

UNIVERSAL  
LIBRARY

**OU\_152026**

UNIVERSAL  
LIBRARY



OSMANIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Call No. 378.063/A 845 Accession No. G 1562

Author Association of the Universities

Title Sixth Congress..... Commonwealth

This book should be returned on or before the date last marked below.



SIXTH CONGRESS  
OF THE  
UNIVERSITIES OF THE  
BRITISH  
COMMONWEALTH  
1948

---

*Report of  
Proceedings*

*Published by*  
THE ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITIES  
OF THE BRITISH COMMONWEALTH

1951

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN

## PREFACE

THE series of quinquennial Congresses of the Universities of the Empire, which were inaugurated at London in 1912 and of which the fifth was held at Cambridge in 1936, was interrupted for a second time by war, and it was not until May 1947 that it was possible to begin to make plans for the sixth Congress.

At an informal meeting at Corpus Christi College, Oxford, in June of that year, when the Presidents of many Canadian Universities and one or two other overseas academic leaders were present as well as Vice-Chancellors and Principals from the United Kingdom, the need was expressed for the resumption of the normally close relationships between Universities in the different parts of the Commonwealth, and it was decided on the initiative of the Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals of the Universities of Great Britain and Ireland to hold another Congress in the summer of 1948, there being general agreement that the venue on this occasion could only be in Great Britain. An invitation from the University of Oxford was accepted by the Executive Council of the Universities Bureau of the British Empire, and the meeting—which it was agreed should be known as the sixth quinquennial Congress of Universities of the Commonwealth—was duly held at Oxford on 19–23 July 1948.

Advantage was taken of the presence in the delegations of a greater number than at pre-war Congresses of the Vice-Chancellors, Presidents, and Principals of the home and overseas Universities and Colleges to plan for the first time a preliminary conference of executive heads of Universities before the delegates assembled at Oxford. By invitation of the University of Bristol this meeting took place at Bristol on 13–17 July, hospitality and accommodation being provided for the visitors in two of the women's residential halls of the University, Manor Hall and Clifton Hill House. The guests were entertained on the evening of Tuesday, 13 July, at a reception given in the University by the Chairman of the Council and Lady Sinclair and by the Vice-Chancellor and Lady Morris; and on the afternoon of Wednesday, 14 July, by the Vice-Chancellor and Senate of the University at a garden party at Wills Hall. The members of the conference were the guests of the Society of Merchant Venturers of Bristol at dinner on Thursday, 15 July. On Friday, 16 July, a Congregation for the conferment of degrees was held in the Great Hall of the University, when honorary degrees were conferred on some of the distinguished visitors by the Chancellor (the Right Hon. Winston S. Churchill). Most of the time of the conference was, however, occupied by the business sessions, at which the problems of resumption

of inter-University relationships within the Commonwealth were discussed in more detail than could be attained at the main Congress, and from which definite recommendations emerged for submission to the plenary sessions at Oxford.

Members of the Congress arrived in Oxford on Monday, 19 July, and were accommodated in various Colleges. In the late afternoon the official opening was performed in the Sheldonian Theatre by the Chancellor of the University (the Right Hon. the Earl of Halifax) who was the President of the Congress. In the evening the Vice-Chancellor received the delegates at Christ Church as guests of the University.

On Tuesday, 20 July, His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom gave a luncheon to the delegates, also at Christ Church, the Lord President of the Council presiding. The speeches made on this occasion are reproduced in the Report. In the afternoon the Mayor and Mayoress of Oxford held a reception at the Town Hall for members of the Congress. The Extraordinary General Meeting of the Universities Bureau of the British Empire that is constitutionally required to be held during a Congress took place in the early evening, its minutes being included in this Report. The necessary resolutions were passed at this meeting to give effect to decisions reached at previous discussions at Bristol to reconstitute the Universities Bureau and to change its name to the Association of Universities of the British Commonwealth. After dinner the delegates were entertained at Rhodes House by the British Council, documentary films being shown.

The Sheldonian Theatre was the scene of another ceremony after luncheon on Wednesday, 21 July, when the Vice-Chancellor conferred honorary degrees on several of the Congress delegates. Subsequently there was a Garden Party at Somerville College by invitation of the Principal, and a Cocktail Party at Rhodes House given by the Nuffield Foundation.

On the afternoon of Thursday, 21 July, the English Speaking Union gave a garden party at St. John's College, and in the evening the University of Oxford entertained the delegates at dinner at Christ Church.

Each day other than Monday and Tuesday there were luncheon parties, a third of the delegates being guests of the Association at Queen's College, and two-thirds those of the University at Exeter, Corpus Christi, Balliol, Merton, or St. John's Colleges.

The formal business of the Congress took the form of general meetings at which the following topics were discussed: on 20 July, 'Relations of the State and the Universities', introduced by Sir Walter Moberly, Chairman of the University Grants Committee; on

21 July, 'Inter-University Relations', opened by Sir Hector Hetherington, Principal of the University of Glasgow; on 22 July, 'The Balance of Research and Teaching at Universities', opened by Dr. G. A. Currie, Vice-Chancellor of the University of Western Australia; and on 23 July, 'Colonial Higher Education' and 'The University Secondment Scheme', introduced respectively by Sir Alexander Carr-Saunders, Director of the London School of Economics, and General Sir Ronald Adam, Chairman of the British Council. In addition to these debates on questions connected with University policy, the planners of the Congress programme decided to arrange for the discussion of a special topic of general academic interest, and a session on 22 July was devoted to 'A critical review, from the points of view of an historian, a philosopher, and a sociologist, of the structural and moral changes produced in modern society by scientific and technological advance'. The Congress divided for this purpose into two parallel meetings, at each of which three opening papers were read by selected speakers. The Chair at the various meetings was taken in turn by leading members of the delegations from the several countries, and a full record of the discussions is contained in the Report.

The detailed organization of the Congress was carried out by the Secretary and staff of the Universities Bureau under the direction of a committee appointed jointly by the Executive Council of the Bureau and by the Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals of Great Britain and Ireland. Mr. H. Claughton, Principal of the University of London, acted as Chairman until May 1948, when he was succeeded by Dr. R. E. Priestley, Vice-Chancellor of the University of Birmingham. Other members who served on the committee were Dr. W. Cullen (Hon. Treasurer of the Bureau), Sir William Hamilton Fyfe (Principal, University of Aberdeen), Sir Hector Hetherington (Principal, University of Glasgow), Dr. T. Loveday, Sir Philip Morris (Vice-Chancellor, University of Bristol), Dr. W. T. S. Stallybrass (Vice-Chancellor, University of Oxford), Dr. H. M. Taylor (Treasurer, University of Cambridge), Dr. D. Veale (Registrar, University of Oxford), and the Secretary (Mr. J. F. Foster). Mrs. F. Mahony, for many years assistant to the Secretary of the Bureau, was stationed at Oxford during the months preceding the Congress and provided valuable liaison with the University and College administrations, without whose generous assistance and co-operation the successful outcome of the committee's carefully made plans could not have been secured.

After the Congress the delegates from overseas were invited to pay visits to the home Universities, and this hospitality was accepted by a large number of them. The University and Colleges of the

University of Cambridge entertained a large party on 23-6 July, and smaller groups made tours which together covered practically all the University institutions in the country. Further honorary degree ceremonies for visiting delegates took place at the Universities of Cambridge, Glasgow, and London.

In the first post-war Congress it was regarded as essential not only to have the attendance of representatives of the whole range of University institutions throughout the Commonwealth and Empire, but also to have effective representation of all important interests within the delegation sent by each institution. To a much greater extent than at previous Congresses efforts were accordingly directed to making it possible for leading academic figures from the overseas countries to come to the Congress, if necessary by travelling to Great Britain by air specially for the purpose. This result, which was in a large measure achieved, was due to the very generous grants made to the fund for the overseas delegates' travelling expenses by the Carnegie Corporation of New York and by the Imperial Relations Trust. The thanks of the Congress were expressed to these Foundations and to other organizations in Great Britain which assisted with the running expenses of the meeting. Under the conditions prevailing in Europe in 1948, the catering for the delegates' meals, even by Oxford College kitchens, could not have been so adequate without the kindly and spontaneous forethought of some of the Canadian Universities who, before their delegates left, consigned to Oxford a large quantity of the foodstuffs known to be in short supply in Britain. The Congress before it dispersed expressed its gratitude to H.M. Government, to the University and Colleges of Oxford, to the University of Bristol, and to the many societies and individuals whose contribution to the entertainment of the members is recorded in these pages.

## CONTENTS

PREFACE . . . . .	iii
PRESIDENT, VICE-PRESIDENTS . . . . .	xiii
DELEGATES . . . . .	xv
REPRESENTATIVES AND GUESTS . . . . .	xxv

### *Monday, 19 July*

#### OPENING ADDRESS

THE RT. HON. THE EARL OF HALIFAX, Chancellor of the University of Oxford; Chancellor of the University of Sheffield; President of the Congress . . . . .	3
DR. R. E. PRIESTLEY . . . . .	6

### *Tuesday, 20 July*

#### DISCUSSION

RELATIONS OF THE STATE AND THE UNIVERSITIES . . . . .	11
---	----

*Chairman:* SIR JOHN MEDLEY, Chairman, Australian Vice-Chancellors' Committee

*Speakers:*

THE CHAIRMAN . . . . .	11, 45
SIR WALTER MOBERLY . . . . .	11, 43
DR. J. F. MOUNTFORD . . . . .	17
DR. F. CYRIL JAMES . . . . .	20
DR. N. A. M. MACKENZIE . . . . .	23
MR. H. R. RAIKES . . . . .	25
DR. G. A. CURRIE . . . . .	27
LT.-COL. SIR A. L. MUDALIAR . . . . .	29
SIR DAVID S. SMITH . . . . .	32
DR. O. H. MALIK . . . . .	35
SIR IVOR JENNINGS . . . . .	37
DR. JULIAN S. HUXLEY . . . . .	39
DR. T. R. McCONNELL . . . . .	41

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS AT A LUNCHEON GIVEN BY HIS MAJESTY'S GOVERNMENT IN THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND TO THE MEMBERS OF THE CONGRESS . . . . .	46
--	----

*Chairman:* THE RT. HON. HERBERT MORRISON, M.P., Lord President of the Council and a Vice-President of the Congress

*Speakers:*

THE CHAIRMAN . . . . .	46, 56
PROFESSOR LILLIAN M. PENSON . . . . .	51

*Speakers (cont.):*

PROFESSOR S. R. RANGANATHAN . . . . .	53
PROFESSOR R. W. WILCOCKS . . . . .	55

EXTRAORDINARY GENERAL MEETING OF THE UNIVERSITIES BUREAU OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE . . . . .	58
--	----

*Minutes of Meeting:*

1. Annual Report of the Executive Council . . . . .	59
2. Change of Name of the Bureau . . . . .	59
3. Alteration of the Articles of Association . . . . .	59
4. Other Matters . . . . .	60

*Wednesday, 21 July*

## DISCUSSION

INTER-UNIVERSITY RELATIONS (INTERCHANGES, CONFERENCES, APPOINTMENTS, ETC.) . . . . .	65
--	----

*Chairman:* DR. NORMAN A. M. MACKENZIE, President of the University of British Columbia

*Speakers:*

DR. F. CYRIL JAMES . . . . .	65, 81
THE CHAIRMAN . . . . .	65, 74, 75, 76, 79, 81, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 92, 93, 95
SIR HECTOR HETHERINGTON . . . . .	68, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 81, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89
SIR JOHN MEDLEY . . . . .	74, 75, 78, 81, 85, 87, 89, 92
PROFESSOR F. L. WARREN . . . . .	75
PROFESSOR A. BOYCE GIBSON . . . . .	75
DR. A. W. TRUEMAN . . . . .	76
PROFESSOR G. H. LANGLEY . . . . .	76
LORD EUSTACE PERCY . . . . .	76, 86
PROFESSOR T. G. B. OSBORN . . . . .	76
DR. K. MELLANBY . . . . .	77, 87
PROFESSOR W. ANDERSON . . . . .	78, 81
PROFESSOR H. A. INNIS . . . . .	79, 87, 88
PROFESSOR I. A. GORDON . . . . .	79
PROFESSOR P. B. MOON . . . . .	81
DR. A. E. MORGAN . . . . .	81
MR. L. FARRER-BROWN . . . . .	84
MR. S. G. RICHARDSON . . . . .	86
PROFESSOR R. PARES . . . . .	87
DR. ROBERT NEWTON . . . . .	89
MR. A. B. COCHRAN . . . . .	92
DR. T. B. DAVIE . . . . .	93
MISS MARY O. STEVENS . . . . .	93
PROFESSOR J. K. ROBERTSON . . . . .	93
DR. D. VEALE . . . . .	94
DR. W. CULLEN . . . . .	97

## CONTENTS

ix

RESOLUTIONS ON 'INTER-UNIVERSITY RELATIONS'	.	66
AMENDED RESOLUTIONS ON 'INTER-UNIVERSITY RELATIONS'	.	89

*Thursday, 22 July*

### DISCUSSIONS

A CRITICAL REVIEW, FROM THE POINTS OF VIEW OF AN HISTORIAN, A PHILOSOPHER, AND A SOCIOLOGIST, OF THE STRUCTURAL AND MORAL CHANGES PRODUCED IN MODERN SOCIETY BY SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNOLOGICAL ADVANCE	.	101
--	---	-----

#### *Parallel Meetings*

#### MEETING A

*Chairman:* DR. SIDNEY SMITH, President of the University of Toronto

#### *Speakers:*

THE CHAIRMAN	.	101, 116, 126, 131, 134, 135
PROFESSOR JOHN MACMURRAY	.	102, 134
DEAN D. L. THOMSON	.	106, 132
PROFESSOR H. REYBURN	.	111
DR. ROBERT NEWTON	.	116
MR. IFOR L. EVANS	.	118, 126
DR. A. J. CRAIG	.	119
DR. E. G. MALHERBE	.	119
PROFESSOR J. K. ROBERTSON	.	122
DEAN H. N. FIELDHOUSE	.	123
DR. R. C. WALLACE	.	125
THE REV. PROFESSOR C. E. RAVEN	.	126
CHIEF JUSTICE O. S. TYNDALE	.	128
MR. J. H. NICHOLSON	.	128
PROFESSOR R. PEERS	.	129
PROFESSOR T. M. KNOX	.	130
PROFESSOR R. W. WILCOCKS	.	132

#### MEETING B

*Chairman:* MR. H. R. RAIKES, Principal and Vice-Chancellor,<sup>†</sup> University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg

#### *Speakers:*

THE CHAIRMAN	.	136, 152
PROFESSOR A. BOYCE GIBSON	.	136, 165
PROFESSOR R. W. FIRTH	.	141
PROFESSOR H. A. INNIS	.	147
DR. C. J. ELIEZER	.	152
DR. C. E. BRUNTON	.	153

*Speakers (cont.):*

MR. R. F. CURREY . . . . .	154
PROFESSOR P. E. DUSTOOR . . . . .	155
MR. M. RUTHNASWAMI . . . . .	156
DR. K. C. BAILEY . . . . .	157
PROFESSOR LILLIAN M. PENSON . . . . .	158
MISS MARY O. STEVENS . . . . .	159
PROFESSOR A. H. TOCKER . . . . .	160
PROFESSOR A. W. P. WOLTERS . . . . .	161
MR. J. R. DARLING . . . . .	162
PROFESSOR S. MATHAI . . . . .	163
PROFESSOR W. ANDERSON . . . . .	164
LT.-COL. H. J. BUTCHART . . . . .	165

