but were universalized in such a way that the pain was eliminated.

#### Greek and Shakespearean Tragedy.

Professor Strong, explaining the difference between Greek and Shakespearean tragedy, said that Greek tragic art possessed a certain almost impersonal grandeur which was, perhaps, not always present in the same degree in Shakespeare, but the latter more than compensated for this by the increased vividness and intensity with which he presented character. In the tragic drama of the last 100 years, it must be admitted that a good deal of the Shakespearean and Greek grandeur had disappeared. This was very far from meaning that these dramas were wholly negligible. Modern tragic drama had done certain things that Shakespeare never attempted to do, especially by widening the field for tragic art. Ibsen, a genius in whom realism, romanticism, and mysticism were superbly united, with a mastery of stagecraft, had shown the spiritual meaning which might lie in middle class lives. The great Russian genius Tchekhov had done one of the most difficult things that a playwright could do. He had shown with fine art, the tragic meaning, and the futility which he saw in Russian life and character. The man, in his opinion, who had the keenest and most profound sense of tragic issue, was one who wrote none of his greatest works for the stage. This was Dostoevski, a genius who handled the darkest and most terrible issues of life with profound spiritual power and insight in such a way, in fact, that those who read his novels must ever after look on life with kinder eyes, and more wise and tolerant hearts.

### TRAGIC ART.

#### ALL PHASES OF LIFE INTERPRETED.

#### LECTURE BY PROFESSOR STRONG.

The function of art, said Professor Strong last night, was to take its subjects from all sides of life, including, in addition to the beautiful, the terrible, the gross, the sinister, and the ugly, and to interpret its subject with such a mastery as to give beholders a keener and more poignant sense of the meaning of life.

Professor A. T. Strong, under the auspices of the Victoria League, delivered a lecture in the Public Library lecture room last night on "The Meaning of Tragic Art." He asked his audience why it was they took pleasure in seeing, lived on the stage, suffering of a kind which in ordinary life would give them pain? Leaving that question for fuller discussion at the end of the lecture, he passed on to the distinction of what was tragic in ordinary life and tragedy on the stage. Many things, like death, or some forms of accidents, he said, were commonly called tragic, but the result of mere accident, could never be tragic in the dramatic sense of the word, where suffering was invariably the outcome in some sense or other of character. He then dealt with the question of the difference between tragedy and melodrama. Many people, when asked this question, replied that melodrama dealt largely with violent and lurid incidents, with battle, murder, and sudden death, which tragedy either avoided or used comparatively sparingly. This was, however, not a true distinction, for an examination of the greatest Greek and Shakespearean dramas showed that they certainly dealt more lavishly in violence, sudden death, and appalling crime than did the average melodrama. The fact was that tragedy faced all the terrors and horrors and crimes of life in the performance of a specific function.

The lecturer made a slight digression in order to discuss the function of tragic art, and art generally. He pointed out that the function of art was not to elevate by selecting beautiful subjects from life, isolating them from all or most that was ugly, and holding them up to the admiration of mankind. Its function was rather to take its subject from all sides of life, including besides the beautiful, also the terrible, the gross, the sinister, and the ugly, and to interpret its subject with such mastery, as to give the beholders a keener and a more poignant sense of the meaning of life. It was no part of art's function to avoid ugly subjects, nor was the beauty of art the same as beauty of subject or of nature. The hideous dwarfs that Valasquez loved to paint were good examples of this. Falstaff was also a good example of a gross subject beautifully handled. Many of the novels of Balzac dealt with the sinister, with but little alleviation from what in life would be called beautiful, and the novels of Balzac were masterpieces of art. Tragic art shrank from no extreme of terror or even of violence. In tragedy the suffering which men and women underwent was out of all proportion to their original deserts. This was so in life, and it was part of life's mystery. It was no part of art's function to solve that mystery. It was art's function, however, to state it, and to state it with the greatest intensity and power. Its object, as Aristotle pointed out, was to effect a purification of the human soul by awakening the emotions of pity and fear. If these emotions were not awakened somehow in human beings, their spiritual nature was starved, but if they were awakened in ordinary life by the sufferings of those near and dear to the beholders, the effect was painful. It was here that art came in and supplied an outlet for these natural human emotions by a process in which a lofty kind of pleasure took the place of pain. The human beings whom they saw presented by tragic art were near enough to common humanity to arouse those feelings, but were universalized in such a way that the pain was eliminated.

Commenting on the difference between Greek and Shakespearean tragedy, the lecturer said Greek tragic art possessed a certain, almost impersonal grandeur which was perhaps not always present in the same degree in Shakespeare, but the latter more than compensated for this by the increased vividness and intensity with which he presented character. In the tragic drama of the last 100 years a good deal of the Shakespearean and Greek grandeur had disappeared. This was very far from meaning that these dramas were wholly negligible. Modern tragic drama had done certain things that Shakespeare never attempted to do, especially by widening the field for tragic art. Ibsen, a genius in whom realism, romanticism, and mysticism were superbly united with a mastery of stagecraft, had shown the spiritual meaning which might lie in middle class lives. The great Russian genius Tchekhov, had shown with fine art the tragic meaning, and the futility which he saw in Russian life and character. In the lecturer's opinion, the man who had the keenest and most profound sense of tragic issue was one who wrote none of his greatest works for the stage. This was Dostoevski, a genius who handled the darkest and most terrible issues of life with profound spiritual power and insight in such a way, in fact, that those who read his novels must ever after look on life with kinder eyes, and more wise and tolerant hearts.