THE BALANCE OF RESEARCH AND TEACHING AT UNIVERSITIES . . . . .	169
--	-----

*Chairman:* DR. W. T. S. STALLYBRASS, Vice-Chancellor of the University of Oxford

*Speakers:*

THE CHAIRMAN . . . . .	169, 191
DR. G. A. CURRIE . . . . .	169, 190
PROFESSOR S. R. RANGANATHAN . . . . .	176
PROFESSOR E. D. MOUNTAIN . . . . .	177
MR. M. RUTHNASWAMI . . . . .	180
PROFESSOR H. A. INNIS . . . . .	180
PROFESSOR F. L. WARREN . . . . .	181
PROFESSOR P. E. DUSTOOR . . . . .	182
PROFESSOR T. G. H. JONES . . . . .	183
DR. T. B. DAVIE . . . . .	184
SIR LEON SIMON . . . . .	186
THE VERY REV. S. M. ZARB . . . . .	187
PROFESSOR A. R. HUMPHREYS . . . . .	188
PROFESSOR A. BOYCE GIBSON . . . . .	189

*Friday, 23 July*

## DISCUSSIONS

1. GENERAL PLANS FOR COLONIAL HIGHER EDUCATION . . . . .	195
2. THE EXTENSION OF THE UNIVERSITY SECONDMENT SCHEME . . . . .	195

*Chairman:* PROFESSOR D. HUGHES PARRY, Vice-Chancellor of the University of London and Chairman of the Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals

1. GENERAL PLANS FOR COLONIAL HIGHER EDUCATION . . . . .	195
--	-----

*Speakers:*

THE CHAIRMAN . . . . .	195, 206, 209, 211
SIR ALEXANDER CARR-SAUNDERS . . . . .	195

# CONTENTS

xi

*Speakers (cont.):*

MR. L. C. WILCHER . . . . .	201
DR. K. MELLANBY . . . . .	204
MR. H. R. RAIKES . . . . .	206
DR. E. G. MALHERBE . . . . .	208
DR. J. W. DAVIDSON . . . . .	209
DR. D. VEALE . . . . .	212

2. THE EXTENSION OF THE UNIVERSITY SECONDMENT SCHEME . 213

*Speakers:*

THE CHAIRMAN . . . . .	213, 218
GENERAL SIR RONALD FORBES ADAM . . . . .	213, 216, 217, 218
PROFESSOR A. R. HUMPHREYS . . . . .	215
SIR LEON SIMON . . . . .	216
THE REV. PROFESSOR C. E. RAVEN . . . . .	216
SIR DAVID S. SMITH . . . . .	218

## GENERAL DISCUSSION

*Speakers:*

MR. H. J. PAGE . . . . .	219
DR. B. W. WILLIAMS . . . . .	220
MR. W. E. DYER . . . . .	221
PROFESSOR F. L. WARREN . . . . .	222
LORD CHORLEY . . . . .	222
PROFESSOR LILLIAN M. PENSON . . . . .	223
THE CHAIRMAN . . . . .	225, 226
GENERAL SIR RONALD FORBES ADAM . . . . .	225
MR. J. F. FOSTER . . . . .	226

APPENDIX I: INTER-UNIVERSITY RELATIONS. REPORT ON A VISIT  
TO AUSTRALIA BY DR. D. VEALE, REGISTRAR OF THE UNIVERSITY  
OF OXFORD . . . . . 228

APPENDIX II: MEMBER INSTITUTIONS OF THE BUREAU, 1936-48;  
MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL OF THE BUREAU, 1936-48 235



SIXTH CONGRESS OF  
UNIVERSITIES OF THE COMMONWEALTH  
1948

PRESIDENT

THE RT. HON. THE EARL OF HALIFAX

K.G., G.C.S.I., G.C.I.E., O.M., D.C.L.

*Chancellor of the University of Oxford and of the University of Sheffield*

VICE-PRESIDENTS

CHANCELLORS of the Universities of England and Wales, Scotland, and Ireland:

BIRMINGHAM	The Rt. Hon. Anthony EDEN, M.C., D.C.L., LL.D., M.P.
BRISTOL	The Rt. Hon. Winston CHURCHILL, O.M., C.H., LL.D., F.R.S., M.P.
CAMBRIDGE	Field-Marshal The Rt. Hon. J. C. SMUTS, O.M., C.H., F.R.S.
DURHAM	The Most Honourable The Marquess of LONDONDERRY, K.G., M.V.O., D.C.L., LL.D.
LEEDS	His Grace The Duke of DEVONSHIRE, K.G., M.B.E., LL.D., J.P.
LONDON	The Rt. Hon. The Earl of ATHLONE, K.G., G.C.B., G.C.M.G., G.C.V.O., D.S.O., LL.D., D.C.L., F.R.S.
MANCHESTER	The Rt. Hon. Lord WOOLTON OF LIVERPOOL, C.H., D.L., M.A., B.Sc., LL.D.
READING	The Rt. Hon. The Viscount TEMPLEWOOD, G.C.S.I., C.M.G., G.B.E., D.C.L., LL.D., D.Litt.
ABERDEEN	Field-Marshal The Rt. Hon. The Earl WAVELL, G.C.B., G.C.S.I., G.C.I.E., C.M.G., M.C.
EDINBURGH	The Most Honourable The Marquess of LINLITHGOW, K.G., K.T., G.C.S.I., G.C.I.E.
GLASGOW	Sir John BOYD ORR, D.S.O., M.D., D.Sc., LL.D., F.R.S.
BELFAST	The Most Honourable The Marquess of LONDONDERRY, K.G., M.V.O., D.C.L., LL.D.
DUBLIN	The Rt. Hon. The Earl of IVEAGH, C.B., C.M.G., LL.D.

HEADS OF HOUSES in the University of Oxford:

ALL SOULS	<i>Warden:</i> B. H. SUMNER, M.A., F.B.A.
BALLIOL	<i>Master:</i> The Rt. Hon. Lord LINDSAY OF BIRKER, C.B.E., M.A., LL.D.
BRASENOSE	<i>Principal:</i> W. T. S. STALLYBRASS, O.B.E., D.C.L.
CHRIST CHURCH	<i>Dean:</i> The Very Rev. J. LOWE, D.D., M.A.
CORPUS CHRISTI	<i>President:</i> Sir Richard W. LIVINGSTONE, M.A., D.Litt., LL.D.
EXETER	<i>Rector:</i> E. A. BARBER, M.A., F.B.A.
HERTFORD	<i>Principal:</i> N. R. MURPHY, M.A.
JESUS	<i>Principal:</i> Sir Frederick W. OGILVIE, M.A., LL.D.
LINCOLN	<i>Rector:</i> K. A. H. MURRAY, B.Litt., M.A., B.Sc., Ph.D.
MAGDALEN	<i>President:</i> T. S. R. BOASE, M.A.

MERTON	Warden: G. R. G. MURE, M.C., M.A.
NEW	Warden: A. H. SMITH, C.B.E., M.A.
ORIEL	Provost: G. N. CLARK, M.A., D.Litt.
PEMBROKE	Master: The Rev. F. HOMES DUDDEN, D.D., D.Litt.
QUEEN'S	Provost: J. Walter JONES, M.A., LL.M.
ST. JOHN'S	President: A. L. POOLE, M.A.
TRINITY	President: J. R. H. WEAVER, D.Litt., M.A.
UNIVERSITY	Master: The Rev. J. H. S. WILD, M.A.
WADHAM	Warden: C. M. BOWRA, M.A., D.Litt., F.B.A.
WORCESTER	Provost: J. C. MASTERMAN, O.B.E., M.A.
ST. EDMUND HALL	Principal: A. B. EMDEN, M.A.
KEBLE	Warden: The Rev. H. J. CARPENTER, M.A.
ST. PETER'S HALL	Master: The Rev. R. W. HOWARD, M.A.
ST. CATHERINE'S SOCIETY	Censor: The Rev. V. J. K. BROOK, M.A.
LADY MARGARET HALL	Principal: Lucy Stuart SUTHERLAND, M.A.
SOMERVILLE	Principal: Janet M. VAUGHAN, D.M., M.A.
ST. HUGH'S	Principal: Evelyn E. S. PROCTER, M.A.
ST. HILDA'S	Principal: Julia de L. MANN, M.A.
ST. ANNE'S SOCIETY	Principal: The Hon. Eleanor M. PLUMER, M.A.
NUFFIELD	Warden: Sir Henry CLAY, D.Sc., M.A.

*Lord President of the Council:* The Rt. Hon. Herbert MORRISON, M.P.

*Secretaries of State:*

COMMONWEALTH RELATIONS	The Rt. Hon. Philip NOEL-BAKER, M.P.
COLONIES	The Rt. Hon. A. CREECH JONES, M.P.
SCOTLAND	The Rt. Hon. Arthur WOODBURN, M.P.

*Minister of Education:* The Rt. Hon. George TOMLINSON, M.P.

*London Representatives of British Dominions:*

CANADA	Norman A. ROBERTSON.
AUSTRALIA	The Rt. Hon. J. A. BEASLEY.
NEW ZEALAND	The Rt. Hon. W. J. JORDON, J.P.
SOUTH AFRICA	Leif EGELAND.
INDIA	V. K. KRISHNA MENON.
PAKISTAN	H. I. RAHIMTOOLA.

*Chairman of the University Grants Committee:*

Sir Walter MOBERLY, K.C.B., D.S.O., Litt.D.

*Chairman of the Carnegie Trust for the Universities of Scotland:*

Sir John Ireland FALCONER, M.A., D.L., LL.D.

*Senior Trustee of the Rhodes Trust:*

The Rt. Hon. L. S. AMERY, C.H., D.C.L.

*Chairman of the Imperial Relations Trust:*

Sir William GOODENOUGH, Bart.

*Chairman of the Managing Trustees, Nuffield Foundation:*

Sir William GOODENOUGH, Bart.

*Chairman of The British Council:*

General Sir Ronald Forbes ADAM, Bart., G.C.B.,  
D.S.O., O.B.E.

*President of The Royal Society:*

Professor Sir Robert ROBINSON, LL.D., D.Sc.

*President of The British Academy:*

Sir Harold Idris BELL, C.B., O.B.E.

*President of The British Association for the Advancement of Science:*

Sir Henry TIZARD, K.C.B., F.R.S.

*Chairman, Universities Bureau of the British Empire:*

The Rt. Hon. Lord HARLECH, K.G., G.C.M.G.,  
D.C.L., LL.D.

## DELEGATES

### GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

#### BIRMINGHAM

R. E. PRIESTLEY, M.C., M.A., D.Sc., LL.D., Vice-Chancellor. (Vice-Chairman, Universities Bureau.)

W. H. NEWTON, M.A., F.C.A., Treasurer.

P. B. MOON, M.Sc., M.A., Ph.D., Professor of Physics.

F. J. SCHONELL, Ph.D., D.Litt., F.B.P.S., Professor and Head of Department of Education.

G. TEMPLEMAN, M.A., Lecturer in Medieval History and Admission Tutor in Arts.

C. G. BURTON, M.Com., F.C.I.S., Secretary.

#### BRISTOL

Sir Philip MORRIS, C.B.E., M.A., Vice-Chancellor.

G. C. FIELD, M.A., D.Litt., Professor of Philosophy and Pro-Vice-Chancellor.

C. M. MACINNES, M.A., Professor of Imperial History.

W. G. VERDON-SMITH, B.C.L., M.A., Vice-Chairman of Council.

#### CAMBRIDGE

The Rev. Professor C. E. RAVEN, M.A., D.D., Master of Christ's College and Vice-Chancellor. (Member of Executive Council, Universities Bureau.)

Sir Will SPENS, C.B.E., M.A., LL.D., CHEV. LÉG.D'H., Master of Corpus Christi College. (Imperial Relations Trustee.)

Sir John LENNARD-JONES, D.Sc., Ph.D., F.R.S., Professor of Theoretical Chemistry.

W. W. GRAVE, M.A., Ph.D., Registry.

J. T. SAUNDERS, M.A., Secretary-General of the Faculties.

#### DURHAM

The Rt. Hon. Lord Eustace PERCY, M.A., LL.D., D.C.L., Vice-Chancellor and Rector of King's College.

J. F. DUFF, M.A., M.Ed., LL.D., Pro-Vice-Chancellor and Warden of the Durham Colleges.

E. F. COLLINGWOOD, C.B.E., M.A., Ph.D., Member of the Court and Council.

D. T. JACK, M.A., Professor of Economics.

C. LEECH, M.A., Ph.D., Lecturer in English.

#### LEEDS

G. C. VEALE, LL.D., Pro-Chancellor.

B. MOUAT-JONES, D.S.O., M.A., D.C.L., Vice-Chancellor.

A. DURWARD, M.D., F.R.S. (Edin.), Professor of Anatomy.

S. G. RICHARDSON, M.Sc., Lecturer in Mechanical Engineering.

LIVERPOOL

- V. E. COTTON, C.B.E., T.D., M.A., President of University Council and Pro-Chancellor.
- J. F. MOUNTFORD, M.A., D.Litt., LL.D., Vice-Chancellor. (Member of Executive Council, Universities Bureau.)
- J. M. WHITTAKER, M.A., D.Sc., Professor of Mathematics.
- C. E. BRUNTON, M.A., M.D., Sc.D., Senior Lecturer in Physiology.

LONDON

- D. HUGHES PARRY, M.A., LL.D., Vice-Chancellor and Professor of English Law. (Chairman of Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals.)
- D. W. LOGAN, D.Phil., M.A., B.C.L., Principal. (Member of Executive Council, Universities Bureau.)
- Sir Alexander CARR-SAUNDERS, M.A., LL.D., Litt.D., F.B.A., Director, London School of Economics.
- Lillian M. PENSON, B.A., Ph.D., F.R.Hist.S., Professor of Modern History. (Chairman of the Academic Council and Vice-Chancellor Elect.)
- S. J. WORSLEY, D.S.O., M.C., T.D., M.A., Principal, College of Estate Management.
- Sir Francis FRASER, M.A., M.D., F.R.C.P., Deputy Vice-Chancellor and Director of Postgraduate Medical Federation.
- B. Ifor EVANS, M.A., D.Litt., Principal, Queen Mary College.

MANCHESTER

- W. J. PUGH, O.B.E., B.A., D.Sc., Deputy Vice-Chancellor and Professor of Geology.
- The Rt. Hon. Lord SIMON OF WYTHENSHAW, M.A., LL.D., Chairman of Council.
- H. B. CHARLTON, M.A., Litt.D., Hon. Dr. (DIJON), Professor of English Literature.
- F. A. VICK, O.B.E., Ph.D., F.Inst.P., Senior Lecturer in Physics.

OXFORD

- \*W. T. S. STALLYBRASS, O.B.E., D.C.L., Principal of Brasenose College and Vice-Chancellor. (Member of Executive Council, Universities Bureau.)
- \*Sir Richard LIVINGSTONE, M.A., D.Litt., LL.D., President of Corpus Christi College.
- \*The Very Rev. J. LOWE, D.D., M.A., Dean of Christ Church.
- C. H. M. WALDOCK, C.M.G., O.B.E., B.C.L., M.A., Fellow of All Souls and Chichele Professor of Public International Law.
- A. L. GOODHART, K.C., D.C.L., Fellow of University College and Professor of Jurisprudence.
- T. G. B. OSBORN, M.A., D.Sc., Fellow of Magdalen College and Sherardian Professor of Botany.
- E. J. BOWEN, M.A., D.Sc., Fellow of University College and Praelector in Chemistry.

READING

- A. W. P. WOLTERS, M.A., Deputy Vice-Chancellor and Professor of Psychology.
- P. WHITE, M.A., Ph.D., Lecturer in Mathematics.
- E. SMITH, M.A., B.Litt., B.Sc., Registrar.

\* Also Vice-President of Congress.

## SHEFFIELD

- J. I. O. MASSON, M.B.E., LL.D., D.Sc., F.R.S., Vice-Chancellor.  
 E. J. WAYNE, M.D., Ph.D., F.R.C.P., Professor of Pharmacology and Therapeutics.  
 Alice GARNETT, B.A., Ph.D., Senior Lecturer in Geography.

## WALES

- Ifor L. EVANS, M.A., Vice-Chancellor; Principal of University College of Wales, Aberystwyth.  
 J. BROUGH, D.Sc., F.R.S. (EDIN.), Professor of Zoology and Comparative Anatomy, University College, Cardiff.  
 The Rev. D. W. GUNDRY, M.Th., Faculty of Theology, University College, Bangor.

## ABERDEEN

- Sir William Hamilton FYFE, M.A., LL.D., F.R.S., F.R.S.Can., Vice-Chancellor and Principal. (Member of Executive Council, Universities Bureau.)  
 D. CAMPBELL, M.C., M.A., B.Sc., M.D., F.R.F.P.S., Regius Professor of Materia Medica.  
 E. M. WRIGHT, M.A., D.Phil., Professor of Mathematics.  
 G. L. PURSER, M.A., F.R.S. (EDIN.), Lecturer in Embryology and Histology.  
 Lt.-Col. H. J. BUTCHART, D.S.O., T.D., B.L., Secretary and Factor.

## EDINBURGH

- Sydney SMITH, C.B.E., M.D., F.R.C.P., D.P.H., Acting Principal and Professor of Forensic Medicine.  
 R. PARES, C.B.E., M.A., Professor of British History.  
 A. M. CLARK, M.A., D.Phil., D.Litt., F.R.S. (EDIN.), Reader in English Literature.  
 C. H. STEWART, M.A., LL.B., Secretary.

## GLASGOW

- Sir Hector HETHERINGTON, K.B.E., Litt.D., LL.D., Principal and Vice-Chancellor. (Member of Executive Council, Universities Bureau.)  
 J. D. ANDERSON, O.B.E., M.A., B.Sc., representing University Court.  
 A. W. GOMME, M.A., F.B.A., Professor of Classics.  
 E. L. G. STONES, M.A., Lecturer in History.  
 W. G. MACLAGAN, M.A., Ph.D., Professor of Moral Philosophy.  
 T. ALTY, D.Sc., Ph.D., Professor of Natural Philosophy. (Master designate of Rhodes University College, S. Africa.)

## ST. ANDREWS

- T. M. KNOX, M.A., Professor of Moral Philosophy.  
 D. N. WIMBERLEY, C.B., D.S.O., M.C., LL.D., Principal, University College, Dundee.  
 D. J. B. RITCHIE, B.L., Secretary and Registrar.

## THE QUEEN'S, BELFAST

- Sir David LINDSAY KEIR, M.A., LL.D., Vice-Chancellor.  
 Brigadier J. A. SINTON, V.C., O.B.E., M.B., B.Ch., D.Sc., F.R.S., Member of Senate.  
 K. S. ISLES, M.A., M.Sc., Professor of Economics.  
 C. L. WILSON, M.Sc., Ph.D., F.R.I.C., Lecturer in Chemistry.

xviii COMMONWEALTH UNIVERSITIES CONGRESS

DUBLIN

E. H. ALTON, M.A., Litt.D., Provost of Trinity College, Dublin.  
K. C. BAILEY, M.A., Sc.D., Litt.D., Registrar.

NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF IRELAND

M. TIERNEY, M.A., President, University College, Dublin.  
A. O'RAHILLY, M.A., D.Litt., D.Phil., D.Sc., President, University College,  
Cork.

*University Colleges*

S.W. OF ENGLAND, EXETER

T. A. BROWN, M.A., B.Sc., F.R.S. (EDIN.), F.R.A.S., Professor of Mathematics.  
B. G. LAMPARD-VACHELL, M.A., LL.B., Treasurer.

HULL

J. H. NICHOLSON, M.A., Principal.  
H. SHOOSMITH, M.A., Member of Council.  
T. E. JESSOP, M.A., B.Litt., Ferens Professor of Philosophy and Psychology.  
H. H. LUCAS, B.A., Lecturer in French.

LEICESTER

F. L. ATTENBOROUGH, M.A., Principal.  
A. R. HUMPHREYS, M.A., Professor of English.  
Rhoda BENNETT, M.A., Librarian.

NOTTINGHAM

R. PEERS, O.B.E., M.C., M.A., J.P., Acting Principal and Professor of Adult  
Education.  
B. L. HALLWARD, M.A., Principal designate.  
Alderman Major T. P. BARBER, D.S.O., B.A., D.L., Vice-President and  
Treasurer.  
C. E. MARSHALL, D.Sc., Ph.D., Professor of Geology.  
A. H. STEWART, B.A., Lecturer in Education.

SOUTHAMPTON

Sir Samuel GURNEY-DIXON, M.A., M.D., J.P., Vice-President and Chairman of  
the Council.  
Sir Robert S. WOOD, K.B.E., C.B., M.A., Principal.  
G. F. FORSEY, M.A., Vice-Principal, Professor of Classics.  
W. I. LUCAS, M.A., Ph.D., Senior Lecturer in German.

---

MUNICIPAL COLLEGE OF TECHNOLOGY, MANCHESTER

J. E. MYERS, O.B.E., D.Sc., J.P., Principal.

ROYAL TECHNICAL COLLEGE, GLASGOW

D. S. ANDERSON, B.Sc., Ph.D., Principal.

CANADA

ALBERTA

Robert NEWTON, M.C., B.S.A., D.Sc., Ph.D., F.R.S.C., President.  
R. M. HARDY, M.Sc., Dean of Engineering and Professor of Civil Engineering.

## BRITISH COLUMBIA

- N. A. M. MACKENZIE, C.M.G., M.M., K.C., B.A., LL.D., D.C.L., F.R.S.C.,  
President.
- W. H. GAGE, M.A., Dean of Administrative and Inter-Faculty Affairs and Pro-  
fessor of Mathematics.
- W. K. LAMB, M.A., Ph.D., Librarian and Assistant to Dean of Faculty of Arts.
- G. M. SHRUM, O.B.E., M.M., M.A., Ph.D., F.R.S.C., Professor and Head of  
Department of Physics.
- J. BIELY, M.S., M.S.A., Associate Professor of Poultry Husbandry.

## DALHOUSIE

- A. E. KERR, D.D., LL.D., President.
- G. E. WILSON, M.A., Ph.D., Dean of Arts and Science, Professor of History.

## LAVAL

- Mgr. Ferdinand VANDRY, P.A., C.M.G., D.Th., L.Ph., Rector Magnificus.
- The Rev. E. LEMIEUX, L.Ph., D.Th., Professor of Theology.

## McGILL

- F. Cyril JAMES, M.A., Ph.D., D.C.L., LL.D., Principal and Vice-Chancellor.  
(Chairman, National Conference of Canadian Universities.)
- Hon. Associate Chief Justice O. S. TYNDALE, M.A., D.C.L., Chancellor and  
Chairman of Board of Governors.
- D. L. THOMSON, M.A., Ph.D., F.R.S.C., Dean of Faculty of Graduate Studies  
and Research and Professor of Biochemistry.
- H. N. FIELDHOUSE, M.A., F.R.S.C., Dean of Faculty of Arts and Science and  
Professor of History.

## McMASTER

- G. P. GILMOUR, M.A., D.D., Chancellor and Principal.
- H. G. THODE, M.Sc., Ph.D., Professor of Chemistry and Director of Research  
(Physical Sciences).
- N. W. RADFORTH, M.A., Ph.D., Professor of Botany. (Director, Royal Botanical  
Gardens, Hamilton.)

## MANITOBA

- A. H. S. GILLSON, O.B.E., M.A., President and Vice-Chancellor.

## MONTREAL

- Mgr. O. MAURAUULT, C.M.G., B.A., D.Litt., P.D., D.C.L., Rector.

## MOUNT ALLISON

- The Rev. W. T. ROSS FLEMINGTON, O.B.E., M.A., D.D., B.Paed., President.
- D. G. MACGREGOR, M.A., Professor of Physics and Secretary of Senate.
- Rev. H. TUCKER, M.A., M.Ed., Ph.D., Dean of Faculty of Arts and Registrar.
- H. W. McKIEL, B.A., B.Sc., LL.D., Dean of Faculty of Science and Professor  
of Engineering and Geology.

## NEW BRUNSWICK

- A. W. TRUEMAN, M.A., D.Litt., President.

## OTTAWA

- The Very Rev. J. C. LAFRAMBOISE, O.M.I., Ph.D., S.T.D., Rector.
- The Rev. H. POUPART, O.M.I., Ph.D., S.T.D., Dean of Faculty of Arts and  
Professor of Mathematics.
- The Rev. F. E. BANIM, O.M.I., M.A., S.T.L., Dean of Faculty of Arts, St.  
Patrick's College.

QUEEN'S

- R. C. WALLACE, C.M.G., M.A., D.Sc., Ph.D., LL.D., F.G.S., F.R.S.C.,  
Principal and Vice-Chancellor.  
G. S. MELVIN, M.D., Dean of Medicine and Professor of Physiology.  
J. K. ROBERTSON, M.A., F.R.S.C., Professor and Head of Department of  
Physics.  
Jean I. ROYCE, B.A., Registrar.  
E. L. BRUCE, M.A., B.Sc., Ph.D., F.R.S.C., Miller Memorial Research Pro-  
fessor (Geology); Chairman, Committee on Graduate Studies.  
A. Vibert DOUGLAS, M.B.E., B.A., M.Sc., Ph.D., F.R.A.S., Dean of Women  
and Associate Professor of Astronomy.  
L. W. BROCKINGTON, C.M.G., K.C., LL.D., D.C.L., Rector.

ST. FRANCIS XAVIER

- The Rt. Rev. Mgr. P. J. NICHOLSON, Ph.D., President.  
The Rev. M. MACDONNELL, M.A., Dean of Discipline and Professor of History.  
The Rev. John H. GILLIS, Ph.D., Registrar and Professor of Classics.

SASKATCHEWAN

- J. S. THOMSON, M.A., D.D., LL.D., F.R.S.C., President and Vice-Chancellor.  
A. ANSTENSEN, M.A., Ph.D., Professor of German and Norwegian.

TORONTO

- Sidney SMITH, K.C., M.A., LL.D., D.C.L., President.  
H. A. INNIS, M.A., Ph.D., LL.D., F.R.S.C., Professor and Head of Department  
of Political Economy.  
J. A. MACFARLANE, B.A., M.B., F.R.C.S., Dean of Faculty of Medicine.  
H. BENNETT, B.A., Ph.D., Dean of Victoria College.

WESTERN ONTARIO

- G. E. HALL, M.S.A., M.D., Ph.D., F.R.S.C., President and Vice-Chancellor.  
R. B. WILLIS, M.A., Comptroller of the University and Lecturer in Finance.  
R. J. ROSSITER, M.A., D.Phil., B.M., B.Ch., B.Sc., F.R.I.C., Professor of Bio-  
chemistry.  
J. B. COLLIP, C.B.E., M.D., F.R.S., Professor of Medical Research and Dean  
of Faculty of Medicine.

AUSTRALIA

ADELAIDE

- K. WILLS, C.B.E., M.C., E.D., Member of Council.  
C. W. GOODMAN, B.E.

AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL UNIVERSITY

- Sir Howard FLOREY, M.A., M.D., Ph.D., Member of Academic Advisory  
Committee. (Professor of Pathology, Oxford.)  
R. W. FIRTH, Ph.D., Member of Academic Advisory Committee. (Professor  
of Social Anthropology, London School of Economics.)  
W. K. HANCOCK, M.A., Member of Academic Advisory Committee. (Professor  
of Economic History, Oxford.)  
M. L. OLIPHANT, M.Sc., Ph.D., LL.D., F.R.S., Member of Academic Advisory  
Committee. (Poynting Professor and Director of Department of Physics,  
Birmingham.)

## MELBOURNE

Sir John D. G. MEDLEY, M.A., Vice-Chancellor. (Chairman, Australian Vice-Chancellors' Committee.)

J. R. DARLING, M.A., Member of Council.

A. Boyce GIBSON, M.A., Professor of Philosophy.

M. SHAW, M.Eng., M.Mech.E., Senior Lecturer in Engineering.

R. C. JOHNSON, M.A., D.Sc., Ph.D., Master of Queen's College and Lecturer in Physics.

## QUEENSLAND

T. G. H. JONES, D.Sc., Professor of Chemistry.

E. C. D. RINGROSE, B.A., B.Ed., B.Sc., Associate Professor of Education.

## SYDNEY

S. H. ROBERTS, M.A., Litt.D., D.Sc., Vice-Chancellor.

C. G. McDONALD, M.B., Ch.M., F.R.A.C.P., Member of Senate, Lecturer in Clinical Medicine.

A. H. McDONALD, M.A., Ph.D., Professor of Ancient World History.

F. V. MERCER, B.Sc., Lecturer in Botany.

## TASMANIA

Alan BURN, M.Sc., B.E., Vice-Chancellor and Professor of Engineering.

Christine M. WALCH, M.A., M.B., Ch.M., Member of Council.

A. G. FENTON, B.Sc., Lecturer in Physics.

## WESTERN AUSTRALIA

G. A. CURRIE, D.Sc., Vice-Chancellor.

Mary O. STEVENS, B.A., Member of Senate.

Allan EDWARDS, M.A., Professor of English.

N. V. RIGGS, B.Sc., Former Lecturer in Organic Chemistry.

## CANBERRA UNIVERSITY COLLEGE

T. M. OWEN, B.Com., Registrar and Secretary to the Council.

## NEW ZEALAND

## UNIVERSITY OF NEW ZEALAND

Sir David S. SMITH, LL.M., Chancellor.

Professor I. A. GORDON, M.A., Ph.D., Vice-Chancellor.

A. W. HUDSON, B.Agr., B.Sc., Professor of Agriculture, Director of Canterbury School of Agriculture.

*Constituent Colleges*

## UNIVERSITY OF OTAGO

R. S. AITKEN, M.D., D.Phil., F.R.C.P., Vice-Chancellor.

R. J. T. BELL, M.A., D.Sc., LL.D., Emeritus Professor of Mathematics (retired).

R. JACK, M.A., D.Sc., Ph.D., Dean of Faculty of Science and Professor of Physics.

S. N. SLATER, M.Sc., D.Phil., Lecturer in Chemistry.

A. ROSS, M.C., M.A., Senior Lecturer in History.

## CANTERBURY UNIVERSITY COLLEGE

A. H. TOCKER, M.A., Rector.

H. R. HULME, M.A., Ph.D., Rector designate.

I. L. HOLMES, B.E., Lecturer in Civil Engineering.

AUCKLAND UNIVERSITY COLLEGE

- W. ANDERSON, M.A., Professor of Philosophy and Chairman of Professorial Board.  
A. B. FITT, M.A., Ph.D., Professor and Dean of Faculty of Education.  
C. G. F. SIMKIN, M.A., Dip.Soc.Sc., Dean of Faculty of Commerce.  
A. H. JOHNSTONE, O.B.E., K.C., B.A., LL.B., Vice-President of Council.  
F. H. SAGAR, M.Sc., Lecturer in Physics.

VICTORIA UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, WELLINGTON

- T. D. M. STOUT, Ch.M., Chairman of Council.  
J. W. DAVIDSON, M.A., Ph.D. (University Lecturer in History, Cambridge, and representative on Bureau.)  
A. B. COCHRAN, M.A., Lecturer in English Language and Literature.

SOUTH AFRICA

CAPE TOWN

- T. B. DAVIE, B.A., M.D., F.R.C.P., Principal and Vice-Chancellor.  
E. BATSON, B.Sc., Professor of Social Science.  
W. S. MACKIE, M.A., De Beers Professor and Head of Department of English.  
H. REYBURN, M.A., Ph.D., Professor of Logic and Psychology.

SOUTH AFRICA

- H. v.d.M. SCHOLTZ, *see* Orange Free State, *below*.  
Anna J. D. DE VILLIERS, *see* Huguenot University College.  
E. G. MALHERBE, *see* Natal University College.  
R. W. VARDER, *see* Rhodes University College.

*Constituent Colleges*

ORANGE FREE STATE, UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF THE

- Professor H. v.d.M. SCHOLTZ, M.A., D.Litt., Principal.

HUGUENOT UNIVERSITY COLLEGE

- Anna J. D. DE VILLIERS, M.A., D.Litt., Principal.  
Paule L. VANDERSTICHELE, M.Sc., Professor of Chemistry.

NATAL UNIVERSITY COLLEGE

- E. G. MALHERBE, M.A., Ph.D., Principal.  
G. H. DURRANT, M.A., Professor of English.  
F. L. WARREN, B.Sc., Ph.D., D.I.C., F.R.I.C., Professor of Chemistry and Chemical Technology and Dean of the Faculty of Science.  
R. M. JEHU, M.Sc., F.G.S., Professor of Geography and Dean of the Faculty of Arts.

POTCHEFSTROOM UNIVERSITY COLLEGE

- J. M. DE WET, M.Sc., Lecturer in Mathematics.

RHODES UNIVERSITY COLLEGE

- R. W. VARDER, M.A., Professor of Physics and Acting Master.  
R. F. CURREY, M.C., M.A., Member of Council.  
E. D. MOUNTAIN, M.A., Professor of Geology and Mineralogy.

PRETORIA

- A. C. PARTRIDGE, M.A., Ph.D., Senior Lecturer in English.

## STELLENBOSCH

- R. W. WILCOCKS, Ph.D., B.A., Principal, Professor of Logic and Psychology.  
 H. P. CRUSE, B.A., D.Litt., Professor of History of Education.  
 A. G. HOOPER, M.A., Ph.D., Professor of English.

## WITWATERSRAND

- H. R. RAIKES, M.A., Principal and Vice-Chancellor.  
 J. Y. T. GREIG, M.A., D.Litt., Professor of English.  
 H. S. FRANKEL, M.A., D.Sc., Ph.D. (Professor of Colonial Economic Affairs,  
 Nuffield College, Oxford.)  
 W. CULLEN, LL.D., F.R.I.C. (Hon. Treasurer, Universities Bureau.)

## INDIA

## ALIGARH MUSLIM

- (Mrs.) M. J. HAIDAR, M.A., Principal, Women's College, Aligarh.

## ALLAHABAD

- P. E. DUSTOOR, M.A., D.Litt., Associate Professor of English Literature.

## ANDHRA

- Sir C. Ramalinga REDDY, M.A., D.Litt., Vice-Chancellor.  
 A. H. SOUTHORN, O.B.E., M.A., Ex-officio Member of Syndicate.

## ANNAMALAI

- M. RUTHNASWAMI, C.I.E., M.A., Vice-Chancellor.  
 Professor M. S. SUNDARAM. (Education Officer at Office of the High Commis-  
 sioner, London.)  
 Dr. CHANDRASEKHAR, Professor of Economics.

## BENARES HINDU

- Sir Sarvepalli RADHAKRISHNAN, M.A., D.Litt., LL.D., F.B.A., ex-Vice-  
 Chancellor. (Spalding Professor of Eastern Religions and Ethics, Oxford.)

## CALCUTTA

- P. N. BANERJEE, M.A., B.L., Barrister-at-Law, Vice-Chancellor and Chairman  
 of Syndicate.  
 Sir S. RADHAKRISHNAN (*see also* Benares).  
 W. S. URQUHART, M.A., D.Litt., D.L., LL.D., ex-Vice-Chancellor.

## DELHI

- Rao Sahib S. R. RANGANATHAN, M.A., D.Litt., L.T., Professor of Library  
 Science.

## LUCKNOW

- A. C. CHATTERJI, D.Sc., Dr. Ing., Professor of Chemistry.

## MADRAS

- Lt.-Col. Sir A. L. MUDALIAR, B.A., D.Sc., M.D., LL.D., F.R.C.O.G., F.A.C.S.,  
 Vice-Chancellor. (Chairman of Inter-University Board, India.)

## OSMANIA

- W. MOHAMMAD, M.A., Ph.D., I.E.S., Vice-Chancellor.

xxiv COMMONWEALTH UNIVERSITIES CONGRESS

PATNA

- Lt.-Col. Sir Chandresvar P. N. SINGH, C.I.E., M.A., Hon. Vice-Chancellor.  
P. P. VARMA, M.A., Member of Syndicate and Senate.  
G. H. SINHA, B.A., B.Sc. (Principal, Tej Narayan Jubilee College, Bhagalpur.)  
M. Q. DOJA, B.A., B.Sc., Professor of Organic Chemistry.

TRAVANCORE

- H. C. PAPWORTH, O.B.E., M.A., Vice-Chancellor.

CEYLON

UNIVERSITY OF CEYLON

- Sir W. Ivor JENNINGS, M.A., Litt.D., LL.D., Vice-Chancellor.  
M. D. RATNASURIYA, B.A., Ph.D., Professor of Sinhalese and Dean of the  
Faculty of Oriental Studies.  
C. J. ELIEZER, M.A., M.Sc., Ph.D., Lecturer in Mathematics.

PAKISTAN

DACCA

- G. H. LANGLEY, M.A., Professor of Philosophy and formerly Vice-Chancellor.  
W. A. JENKINS, C.I.E., D.Sc. (Formerly Director of Public Instruction, Bengal.)  
A. F. M. K. RAHMAN, B.A., Ph.D. (Educational Attaché to the High Com-  
missioner for Pakistan.)

PANJAB

- O. H. MALIK, M.A., LL.B., M.Sc., Ph.D., Vice-Chancellor.  
B. AHMAD, M.Sc., Ph.D., F.R.I.C., F.N.I., Director, University Institute of  
Chemistry, Lahore, and Professor of Organic Chemistry.  
A. WAHEED, B.A., Ph.D., Fellow and Member of Syndicate.

COLONIAL TERRITORIES

MALTA

- The Hon. R. V. GALEA, O.B.E., D.Sc., Vice-Chancellor and Rector Magnificus.  
G. E. DE GIORGIO, LL.D., Professor of Laws.  
The Very Rev. S. M. ZARB, O.B.E., S.Th.M., S.S.D., Professor of Dogmatic  
Theology.  
A. J. CRAIG, B.Sc., M.D., F.R.C.S., Lecturer in Orthopaedic Surgery.

HONG KONG

- F. A. REDMOND, B.Sc., Professor of Civil Engineering.  
Lt.-Col. L. T. RIDE, C.B.E., M.A., D.M., B.Ch., Professor of Physiology.

SINGAPORE

KING EDWARD VII COLLEGE OF MEDICINE

- D. W. G. FARIS, C.B.E., M.B., B.S., D.P.H., Principal.  
E. S. MONTEIRO, F.R.F.P.S., L.M.S.  
J. H. STRAHAN, M.B., B.Ch., B.Sc., D.P.H., D.T.M. AND H., Professor of Social  
Medicine and Hygiene.

RAFFLES COLLEGE

- W. E. DYER, M.A., Principal.  
A. OPPENHEIM, B.A., Ph.D., Professor of Mathematics.  
C. G. WEBB, B.Sc., Lecturer in Physics.

## TRINIDAD

## IMPERIAL COLLEGE OF TROPICAL AGRICULTURE

H. J. PAGE, O.B.E., B.Sc., F.R.I.C., Principal.

W. NOWELL, C.M.G., C.B.E., Member of Governing Body.

*REPRESENTATIVES AND GUESTS*

## ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY TEACHERS

The Rt. Hon. Lord CHORLEY OF KENDAL, M.A., President.

E. R. DODDS, D.Litt., F.B.A. (Regius Professor of Greek, University of Oxford.)

R. DOUGLAS LAURIE, M.A. (Emeritus Professor, University of Wales, Aberystwyth), Secretary.

## THE BRITISH COUNCIL

General Sir Ronald ADAM, BART., Chairman.

A. E. MORGAN, M.A., LL.D., F.R.S.C., Controller, Education Division (formerly Principal, McGill University).

Nancy B. PARKINSON, C.B.E., Director, Home Division.

Sir Angus GILLAN, C.M.G., B.A., Controller, Overseas Division A.

E. BOLTON KING, M.A., Director, Science Department.

T. H. SEARLS, M.A., Deputy Controller, Education Division.

R. SEYMOUR, C.B.E., Secretary.

R. C. SYMONDS, Education Division.

H. PAGET, Area Officer, Oxford.

## CARNEGIE TRUST FOR THE UNIVERSITIES OF SCOTLAND

J. R. PEDDIE, C.B.E., M.A., D.Litt., F.R.S. (EDIN.), Secretary.

## COLONIAL OFFICE

C. W. M. COX, C.M.G., M.A., Educational Adviser.

## GOLDSMITHS COMPANY

D. VEALE, C.B.E., M.A., Hon. LL.D. (Registrar, University of Oxford.)

## IMPERIAL RELATIONS TRUST

Sir Will SPENS (v. Cambridge University).

## INTER-UNIVERSITY COUNCIL FOR HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE COLONIES

Walter ADAMS, O.B.E., B.A., Secretary.

## NUFFIELD FOUNDATION

L. FARRER-BROWN, B.Sc. (Econ.), Secretary.

## H.M. TREASURY

P. D. PROCTOR, C.B., M.A., Under-Secretary.

## UNIVERSITY GRANTS COMMITTEE

Sir Walter MOBERLY, M.A., D.Litt., Chairman.

A. E. TRUEMAN, F.R.S., Vice-Chairman.

H. A. DE MONTMORENCY, Secretary.

## AUSTRALIAN COUNCIL FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

K. S. CUNNINGHAM, M.A., Ph.D., Chief Executive Officer.

xxvi COMMONWEALTH UNIVERSITIES CONGRESS

AUSTRALIAN UNIVERSITIES COMMISSION

A. J. A. NELSON, B.A., Representative in United Kingdom.

AUSTRALIAN VICE-CHANCELLORS' COMMITTEE

A. J. GLASSON WILLIAMS, B.Arch., Secretary. (Assistant Registrar, University of Melbourne.)

DOMINION STUDENTS' HALL TRUST (London House)

Brigadier E. C. PEPPER, C.B.E., D.S.O., D.L., Controller.

GORDON MEMORIAL COLLEGE, KHARTOUM

L. C. WILCHER, M.A., B.Litt., Principal.

HEBREW UNIVERSITY OF JERUSALEM

Sir Leon SIMON, C.B., M.A.

INTER-UNIVERSITY BOARD, INDIA

S. MATHAI, M.A., Secretary. (Professor of English, Delhi University.)

MAKERERE COLLEGE, UGANDA

W. D. LAMONT, M.A., D.Phil., Principal.

NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF CANADIAN UNIVERSITIES

T. H. MATTHEWS, M.A., Secretary. (Registrar, McGill University.)

SOUTH AFRICAN NATIVE COLLEGE, FORT HARE

A. KERR, M.A., LL.D. (Principal).

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, IBADAN

K. MELLANBY, O.B.E., Sc.D., Principal.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF THE GOLD COAST

D. M. BALME, D.S.O., D.F.C., M.A., Principal designate.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF THE WEST INDIES

B. W. WILLIAMS, B.A., B.M., B.Ch., F.R.C.S., Medical Adviser, Acting Dean of Medical School.

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC, AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

Julian S. HUXLEY, M.A., D.Sc., F.R.S., Director-General.

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

L. CARMICHAEL, Ph.D., Sc.D., Litt.D., LL.D. (President, Tufts College, Medford, Massachusetts.)

H. S. TAYLOR, D.Sc., LL.D., F.R.S. (Dean of Graduate School and Professor of Chemistry, Princeton University.)

T. R. McCONNELL, A.M., Ph.D. (Dean, College of Science, Literature, and Arts, University of Minnesota.)

G. D. STODDARD, Ph.D., LL.D., L.H.D., Litt.D., Representative of Council. (President, University of Illinois.)

AMERICAN UNIVERSITY UNION—CONTINENTAL DIVISION

Charles B. VIBBERT, A.B., Ph.D., Director.

CARNEGIE CORPORATION OF NEW YORK

O. C. CARMICHAEL, A.M., B.Sc., Hon. LL.D., D.C.L., D.Litt., President, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

INSTITUTE OF INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

Laurence DUGGAN, A.B., LL.D., Director.

THE ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION

D. H. STEVENS, A.M., Ph.D., LL.D., Director of Humanities.

CONGRESS SPEAKER

J. MACMURRAY, M.A., Professor of Moral Philosophy, University of Edinburgh.

PRESS LIAISON OFFICER

G. A. ALINGTON. (Fellow of University College, Oxford.)

REPRESENTATIVES ON UNIVERSITIES BUREAU OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE (not elsewhere included)

J. CAMERON, D.Sc., M.D. (Dalhousie.)

T. F. COTTON, M.D., C.M., D.Sc., F.R.C.P. (McGill.)

J. W. EVANS, M.A., D.Sc. (Tasmania.)

F. GOLDBY, M.A., M.D., M.R.C.P. (Adelaide.)

A. J. HARROP, Litt.D., Ph.D. (Canterbury University College, New Zealand.)

R. LITTLEHAILES, C.I.E., M.A. (Madras.)

E. MARSDEN, C.M.G., C.B.E., M.C., D.Sc., F.R.S. (Auckland University College, New Zealand.)

R. L. VOLLUM, M.A., D.Phil. (British Columbia.)

CONGRESS ORGANIZING COMMITTEE (not elsewhere included)

Sir Harold CLAUGHTON, C.B.E., M.A.

T. LOVEDAY, M.A., LL.D.

J. F. FOSTER, M.A., LL.M. (Secretary of Congress.)

UNIVERSITIES BUREAU STAFF

F. MAHONEY (Mrs.).

W. G. B. GILCHRIST (Mrs.).

M. HORN, B.A. (Mrs.).

M. Margaret PALSTRA, B.A.

Joan A. CLEMENGER, B.A.

H. MCGREGOR (Mrs.).

Lady Betty SHIRLEY.



REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS  
*Monday, 19 July*



# OFFICIAL OPENING OF THE CONGRESS

By THE RIGHT HON. THE EARL OF HALIFAX, *Chancellor of the University of Oxford; Chancellor of the University of Sheffield; President of the Congress*

THE RIGHT HON. THE EARL OF HALIFAX: It is not necessary to stress the importance of this Congress—the sixth of the series which began in 1912—or what it stands for in the range and significance of educational effort over the whole field of our British Commonwealth.

On behalf of the University of Oxford, I judge it a great honour to bid welcome to so large and representative an assembly.

It must surely be unprecedented that so many Universities have been able to send their active heads to participate in the discussions of the Congress, and we are all grateful to the private foundations, such as the Imperial Relations Trust and the Carnegie Corporation of New York, which have generously made very substantial grants towards the travel expenses of delegates from overseas and made this Congress possible.

There is particular value in a gathering such as this at the present time, when we are spectators of a conflict of ideas more fundamental and more intense than has ever before been played upon the human stage; more fundamental because, as compared with earlier struggles, there is less common ground; more intense because, like the mortal combats of medieval tourney, the issue once joined may well end only with the disabling or death of one or other of the combatants. Therefore the University which, under whatever outward presentation, is devoted to the pursuit of truth is necessarily enlisted in this conflict. By the very fact of its existence and the faith on which its being is based, it is one of the principal actors in the drama and, unlike the ordinary player on the stage, it can vitally affect the end to which the play will come.

We can never afford to forget how weighty a responsibility has been placed upon those who emerged victors from the recent war. A wise American writer made an observation the other day which we may well ponder. 'Even the supreme test of victory in arms', he said, 'writes not just the last sentence in one chapter of responsibilities but the first in another.' Not only by that verdict on the appeal to arms was another opportunity given to those who believed in the power and capacity of freedom to prove their faith. The war of arms may be suspended, but the war of ideas continues, and on those who secured victory in the contest of arms rests the obligation to see that

those who, as individuals or as nations, have to support the new fight are adequately equipped for the stern test, for this obligation, if our democratic creed is to survive, is one which free citizens everywhere must accept and worthily discharge.

The purpose of a University has been often defined, perhaps most notably by that distinguished son of Oxford, Cardinal Newman, and I do not think the passage of time has impaired the value of his analysis and judgement. At least, I would say that only at their peril will Universities disregard the broader purpose and ultimate end that he portrayed.

No doubt the boundaries of knowledge have been extended; the fields of study that are open have become diverse; the extension of knowledge has irresistibly brought with it the necessity of specialist approach; but by that very process it has become more necessary that every attempt to tread the paths of learning should be sustained by a firm hold on certain fixed principles of universal application, for otherwise we are in some danger of what in the end will be seen to have been aimless wandering.

Several factors have combined to make the business of a University even more important than it was one hundred years ago. If man be endowed, as we believe, with freedom of choice, his exercise of this power will depend on the training of the faculties by which choice is made, and for our generation the matter assumes a new and critical importance, as we ask ourselves whether, through the new store-houses of knowledge to which man has forced an entrance, human life may not be doomed to self-destruction within a measurable term of years.

In our own communities, society has cast loose from its ancient moorings in thought, custom, and convention and is, as we watch, being remodelled and reborn. The earlier voice of authority by which many human relations were accustomed to be guided is no longer clearly heard or, if heard, is frequently unheeded. Old associations have been disrupted and, as always, it is easier to destroy than to rebuild. It is an age of distraction, of uncertainty, of experiment and of dangerous temptation through partial and incomplete appreciation of the truth. I should like for a moment to emphasize what this last appears to me to mean.

Man's capacity to acquire knowledge is of necessity limited, and the task of a University to lead men to the apprehension of the truth can therefore, by reason of the limitations of the human intellect, never be more than imperfectly discharged. Most truly is it said that perhaps the most important element of knowledge, as it is the greatly to be desired end of all education, is to know how much there is that we do not know. Only thus can we spare ourselves and others the

damage that flows from easy generalizations on insufficient premisses, and only thus can we escape the intellectual arrogance or complacency that is the bitterest enemy of all intellectual progress. If this is true of education, it is even more relevant in the wide field of human life, of which education is one element. The truth is many-sided and human life, to be handled wisely, will often demand a measure of equilibrium between the different components of truth that seem superficially to be in conflict.

On the political side, human society is perpetually seeking a just balance between the claims of organized society, as the instrument of order, and those of the individual demanding freedom. The wisdom of Burke's words remains: 'The extreme of liberty obtains nowhere, nor ought to obtain anywhere. Liberty must be limited in order to be possessed.'

The same duality of claim makes itself heard as the effort is made to merge nationhood in the wider concept of international unity. With the preaching of new philosophies and creeds, we are afforded melancholy proof of the damage that follows when truth is no longer the lodestar of human search and aspiration, for the pursuit of truth begets the quality of tolerance, as men realize their own limitations, but if truth is shackled and dethroned in favour of the worship of some man-made idol there is no longer room for tolerance in the new world of compulsory conformity. In one sense indeed tolerance is not to be encouraged in any branch of human study. We cannot afford to be tolerant of clumsiness in a brain surgeon or of inaccuracy in an engineer. We should be equally wrong to condone careless craftsmanship in any servant of the arts. Tolerance must never degenerate into a cloak for the second best or the slipshod. While, therefore, we must be ruthlessly intolerant of anything which is intellectually shoddy, we must at the same time be avid of new truth and tolerant of all honest efforts to attain it.

In not dissimilar fashion the individual is aware of a rivalry of claim affecting his own thought and conduct. It may be the contradiction that will often appear between the abstract claims of stern justice and the instinctive impulse towards the gentler quality of mercy. One man will be attracted by tradition that will speak to him more powerfully than experience, which may be the ultimate argument for another, just as one mind will be captivated by the ideal when another can find no comfort outside what he judges to be the hard fact of everyday reality, and more profound than any is the failure to appreciate that the material side of life is sterilized and degraded if it is sought to divorce it from the spiritual foundation, which alone can explain and make it a worthy servant of that complex thing which we call human nature.

Clearly something more than mere information and factual knowledge is here required, and, if the achievement of more profound harmony in these and many like components of life is now, as I would suggest, an essential condition of the approach to truth, the opportunity and responsibility of Universities are great.

I am glad to see that, as part of its comprehensive programme, the Congress is to concern itself with arrangements for inter-University co-operation and with the setting up of machinery to promote or facilitate the movement of University people from one part of the Commonwealth to another. The interchange of persons and ideas is a need for all Universities, and, if, particularly inside the Commonwealth, where there is a reasonable unity of language and a general understanding of the desired objectives of University education, conditions can be created in which University workers at all levels can come into personal contact with their colleagues in other Universities, everybody will be the richer, for we of the British Commonwealth are the happy inheritors of a system of thought and a way of life which, as we think, offer the best reconciliation, over all the wide field of human activity, of the several elements in the life of man. The foundations of this system of thought and life—intellectual, political, social, and religious—lie deep, but no foundations can for long sustain the building against time and weather if matters requisite for its preservation are neglected. It is in our power to make the things by which we ourselves have lived the life-giving source of new strength to others less fortunate than ourselves. The world today craves assurance that there is a goal of human endeavour which is worth striving for and which can surely be attained, and I hope that, over and above their special activities and duties, the forwarding of this purpose may always hold high place in the thought of those who may now, or in time to come, guide the destinies of those places of learning whose representatives Oxford is happy to welcome here today.

DR. R. E. PRIESTLEY (*Vice-Chairman, Universities Bureau of the British Empire*): My Lord Chancellor, in the regretted absence of Lord Harlech, the Chairman of the Universities Bureau, it is my privilege to thank you for your gracious reception of this Congress of Universities and for so clearly defining in your speech of welcome some of the problems and in particular the central problem with which we are today concerned in the University world.

The executive heads of University institutions have arrived here direct from a preparatory meeting at Bristol, at which we believe useful work has been done. There we were the guests of one of the newer Universities, but we were royally entertained in the authentic

University atmosphere, emphasized and enhanced by the visible scars of war.

It is fitting that after the war gap the first full Congress should take place in the senior University of the Commonwealth, the Mecca of Rhodes scholars and other scholars from all over the world. The whole University world, within the Commonwealth and without, must be profoundly grateful that Oxford escaped unscathed from the fury of the enemy during the recent war, and Cambridge University almost unscathed. I sometimes speculate whether the fact that 'Fenner's' was the only part of Cambridge University to be struck by bombs was a reflection of the impression made on some German Rhodian that athletic honours had not been correctly distributed between the wars.

To you, Mr. Vice-Chancellor, to the Registrar, and (to use the words of the degree formula of my present University) to the whole University, I wish to present the thanks of all the members of the Congress for permitting us to meet here and for the trouble that you have taken and are taking in the hospitality that you are according to us. We are grateful, and we hope that the increase in solidarity which must come from the intercourse of pleasant people in ideal surroundings will be to you sufficient reward.



*Tuesday, 20 July*



# DISCUSSION

## RELATIONS OF THE STATE AND THE UNIVERSITIES

*Chairman:* SIR JOHN D. G. MEDLEY,  
Chairman, Australian Vice-Chancellors' Committee

THE CHAIRMAN: I have often thought that a very useful thesis could be prepared upon the effect on the history of Australia of the fact that its name begins with 'A', but I never fully realized how accurate my suspicions were until I was asked to preside over this first working session of our Congress. I should have been very graceless indeed if I had done anything but accept the invitation. It gives me an opportunity of taking part in an historic occasion in the city which was my birthplace and which I like to think is still my spiritual home, but I can assure you that I shall not abuse the privilege. I come from a country in which indiscriminate oratory is probably the favourite pastime, after cricket and horse-racing, but, although I have lived there for nearly thirty years, I have not yet acquired so complete a protective colouring as to forget that the proper place for a chairman is, as his name implies, in his chair and not on his feet. Therefore, before I ask Sir Walter Moberly, the Chairman of the University Grants Committee, to open the discussion, I will say only this, that those who selected the topic of the relationship of the State and the Universities for our first subject of discussion acted wisely and well, for it is the problem which more than any other is keeping all those of us who are responsible for University administration awake. We could not have a better opener of the discussion than Sir Walter Moberly, and I will now ask him to address us.

SIR WALTER MOBERLY (*Chairman, University Grants Committee*): I should like to start with a few, very general, assumptions.

On any showing, Universities are powerful and influential corporations and they perform functions which are of high public importance, so that in no country can the supreme political authority be completely disinterested in the affairs of the Universities. It does and it must exercise some measure of supervision over them. Nowhere is University autonomy absolute or unconditional. That is the first of my assumptions.

My second assumption is that a high degree of autonomy is absolutely necessary if the functions of Universities are to be properly performed. I am not going to be so foolish as to waste time in defending or elaborating that thesis in this gathering.

My third assumption is that, for the maintenance of this autonomy, vigilance is always necessary. Anything which threatens the autonomy of Universities must be resisted, whatever form it takes. It may be political interference. All of us have examples of that in our minds. It may be just tidy-minded administration, the passion for standardization. It may be an uninstructed popular outcry for some quick and tangible returns, based upon an undervaluing of, and almost a contempt for, the sort of thing which its coarse thumb and finger fail to plumb. It may be only a flattering but quite crushing demand made for services of all kinds. In all these ways demands may be made upon Universities which are inconsistent with the carrying out of their function as they understand it, and all these demands must be resisted.

Those are truisms. I take them for granted, and I do not propose to say any more this morning about abstract general principles, because I think I can open this discussion most usefully if I speak mainly about actual experience in the United Kingdom, which has in many ways been happy.

In all its different forms State supervision and control over Universities seems to me to be at its minimum in the United Kingdom, where there are no State Universities.

With regard to the various methods of supervision and control, I refer first to the granting of a charter of foundation. With the exception of a few of the very earliest European Universities, all Universities have owed their status and their degree-giving powers to a charter received from the supreme sovereign power, whether that power was spiritual, the papacy, as in the earliest days, or whether it was political. That means that the field in which the Universities exercise their autonomy is always restricted by fundamental laws, which the Universities cannot alter. In that sense all Universities are non-sovereign law-making bodies. That is true in the United Kingdom, as elsewhere. But in fact when the State grants a charter to a University (as it did the other day in the case of the University of Nottingham, which we all congratulate upon its new status) it does not itself lay down the conditions under which the University is to work; it gives its sanction to rules and conditions which have in practice been worked out by the embryo University.

Secondly, the State sometimes interferes in what I might call a quasi-visitatorial capacity. Bosanquet has described the State as 'the operative criticism of institutions', and in that sense the State must assure itself that the institutions in the country—the Universities among others—are in fact performing their functions. We are far removed from the days of somnolence of the ancient Universities in the eighteenth century, but we should all recognize that such a thing

obviously could not be tolerated today; it would necessarily entail some kind of interference. The distinctive feature in the United Kingdom has been that all intervention of that kind has been only occasional and not regular. Lord Palmerston, writing as Prime Minister to the then Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge University, with regard to the first University Commission, said: 'The State has always disavowed repeated and minute intervention in University affairs.' During the last century there have been Royal Commissions on the Universities of Oxford, Cambridge, Scotland, London, Wales, and Durham, but those have not been simply cases of interference by the State in the affairs of the Universities, because, so far as my knowledge goes, in no case was the Commission set up except in response, among other things, to the demands of a strong reform party inside the University. I admit that in many cases the Commission was unacceptable to the University authorities for the time being, but there was always a strong reform party.

Thirdly, in many countries the State has maintained a hold on the Universities through the control of major appointments. In the United Kingdom we are familiar with the existence of some Regius Chairs in Scottish Universities and in Oxford and Cambridge, and there are Crown appointments to some headships, but these are confined to the ancient Universities and to some of the more ancient Chairs in those. Moreover, I do not think they are instances of the interference of the State in its political capacity; I think they are relics of earlier activities of the Crown in the role of pious founder. In any case, in nearly all instances, I believe, some means of testing informally the opinion of the University concerned is adopted before the appointments are made.

Lastly, I come to the main point about which I wish to speak, namely, possible State interference through the use of the power of the purse. 'He who pays the piper calls the tune'; that principle is widely regarded as axiomatic. Where the State subsidizes the Universities on any considerable scale, it may attach conditions to its grants, and it can do that with special effect if it threatens to withdraw financial support needed for the fulfilment of commitments into which a University has already entered. Therefore the burning question arises: is acceptance of substantial financial support incompatible with University autonomy? Is State subvention necessarily a Greek gift? Is any demand for a combination of autonomy and subvention really a demand to be able to eat one's cake and still to have it?

In this connexion I venture to suggest that the United Kingdom is a crucial instance. Thirty years ago State financial support of Universities in this country was negligible. In the inter-war years it became very substantial, amounting on the average to about one-third of

the Universities' total revenues. Since the war there has been a further dramatic increase, and by the end of this quinquennium, that is to say, by the year 1952, the total grants will be about six times as much as they were in the year 1938. Yet I believe it is widely understood that a technique of Treasury aid has been evolved which gives the State the assurance to which it is entitled that the funds it provides are being wisely and effectively used by the Universities, and does that without sacrificing the responsible independence of the Universities. The medium through which this is done is the University Grants Committee, and I should like to spend the rest of my time this morning in discussing how that Committee works in fact and how this bears upon the question of University autonomy. I speak with a good deal of experience in these matters, since I have been associated with the work of the Committee on both sides of the table, that is, I have dealt with the Committee as the representative of my University or College and I have also dealt with Universities and Colleges as a representative of the Committee.

There are various ways in which this method of procedure safeguards University independence.

First, there is the actual composition of the Committee. Its members are appointed by the Chancellor of the Exchequer with the concurrence of the Minister of Education and the Secretary of State for Scotland, but they have always, from the beginning, been predominantly academic persons, with academic rather than official backgrounds. The air they breathe, the thoughts they think, and the ideals to which they pay allegiance are not those of Whitehall but are those of the University world, which is their spiritual home. The Committee was first appointed in 1919, and it then consisted very largely of persons not merely of academic origin but of exceptional academic distinction. Among them were Sir William Osler, Sir J. J. Thomson, and Sir Frederic Kenyon, and I would describe its standard colloquially as being 'Order of Merit or near Order of Merit'! The members were persons likely to share the views of the Universities but also likely to be respected by the Universities.

Secondly, the Committee has always been attached not to the Ministry of Education but to the Treasury. On the face of it, of course, that is illogical. The actions of the Universities have repercussions on the schools, and the actions of the schools have repercussions on the Universities. The arrangement would obviously give rise to confusion and difficulty if there was not, as there is, a fairly close liaison between the officials of the University Grants Committee and the officers of the Ministry of Education. But I am convinced that the arrangement is a pillar of University autonomy and is valued as such by the British Universities. If the University Grants Committee had

been made advisory to the Ministry of Education and not to the Treasury, the last word on questions of policy would have lain with a Government Department. The Treasury, unlike the Ministry of Education, does not and cannot claim any educational authority, and it has never rejected the advice of the Committee on any educational ground.

Thirdly, the grants are quinquennial. In strict law that is not and cannot be so; the Budget is an annual Budget and the legal commitment cannot be for more than one year. But from the beginning there has been a gentleman's understanding between the Treasury, the Committee, and the Universities that the grants shall be stabilized for periods of five years, so that the Universities can plan ahead, and even in the slump of 1931 no reduction was made. This has made the Universities independent of temporary fluctuations in public opinion or even in ministerial policy.

Fourthly, the Committee has manifold contacts with the Universities. Some of these occur when, before the end of each quinquennium, the Committee pays a visit to every University and University College. On those occasions the Committee has interviews with all sections of the staff and with the students, and finally it has a discussion with the governing body or with representatives of the governing body, which takes the form of a frank talk across the table about the University's financial needs and policies. Even more important are the frequent informal visits of the academic heads of Universities to the office of the Committee and the intimate and friendly relations which exist between Vice-Chancellors and the Committee's officers. May I cite my own experience when I was still representing a University and not the Committee, and used to go to the Committee's office in London to see its then Secretary, Mr. Alan Kidd (whom I must mention *honoris causa*)? I found in him not an official with whom I had to be a little on the defensive and be careful to give nothing away, but a wise and friendly adviser with whom I could put all my cards on the table and discuss my problems just as I saw them myself, in the confident expectation of receiving sympathetic and intelligent advice.

Fifthly, the recurrent grants have been block grants, that is to say, they have been given in aid of the University's programme as a whole, and they have not been earmarked for particular purposes. It is true that at this moment there are certain temporary exceptions to that rule, but that has been and will be the general rule. In the course of discussion the Universities have opportunities of gathering informally any views on their policies which the Committee may hold, and those views may, and no doubt do, to some extent influence their decisions, but certainly do not dominate them.

With the recent great increase in the amount of the grants and with the growing experience of the Committee, its functions have somewhat expanded. For instance, it is becoming a clearing-house for information. If a University representative tells us that he is wrestling with some particular problem in his own University, we may be in a position to tell him that some other University had a similar problem two or three years ago and dealt with it in a particular way. By this means we become a repository of information and can be useful.

Again, through our close connexion with the Treasury and our communications with other Government Departments we can sometimes give guidance to University authorities about public needs. For instance, if there is a demand for the production in larger numbers of a particular type of graduate—chemical engineers, for example—we can pass that on to the Universities. I remember that Mr. Dalton, when he was Chancellor of the Exchequer, described the function of the Committee as being to act as a buffer or shock-absorber between the Government and the Universities, and I think the Committee is aided in carrying out that function by its relations with the Vice-Chancellors' Committee, whose functions are similarly growing.

Most important of all, we can to some extent act as a gadfly, or, if I may use a scientific metaphor, as a catalyst; that is to say, the Committee conceives its task as being to act not as a collection of supermen making plans for the Universities but as a stimulating influence always inciting the Universities to plan for themselves somewhat more fully than they might do if they were left to themselves.

Thus the relation between the Committee and the Universities, as I conceive it, is essentially one of partnership. The relation is so flexible and sensitive that the question on which side a particular suggestion originated is often quite unanswerable and quite irrelevant.

How far is such a system exportable? Obviously I cannot answer that question, but I can mention certain conditions which seem to me to help it in the United Kingdom.

First, there is our national tradition, which abhors regimentation and favours the growth of guilds and voluntary societies.

Secondly, both in England and in Scotland the ancient Universities had for long enjoyed a high prestige before any grants were made on any considerable scale, and in this respect the modern Universities have profited by the prestige of the ancient Universities. The University has long been regarded by the public as something to be held in veneration, even where it is not fully comprehended.

Thirdly, the Universities have been able to rely upon the understanding good will of Ministers and senior Civil Servants. Indeed,

Ministers and senior Civil Servants have themselves generally been alumni of Universities. That is so much the case that the hostile critic might and sometimes does refer a little acidly to the excessive influence of the old school tie.

Fourthly, the Universities and their grants have been kept out of party politics. They have never yet become the object of acrimonious party debate.

Fifthly, it has been possible to find, as members of the University Grants Committee, persons who command the confidence both of the Universities and of the Treasury, that is, persons in whose impartiality and understanding the Universities have been prepared to trust.

Sixthly, this is a small island and the most remote University is only twelve hours by rail from London. Meeting is therefore comparatively easy.

Seventhly, the United Kingdom has a unitary and not a federal Constitution, and State support of University finance is an affair of the central Government.

Lastly, an important condition has been our national habit of not pushing theories to their logical conclusion. There has been little disposition to draw deductive inferences from the principles either of autonomy or of the need for central planning.

What guarantee is there that this autonomy will continue in the future? The answer to that question is that there is not and in this country there cannot be any formal guarantee. Undoubtedly the machinery exists by which the State could, if it were so minded, apply almost irresistible financial pressure to the Universities. The basis of confidence is the conviction not that the State cannot but that the State will not want to do so; it rests, in other words, not upon the law but upon the convention of the Constitution.

In my view there are two conditions for the continuance of this happy state of affairs. On the one hand, public opinion and Ministers and officials must continue to value Universities and to understand in broad outline what their purpose is and what are the conditions of their working successfully. On the other hand, the Universities on their side must be reasonably responsive to general public needs and reasonably quick to put their own houses in order, so that they may 'rise to the height of the times'. Given those two conditions, Universities in this country have little to fear in future from Treasury support and a great deal to hope from it.

DR. J. F. MOUNTFORD (*Liverpool*): It is by no means an easy task to follow so brilliant and fair-minded an exposition as we have just heard from Sir Walter Moberly.

I should like to begin by saying that the British Universities have a very great deal for which to be grateful to the University Grants Committee, which, ever since its inception and largely because of its composition and the wisdom of its successive Chairmen, has adopted towards the Universities an attitude of the utmost liberality, not only financial but spiritual liberality also.

As the University Grants Committee is working at the present time in conformity with the traditions that have been established over the last thirty years, the Universities of this country have no fears for their autonomy. If we had a guarantee that the present arrangements would continue, we should all be able to lie easily at nights. I do not want to introduce unnecessarily any note of alarm, but I think that, in order to give a slightly different side of the picture, there are a few comments that may interest the Congress.

Sir Walter Moberly has spoken of the terms of reference of the University Grants Committee. They have recently been enlarged and it is now the duty of the Committee 'to assist, in consultation with the Universities and other bodies concerned, the preparation and execution of such plans for the development of Universities as may from time to time be required in order to ensure that they are fully adequate to national needs'. That may sound quite unexceptionable; but if we begin to analyse it we find that a number of disquieting questions arise. The duty of the University Grants Committee is not only to prepare but to execute—one would like to know what may be the implications of that—plans for the development of Universities as may from time to time be required. Required by whom? The Committee is to do this in consultation. In Government circles there is a technique of consultation whereby a meeting is held at 3 o'clock in the afternoon; the Minister already has a Statutory Order in front of him, and as the delegation goes out at the door he signs that Statutory Order. He has 'consulted'. Again, it is to be consultation not only with the Universities but with 'other bodies concerned'. We should like to know what 'other bodies concerned' may at some time or other be involved in this matter.

Sir Walter Moberly has already spoken of the composition of the University Grants Committee, which has hitherto been entirely to the satisfaction of the Universities and has won their admiration, respect, and confidence; but, as Sir Walter pointed out, the members of the University Grants Committee are appointed in fact by the Treasury, after consultation with the Minister of Education and the Secretary of State for Scotland. The Universities have no guarantee that the composition of the University Grants Committee will always remain as acceptable in the future as it has been in the past.

Again, the University Grants Committee has been entrusted in

the last few years with the implementing of the recommendations contained in Government Reports. I am interested to notice that in the pamphlet which has just been produced by Nuffield College, entitled *The Problem Facing British Universities*, the statement is made that 'the Universities have found no reason to resent but, on the contrary, have welcomed the surveys and recommendations of specialized committees investigating particular parts of their field, such as the Reports of the Goodenough, the Barlow, the Clapham, and the Scarborough Committees'. I think perhaps that is stated a little too categorically; but certainly one of the results of these committees has been that the Treasury has placed at the disposal of the University Grants Committee considerable sums of money in order that the recommendations of those Committees might be implemented, and that the University Grants Committee has distributed those sums after consultation with the Universities. It has meant, however, that Universities have felt, in some instances, rather more impelled to undertake new functions than they would have been if they had been left entirely to their own judgement on such matters. There are serious doubts in some University circles with regard to the wisdom of some of the recommendations of the Goodenough Committee, the Clapham Committee, and the Scarborough Committee. Of course no University is compelled to accept and use money for purposes of which it does not approve; yet the fact that the University Grants Committee is being made the instrument whereby the recommendations of Government committees are implemented does, I think, contain within itself possible seeds of danger.

I should like now to turn from the University Grants Committee and draw the attention of the Congress to another matter concerning University finance. The whole of our income is not derived from the University Grants Committee, though the proportion so derived is now between 60 and 65 per cent. We also have our endowments; but they are becoming of less and less significance in many cases, because they are not increasing at the same rate as the total revenues of Universities are increasing. Another important source of revenue is the grants that are made to Universities by local education authorities. There are also the fees of students. To an increasing degree those fees are not paid by the students' parents but come from public funds on the basis of awards which are made either by the Ministry of Education direct to the students or in part by the Ministry of Education through the medium of local education authority awards. A local education authority is a very different kind of body from the University Grants Committee. It is often very much less instructed in the matters with which it purports to deal. It has not the same background of knowledge of the needs of Universities or the same instinctive

tradition of a liberal attitude towards them. There are not lacking signs that local education authorities would like to have a greater say in the management and the running of Universities than they have hitherto had. They make direct contributions to Universities; they are paying for many young people to come to the Universities, and it is not unnatural for some of them to think that they might even have a say in the kind of young person who should be admitted to the University. Again, as they are paying for young people to come to the Universities, ought not they to have some say even in the kind of course which is given? They are conscious of their own need for, for example, social workers and psychiatrists; they feel that the Universities are not producing such people in sufficient numbers; are they not then justified in bringing pressure to bear upon the Universities to produce the kind of person needed? Relying upon such claims of reasoning, local education authorities may, I think, try to exert on the Universities a pressure as regards selection of students and courses which the University Grants Committee and the Treasury would never attempt to exert. The amounts of money that we get from local education authorities are not really comparable with those that come from the Treasury; but they are of sufficient magnitude to make the difference between solvency and bankruptcy; and we need to be on our guard against any abuse of the power which those contributions may be thought to bestow.

I hope that the remarks which I have made will not be taken to imply dissatisfaction with the work that the University Grants Committee has done for the Universities; but I judged that it might be of interest to the Congress to realize that there are some aspects of the situation which, if they do not cause serious anxiety in the minds of University administrators, do at any rate warn them to be vigilant.

DR. F. CYRIL JAMES (*McGill*): When I listened to Sir Walter Moberly this morning I felt that the situation in Great Britain was so very different from that in Canada that there was very little possibility of my contributing anything to the discussion, but Dr. Mountford rather suggested that there are some problems in Great Britain that are not greatly different from our own.

The Universities of Canada are divided into two groups, private foundations and State Universities. I will leave the problems of the State Universities to be discussed by my colleague Dr. MacKenzie, and I should like to say a word about the private foundations.

The figure of 60 to 65 per cent. financial assistance from the State, which was mentioned by Dr. Mountford, makes me feel very envious, because in the case of my own University the total amount of financial

assistance that we receive from public authorities for all purposes is slightly less than 6 per cent. of our total budget, and the contribution towards general educational work (i.e. excluding hospitals and such forms, &c.) is less than 3 per cent. If public subvention could be combined with University autonomy, in the way to which Sir Walter Moberly referred, I should like that 3 per cent. to be increased to 60 per cent. There is, however, a very real doubt on the part of a good many of the private Universities in Canada, and also, I think, in the United States, with regard to the difficulty of combining subvention and autonomy.

As most of you probably know, in Canada, under the British North America Act, education is a matter solely for the Provinces. The Dominion Government has no concern, financial or administrative, with the educational work of the Universities, and there begins one of our difficulties, because the Federal Government has a very direct concern with scientific research and is spending many times the amount that it spent before the war on research activities in the Universities. Not infrequently the problem arises of a really good member of the teaching staff who is at the same time an excellent scientist and who therefore faces the extraordinary difficulty of undertaking research work for which he may not have adequate time if his teaching work is properly carried on, yet knows that such research is important, well financed, and would contribute to his scientific prestige.

Such teaching subventions as are obtained in the case of a private University are from the Provincial Government, and, as I have indicated, they are extremely small, which is another difficulty that needs little comment.

A third problem arises from the fact that our Legislatures and our Civil Service are not so predominantly 'coloured by the old school tie' as Sir Walter Moberly suggested them to be in this country. The degree of sympathy with academic work varies from department to department, and it sometimes varies from one political party to another. I think it is not unfair to say that there is a tendency on the part of the Government to prefer some academic activities to others. If I might cite my own institution as an example, I would say that it is a great deal more easy to obtain from the Provincial Government funds for such highly specialized things as the Institute of Psychiatry, the Institute of Neurology and Neurosurgery, a development in the field of public health and social medicine along lines previously worked out in consultation with the Provincial Government, or a School of Agriculture (and particularly that part of the work of the School of Agriculture which deals with problems that are at the moment serious to the Province) than it is to obtain funds from the

Provincial Government for that hard core of University activity which we call the humanities and the pure sciences. These 'theoretical' fields do not commend themselves highly to the Legislature.

Owing to the absence of anything comparable to the University Grants Committee, the application of a University must be made direct to the Governmental authorities concerned with finance, education, agriculture, or health, and in some Provinces of Canada (as in some of the states of our southern neighbour) there has sometimes been a suggestion from those authorities that the work of the University might more nearly approach the activities and philosophy of the political party in power. There are instances in Canada where a member of the teaching staff of a University has said things that are impolite about the Government, as members of teaching staffs occasionally do, and this fact has been specifically mentioned in connexion with University Grants. I need not add that the mention of it did not suggest any tendency towards greater generosity on the part of the Government! There have even been occasional suggestions from Government officials regarding the appointment of University officers, and members of the teaching staff—although this is not frequent.

I am deliberately citing things that are straws in the wind rather than governing factors in University administration, but in the present situation there is a growing concern about the autonomy of the few remaining private Universities. I think it was Laird Bell who, in a recent issue of *The Atlantic* monthly, referring to the American rather than the Canadian situation, emphasized the fact that by and large it has been owing to the work of private Universities that there has grown up in our continent something of that prestige of academic institutions to which Sir Walter Moberly called attention in regard to this island. Unless that independence can be preserved, there are doubts in regard to the future which I think are of profound significance at the present time, because, if I see the years ahead of us with any clarity, we are in a period when some of the most fundamental questions in the humanities and the social sciences, questions of philosophy and questions of public organization, are going to be matters on which the Government in power will have a very definite opinion and a very definite line of policy. I am not sure to what extent a Government which has a firm conviction will be willing to finance and encourage an academic institution that seems predominantly concerned with an opposite opinion. That may be the problem with which Sir Walter Moberly concluded his speech, when he suggested that Universities must 'rise to the height of the times'.

The problem in Canada, therefore, while not identical with that which Dr. Mountford put forward as the problem in Great Britain,

is one of very profound concern, and I think that I speak for a good many of my colleagues in my own University when I say that we should be glad to preserve a situation in which some Universities—necessarily a minority—were able to operate without any Government aid whatever in order that they might provide a standard, a criterion, to which Governments would have to let state institutions conform. The only problem in regard to this desire is the problem of where such private institutions would obtain the necessary financial supports, and that is a question to which we have not yet found the answer.

DR. N. A. M. MACKENZIE (*British Columbia*): My experience has been with institutions in Eastern and Western Canada almost wholly dependent upon the State for their financial support. There is very little that I can say which has not already been mentioned by the speakers who have preceded me, but there are a few statements which I think it might be useful to add.

In the circumstances I am grateful to the Governments concerned for the measure of freedom that they have afforded us in our Universities, or at least in those with which I have been connected, and, while Dr. James may feel that he is best protected by the minimum of Government support, there is the other point, which Sir Walter Moberly brought out, that 'he who pays the piper calls the tune', and the influence of private donors can be in some ways as effective as that of Governments in determining the nature and status of a University.

Most of us in Canada desperately need money to maintain and develop our institutions. We realize that in the world in which we live almost the only source from which we can obtain increased funds is public money and that we are therefore to an increasing degree dependent upon Government support.

Dr. James mentioned the fact that our Federal Government had little responsibility for education except in the scientific and research fields. That was true until three years ago. During the past three years (and this will apply for some time in the future, while our ex-service students are still with us) we have been receiving substantial assistance from our Federal Government. When that support is withdrawn, its withdrawal will, in the kind of inflated economy in which we live, greatly increase our difficulties, and we are canvassing ways and means of persuading the Federal Government to continue some measure of support to the institutions in Canada.

The main way of influencing or threatening to influence institutions in Canada which are dependent upon public support is the limiting of the amount of money available. Governments and Legislatures are responsive to the local electorate. They want to remain in

power or to be elected, and they are likely to spend money on those things that tend to be popular. It is only in so far as we in the Universities can persuade the community and the individuals in it that we are worth spending money on that we can hope to get the adequate support that we need. That in a measure limits our freedom in the functions that we perform, because the Government itself and the electors think of ways and means of keeping us busy and occupied that are not always in accordance with what we should like to do and are not always, in my opinion, in the best interests of the Universities or, in the long run, in the best interests of the community, but we have to keep public opinion constantly in mind if we are to obtain the funds that we must have to maintain our institutions.

There is very little direct interference with our operations. Occasionally the more radical members of opposition parties suggest that if and when they get into office they will see that more of those sympathetic with their political points of view are appointed to our staffs than they think is now the case. On the other hand, what I might describe as the more reactionary elements in the community sometimes criticize the radical members of staffs who are appointed or have been appointed, or condemn their participation in public affairs at the political level, because they are not in agreement with the views of the more conservative or reactionary groups.

One other factor which, in my own experience, has had some influence upon the freedom of the Universities is direct interference by citizens at the political level, through Ministers or legislators or by letters to the Press. As I have said, Governments are responsive to the views of the electors, and when the electors suggest that this course or that course should be given, or that standards are too high or too low, or whatever it may be, Ministers and legislators are likely to be affected by that view, if it is expressed by any number of citizens, and, if the same individual citizens criticize the work we are doing or attempting to do, it becomes difficult for us to get from the Government the support and the funds that we need.

I was interested in what Sir Walter Moberly said about the effect of departmental officials and departments of Governments themselves, because that too, in my own experience, has a limiting effect on the freedom of operation of Universities. Deputy Ministers and department officials are naturally of the opinion that they have some authority or some right to determine, at least to a limited extent, the activities and the policies of the institutions that depend upon their departments for their funds.

In conclusion, I should like to mention what I consider are the two best defences of the freedom of Universities from the financial point of view. One is a variety of support. I hope that those of us in the

State institutions, while continuing to get larger amounts from our Governments and Legislatures, will also get greatly increased contributions from private citizens and corporations. If we do that, I think we shall be in a better position to resist both groups when they attempt to interfere with us.

Secondly, we should so command the confidence and the respect of the community that they will urge the Government to provide us with the necessary support and permit us to have freedom to serve the community in the ways that we believe to be the best.

MR. H. R. RAIKES (*Witwatersrand*): The position in the Union of South Africa, in regard to the relation of the State and the Universities, is somewhat different from that in either Great Britain or Canada, because higher education is entirely the business of the Union Government, but unfortunately the Union Government has practically no control over school education. As a result, on purely academic grounds the Universities have a certain amount of trouble with the students coming to them, because they do not think the students are sufficiently well prepared, and the Union Government has no power to enforce better preparation on the Provinces.

In financial matters we deal solely with the Minister of Education. Very unfortunately, for the last nine years the Minister of Education has also been the Minister of Finance, and the position has at times been difficult. The Minister has an Advisory Committee to assist him in the allocation of grants. That Committee has been working for only about three years and must be regarded as a rather unsatisfactory beginner. It consists of three members only, none of whom has had any real University experience at all. One is a senator and one is the head of a technical college. The third was Under Secretary for Education and has now retired. He is one of those people who are frequently employed by the Union Government as a Commissioner and as Secretary to the Commission at the same time, and in consequence he has very little time to devote to the business of the Advisory Committee. Also, I think, very unfortunately, the Department of Education has not in the past been in adequate touch with its own Advisory Committee; the Committee has not even received copies of the Reports of Committees of Inquiry which have been appointed by the Minister.

All the Universities in the Union of South Africa are constituted under Acts of the Union Parliament. In the case of Cape Town and Stellenbosch, the Acts are public Acts, and in the case of all the other Universities the Acts are private Acts, but in regard to the amendment of Charters there is very little difference whether the Act is a public or a private one, except that Cape Town and Stellenbosch

can get their Charters amended without having to pay the costs of private legislation. The Acts are in fact in very general terms, and we do not often amend them. The Act under which my University is constituted has been amended only once, on a minor point, in twenty-seven years. The Statutes made under the Acts are made by the Universities; they have to be approved by the Minister, and they are then laid on the table of the House and become law after thirty days. That is the way in which we get our day to day changes in our constitutions.

The financial support given to the Universities by the Government is very considerable, though it does not reach the figure of 60 per cent. mentioned by Sir Walter Moberly. In the case of my University the ordinary grant was, in 1947, 38 per cent. of ordinary revenue. Taking into account ex-service grants and fees, Government subvention was 41 per cent. of total income. Technically, the Minister has the right to control expenditure under an Act of Parliament passed in 1931, but at the time when that Act was passed a depression was developing in the Union and, as a result of that depression, the larger institutions have never come within the grip of that financial control, chiefly because their grants have not risen to the figures we hoped they would, which would give the Minister power to control expenditure.

There is quite definite political interference and also municipal interference with the Universities. Extremely minor matters are brought up from time to time and discussed in Parliament, generally without full information and before the full information can be placed at the disposal of the Minister. My University is a thousand miles away from the place where Parliament meets, and quite often appreciable harm has been done owing to the dissemination of incorrect information.

The main issue, however, as it is everywhere else, is the education of the community in the value of the Universities. It is true that all Universities have Charters under which they act and those Charters in normal circumstances can be amended in only very special ways, but if a Government at any time wants to take control of Universities it will have no difficulty in doing so, provided that it commands a majority in the Legislative Assembly. Therefore it is the prime duty of the Universities to educate the community in the essential need for University independence, while at the same time the maximum possible financial assistance should come from that department of the State which grants assistance.

I left the Union after the recent general election but before the Cabinet had been announced, so that I know very little about the immediate policy of the new Government. I think that in certain

directions it will probably show an improvement, but in a new country like South Africa there is always the difficulty that people have not sufficient knowledge of what a University ought to be, and if they want some new policy to be carried out it is very easy to sweep away the Universities' independence by an Act of Parliament, which may be introduced without any information being placed at the disposal of the Universities. That is why it is absolutely essential and the first duty of the Universities in the Union to see that the Government and the Legislature realize the importance of University independence. That is the fundamental issue in South Africa, as I am sure it is everywhere else, but the Government must also be educated in the belief that the amount of its support can be watched over by a very responsible body like the University Grants Committee in this country, instead of by direct departmental control.

DR. G. A. CURRIE (*Western Australia*): The Chairman has warned us about Australia producing hot air, so I will restrict myself as far as I can to factual matter.

First, I should like to say that Sir Walter Moberly's statement about gentlemen's agreements does not apply at all to Australia. We have agreements there, but the only gentlemen's agreements are found in the Vice-Chancellors' Committee itself.

Our difficulties are a combination of those mentioned by all the previous speakers in this discussion. We have every kind of University, ranging from those in which the fees form a very substantial part of the income to a University which is completely endowed by the State. We have a State University in each of the States, and this year a University has been established by the Federal Government with an income, guaranteed from the public purse, of £325,000 a year. It is, as yet, something in the nature of a mathematical point, in that it has position but no magnitude. It has no buildings; its buildings have not yet been started. It has a Vice-Chancellor and a Registrar, and it has some research students. It has had conversations with very eminent Australians in this country, but so far they have not said they will come to work there until the University has some magnitude as well as position.

My own University is an extreme example of the kind of University of which Dr. MacKenzie has spoken. We are a free University in the sense that the students pay no fees. As far as maintenance is concerned, our income is derived entirely from the State, so the question of State/University relationship arises in its most acute form.

The State as such gives funds to all the Universities, but the amount varies from less than 10 per cent. in some of the States to over 70 per cent. in the case of my own University, so there is a wide range. So

far State interference with the Universities has been successfully avoided so far as political interference is concerned. Politicians sometimes say that they will support a certain candidate for an office, but so far there has never been even a veiled hint that if the candidate is not successful there may be a repercussion on University finances.

We have in Western Australia the constant possibility of political interference, since the State finds so much of our funds, and we are constantly on the lookout to see that, to the eternal credit of the good sense of our governments, there is no interference with University teaching. So far we have been entirely successful in that connexion in all the Universities.

The next difficulty that we are facing now is that the Governments of States are no longer so wealthy as they were, since the Federal Government is now substantially in charge of income from taxation. The Federal Government is wealthy and earns more than the sum necessary for carrying on its Government, whereas nearly all the State Governments are in difficulties. From the Federal Government, through the Universities Commission and through an inter-departmental Committee of heads of Departments, all the Australian Universities receive grants for research purposes. At the moment the grants are very small, but we hope that this thin end of the wedge will thicken rapidly. The grants are for research only, because the Federal Government, as in the case of Canada, has no place in the educational structure of the Commonwealth except through grants-in-aid and grants for specific purposes, the specific purpose in the case of the Universities being research.

As the States are sometimes poverty stricken and as the Federal Government is very wealthy, we are now in this position, that the Vice-Chancellors' Committee as a whole thinks (though the individual members of the Committee may not all express it in the same way) that the Universities of Australia will require Federal funds in order to function satisfactorily after the very generous moneys now received for reconstruction training have come to an end. At the moment £1.5 million has been spent in building for reconstruction training, and nearly £500,000 has been spent on fees for reconstruction training; also many millions of pounds have been paid to the reconstruction trainees, of whom there are 10,000 in Australia alone, for their maintenance. We think that when these moneys come to an end we shall be in a very difficult situation financially, that our State treasuries—at any rate mine—cannot come to our aid, and that we shall be compelled to have some body like the British University Grants Committee, but we have not yet reached the stage of the Federal Government saying that it will take part in general University financing. When it does, there will not be any question of whether

we can tolerate State aid. So far as we can see, it is a question of having to have State aid or not being able to perform the duties imposed upon us in our Acts, all of which are State Acts. We shall require both Federal Government money and State Government money, and we hope to continue to operate under our State Acts and to have no interference from the Federal Government. We hope—and we are working towards this end—that Federal moneys will be available to take the place of the moneys that we shall lose when reconstruction training moneys cease to be provided.

With regard to the moneys given to the Universities by the Federal Government for research, a part of them is given as a block grant, which the Vice-Chancellors divide, according to a gentleman's agreement, between their Universities, and another part is given for research projects. We have to provide the title of the research project and the names of the people carrying it out, and, although the Government says it will not supervise the research in any way, we find ourselves asked for ever more information.

It will therefore be seen that the matter of University financing from Government funds in Australia is an acute one. We do not fear it, because, like Western Canada, we feel that, provided the University has sufficient prestige, provided that the personnel at the University keep in contact with their State politically, particularly with the Premier, and provided that the community can be got behind the University, we need not fear that the people in any State will be unwise enough to cramp the direction of the development which those responsible in the Universities think is in the best interests of the Universities and finally, of course, in the best interests of the people of the State.

LT.-COL. SIR A. L. MUDALIAR (*Madras*): I had hoped to be silent during this interesting debate, but when the Chairman asked me to present the case of my country I felt it was my duty, both to this Congress and to my country, to agree to do so.

I come from a newly fledged democracy, and I feel that this discussion will be of the greatest assistance to us, both from the point of view of the Universities themselves and from the point of view of the administrators who will be ultimately responsible for much of the University work and its progress.

The position in India is that there are at present twenty-four Universities, twenty-three of which were incorporated as Universities by the State Legislature, the University of Travancore being brought into existence by royal proclamation by the ruler of the State. It is possible that in course of time, with the development of democracy, the Universities may have to alter their constitution in some respects.

There has been a provision for visitation of the Universities, the visitor being the Governor-General or the Viceroy, but under the India Act of 1937 that power was vested in the Provincial Governments, which can, if they so desire, ask that any University shall be inspected and a report made on it. I am glad, however, to be able to state that within the last century, ever since the founding of the ancient Universities of Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay, there has never been an occasion for such a visitation of the Indian Universities.

It has been necessary from time to time to appoint Commissions in the nature of Royal Commissions. The Commission of 1882, the Commission of 1902, and the more recent Commission of 1917, presided over by Sir Michael Sadler, well known in this country, have made valuable contributions in regard to the scope, functions, and structure of Indian Universities, and I am glad to say that, in response to the Report of the Sadler Commission, many Indian Universities have reorganized themselves, although the Calcutta University itself, which was the starting-point for this Commission, has not had such an opportunity presented to it.

I should like to state also, in regard to these Commissions, that it was in the interest of the Universities themselves to have such Commissions appointed, and we hope in the next cold weather to have a similar Commission appointed by the Central Government. In 1946 the University of Madras sent to the Inter-University Board of India, which corresponds to the Vice-Chancellors' Committee in this country, a request for the appointment of a Universities Commission to review the work of the Universities in the whole of India and to suggest ways and means whereby the Universities could improve their academic outlook and their general work. I am in a position to state that the Government of India has accepted this suggestion and that, as I have said, in the cold weather of this year a Universities Commission will be appointed to visit the different Universities of India and to suggest ways and means by which we may improve our academic outlook in divers fields.

Another great improvement is that a University Grants Committee for India has been appointed. I may say that, so far as the Indian Universities are concerned, some of them get Provincial grants and there are certain of them which are given grants from the centre, but it is our hope that within a very short time the Central Government will be able to finance certain essential projects in the Universities. The suggestion that a University Grants Committee should be set up in India was first made in the Central Advisory Board of Education, on which the Indian Universities are represented, and last year we had the privilege of welcoming Sir Walter Moberly and Sir Cyril

Norwood and discussing this question with them. The Central Government has now constituted a Central University Grants Committee, presided over by the Right Hon. Dr. M. R. Jayakar, and it is our hope that this Committee will be in a position to function in a manner similar to that of the University Grants Committee in England.

Besides the Central University Grants Committee, we have in my own Province a Provincial University Grants Committee, because there are three Universities in my Province and the Provincial Government has to finance all of them, and, although we Vice-Chancellors are on the best of terms and the best of friends, we felt that it was desirable, from the point of view of the Provincial Government, that there should be a University Grants Committee, which would look with the same kindly eye on all of us and would not take into consideration the special pleas that might be put forward by one or other of the Vice-Chancellors.

We feel that what is happening at this Congress will have repercussions in my country, for undoubtedly the Indian democracy is following very closely the activities of the older democracies in many parts of the Commonwealth. For example, the decision of the British Parliament to do away with University representation on that august body has had repercussions already in my country. I will not comment one way or the other on that particular matter but will content myself with saying that at the present time there is no doubt whatever that many of the discussions which are taking place in different countries and more particularly within the Commonwealth are being assiduously followed by the democratic assemblies in my country.

We hope that we shall be allowed to continue with the amount of academic independence which we have cherished in the past. We cannot foretell what will happen, because we are living in a very small world, and what is done in one part of the world is bound to have repercussions on other parts. Those of us who are connected with the Universities feel that we have steered clear of the Scylla of academic subservience and the Charybdis of academic intolerance, and I feel that the strong element of the University, not necessarily the Vice-Chancellors and such heads of Universities but the really strong element, which is the professorial element, will have a great part to play in this direction.

Dr. MacKenzie referred to the possibility that University life will be so conducted that it will not take an active part in controversial party politics. I think that requires some little emphasis, because I feel that with a nascent democracy, with the widening of the electorate and the adult franchise coming into being, there should be as little likelihood of friction between one element and the other as

possible. It would be well, I think, if this Congress would express an opinion on whether it is desirable, from the University point of view, from the point of view of academic freedom itself, that there should be as little participation as possible in the national controversial politics of the day by University professors and others connected with the Universities. We shall continue to watch with eagerness the proceedings of similar bodies in the Commonwealth, and I can assure you that we shall gain much by exchanging notes on such topics.

SIR DAVID S. SMITH (*New Zealand*): New Zealand has been known as a Socialist country for many years, and it might be thought that influence would be brought to bear by the Government upon the Universities from time to time, in order to make them instruments of Government policy, but I should like to assure you that that has never been so, that it is not so now, and that it is never likely to be so.

I may say that when I became Chancellor of the University a few years ago I took an interest in this matter of finance, because I thought that we should never make any progress until we had established a satisfactory method of approaching the Government for finance for the University, not because there was any danger of political interference but because of the necessity for reconciling the conflicting claims of the Colleges and of putting on an equitable basis the claims which they were making, so as to bring them within the moneys available.

In order to explain the position quite shortly, I will put before you four statements which you can take as representing the facts in New Zealand.

The first is that the State does not attempt to control the University or its Colleges through its own nominees on the governing bodies, for two reasons, the first that these nominees are few in number and the second that they are not persons who would use their position to influence the University on behalf of the Government. In order to make that plain, perhaps I should explain to you in a few words what our University is like. It is a Federal University with four University Colleges, at Auckland, Wellington, Christchurch, and Dunedin, and two Agricultural Colleges. Each of these is governed by its own statutory governing body, but the students can obtain degrees only from the University of New Zealand, which is also a corporate body and is governed by a Senate. The Senate exercises the final control both in administrative and academic matters, but in academic matters it is advised by an Academic Board, which consists of professors chosen by the various Colleges, and on the University Senate, which numbers twenty-six, the Government has five

nominees plus the Director of Education or his deputy, so no attempt is made by the Government to control the administration by numbers. Secondly, the persons who are appointed would, I can confidently say, resist any attempt by the Government to indicate to them how they should perform their duties in the University.

The second point is that the State controls the main sources of University funds, both for capital and for revenue. With regard to capital, nobody in New Zealand would think of putting up a University building without making sure that the Government would provide the money. The municipal authorities never think of doing so. The position with regard to residential hostels is different. Various religious bodies have provided them, particularly in Dunedin and Christchurch. There are some in Wellington for women, and there is one for men in Wellington on a non-religious basis. Auckland, which has the largest number of students, has no residential College at all, but I understand that steps are being taken to get the finance for such a College and that a Government subvention has been requested.

With regard to revenue, we depend on students' fees and Government grants. As to students' fees, the Government pays bursaries to every part-time student up to £20 per year for three years and to every full-time student up to £40 a year, and if the students are living away from home they get additional bursaries. Therefore the revenue which appears in the College books as students' fees has largely come from Government sources. The Government grants are straight-out grants, coming straight from the consolidated fund.

To give you some idea of the proportion, I will quote the amounts that were paid to Auckland University College in 1945. The Government grants totalled £35,823, the fees were £26,210, and the miscellaneous revenue came to £4,079. No University College has any endowment income beyond about £14,000 per annum, so you will see that we are really dependent upon the State for finance. Obviously that creates a situation which may be perilous to a University.

My third statement is this, that the Government has shown itself responsive to the financial needs of the University and its Colleges whenever those needs have been made sufficiently clear or have been sufficiently pressed. There has been no need whatever for the University to press for assistance for entrance to the University. In New Zealand the position is that the Government wants people to go to the University, and it has been providing the bursaries really on its own initiative, with the result that the professors have been failing about 50 per cent. of the first year students at the end of the year. Our democracy, I think, accepts that, because people say: 'Well, they have had their chance, and if they have not been able to make

use of it that is their fault.' I think that a very similar position obtains in the United States.

With regard to the expansion of the University Colleges, the provision of increased salaries for professors, which were badly needed, and the provision of new buildings, which were also badly needed, we found that we had to press the Government very hard indeed, because the Government had so many other claims upon it. In our country most people look to the Government to do something about any trouble that occurs. We had to make our voice heard, and so you might say that we had to participate in politics, but we were not participating in politics at all in the ordinary sense. What we did was to make plain to the public what the needs of the University were, and the Government, which had been primarily concerned with primary and secondary education, found that it had to consider very seriously the needs of University education. When the situation was made plain to the public and the Government saw that it was a public issue, the Government increased our grants. I think we got about £175,000 extra in the first year, rising over three years to £220,000, so you can see that in a country like ours the influence of public opinion may be very great.

The fourth statement I wish to make is that the Government has approved, at least by implication, of the establishment of a better method of approaching the Government for University finance. In the past we have tried a conference of representatives of Colleges, but they never had time to get together and do the work properly; there were troubles and difficulties, and the arrangement became obviously unsatisfactory. We therefore approached the Government and said: 'Will you appoint a University Grants Committee after the fashion of the British University Grants Committee?' The Government said: 'No. If we do that we shall be prejudging our case. If we appoint a Committee we shall have to accept what the Committee recommends, although we might not want to do so. You appoint the Committee yourselves.' Therefore the Senate set to work to see whether it could appoint a University Grants Committee. It was thought that we might not be able to get the people for it, but I think we have now got a Committee which will be satisfactory. The Chancellor and the Vice-Chancellor of the University are *ex officio* members of the Committee, and the other members of the Committee are a scientist from Auckland, the retired head of an agricultural college and a retired surgeon from Wellington, the Chairman of the Bank of New Zealand from Christchurch, and, from Dunedin, Dr. Bell, who recently retired from the Chair of Mathematics in the University of Otago. We think that this Committee will work successfully. The Minister of Finance told me that, if we visited the Colleges and presented a reasoned

budget, then subject to the control which any Minister of Finance must exercise over the total amount, he would give us an amount based on a reasoned budget and let us control it. I think we can say that there is no attempt to exercise political control over our University.

DR. O. H. MALIK (*Panjab*): I should like to describe briefly the position in Pakistan with regard to the very important question of the relation between the State and the Universities.

In Pakistan, education is a Provincial subject, and there are three Provincial Universities, Dacca (East Bengal), Panjab, and Sind. All those Universities were created by Acts of the Provincial Legislatures. Their constitutions are, or at least have been, fairly liberal, and they have enjoyed a fair degree of autonomy in their administration.

I can speak with more accuracy and knowledge about my own University, the Panjab University. The only control which the Government exercises there is by virtue of the power to review the regulations framed by the University, and in practice that power is seldom exercised, the regulations as drawn up by the University being agreed to by the Government; therefore in practice there is no interference. In regard to matters of appointment, the creation of new posts, and so forth, there is hardly any interference from the Government, so we are practically autonomous in the administrative field. There may be indirect ways of influencing opinion, as there are all the world over, but the administration is in fact the business of those who are in charge of the affairs of the University.

Unfortunately, certain changes have very recently been made in the constitution of the Dacca University, which tend to lessen the autonomy which that University has so far enjoyed. Dacca University is not well off financially. Almost all the expenses of the University are met by the Government, whereas in the case of the Panjab University only about 20 per cent. of the expenses are met by the Government, and in the new constitution of the Dacca University a great deal of power has been taken over by the Government. We in Pakistan are thinking of ways and means to resist this tendency. The Inter-University Board of Pakistan has recently made a demand that a University Grants Committee, on the lines of the British University Grants Committee, should be set up, which would act as mediator between the Universities and the Government and see that, in spite of the grants given by the Government, the autonomy of the Universities is maintained. It remains to be seen how far this attempt will be successful.

The Central Government has so far made no grants to the Universities and has had no control over the affairs of the Universities, but

it is now contemplated that the Central Government should be moved to provide funds to meet some of the very pressing needs which Pakistan Universities have at the present time. As you all know, we are a very young State, the youngest in the world, and we have been passing through very difficult times during the last year or so. Our Universities have suffered very considerably, and we are using this as an argument to support our claim that the central Government should come forward and help us. We shall try to see that we get the money without the control.

The conflict between the State and the Universities arises when Universities begin to discharge the higher of their functions, which, in my view, are indicated by the name 'University'. A University is a body which tries to inculcate a universal outlook not only with regard to the entire body of knowledge but also with regard to the whole of humanity. That presupposes, if I understand the functions of a University aright, that the University is above all narrow nationalism. However much knowledge a University may be disseminating and however much it may contribute to knowledge by research, if it does not give its alumni a universal outlook as distinct from a parochial outlook I do not think it is performing its proper function. If it does perform that function, it comes into conflict with the State. All States now are national, whatever they may say and profess. I submit that, notwithstanding the League of Nations, which is dead, and notwithstanding the United Nations, which is alive, all the States are intensely national, and in that lies the real danger to humanity. What bodies or agencies can serve to mitigate, if not to destroy, this national outlook? I think we can look only to the Universities to do that. They stand above nationalism and should inculcate a world outlook, but as soon as they begin to do that they come into conflict with the State, and then arises the question of how far the Universities can emerge successfully from the struggle. In my opinion, minor matters of making appointments, and so forth, do not matter so much. It is the bigger things that we must look after and see what we can do.

Another important function of the University, to my mind, is the preservation of moral standards. Just as the State preserves material standards, such as weights and measures, so the Universities should and do preserve moral standards. In doing that they come into conflict with the State, because States are unmoral and very often immoral.

The Universities should preserve a world outlook and should preserve moral standards, even if they come into conflict with the State in so doing. I wish them well in the discharge of these higher functions, and I hope that they will emerge successfully from their struggle.

SIR IVOR JENNINGS (*Ceylon*): The Chairman has asked me to speak for the Colonial Universities, because Ceylon was a Colony until a few months ago. It has ceased to enjoy that more or less proud position, and, in any case, education has been a matter of self-government in Ceylon since 1931. Accordingly I do not feel competent to speak for the Universities of Malta and Hong Kong, so I will devote the time at my disposal to saying a few words about a peculiar problem which we have had in Ceylon.

We have had the problem of establishing and maintaining University autonomy when the University is subsidized by an annual grant covering practically 100 per cent. of its expenditure. Like the University of Western Australia, we charge no fees. There are very few endowments. When the University was created in 1942 the total of the endowments was 100,000 rupees. It has now been increased to 2 million rupees, but even that produces such a small income that it is possible to say that practically 100 per cent. of our income comes from the Government. Nevertheless, it has been possible to establish a very large measure of autonomy, chiefly because the constitution was laid down by a Commission presided over by Sir Walter Buchanan-Riddell, formerly Chairman of the University Grants Committee of this country, and the Government of Ceylon has maintained the conventions which it was hoped would be established when the constitution was laid down. One reason is that the Legislature is given adequate representation in the Court of the University, and the Court, like the Courts of the provincial Universities in this country, has not very extensive powers, or perhaps I should say that it has extensive powers but does not exercise them fully. The presence of elected members of the House of Representatives and the Senate of Ceylon in the Court enables those bodies to have adequate information about University activities and at the same time prevents members raising questions relating to the University in Parliament, because whenever a question is raised in Parliament about the University it is possible for the Minister to point out that the House has representatives in the University Court and that that is the proper place in which to raise the question. Therefore, strangely enough, the existence of those representatives in the Court of the University has contributed to University autonomy rather than the reverse. I should perhaps add that the University staff has a majority in the Court.

Secondly, it is obviously unnecessary to have a University Grants Committee in any country where there is only one University; in fact, any such Committee would not be a buffer; it would be a barrier, because in Ceylon, and indeed in any other country where there is only one University, it is easy for the Vice-Chancellor to

approach the Minister of Education or the Minister of Finance or the Prime Minister, or indeed all the Ministers if he so wishes. Therefore the University has a much more direct approach without a Committee than it would have if there was a Committee in existence.

Thirdly, there is the problem of the annual grant. The University Commission, over which Sir Walter Buchanan-Riddell presided, recommended a quinquennial grant, as in this country, but the politicians were anxious to make it an annual grant, and in 1942 we had the difficult problem of deciding whether we should fight for a quinquennial grant or accept the suggestion of an annual grant. The question was ultimately decided in favour of accepting an annual grant, for this reason, that in 1942 we had no idea of the nature and scope of the functions which the University was going to exercise. Actually the grant requested for the first year was 850,000 rupees and the grant requested for the final year of the quinquennium was 3.5 million rupees. If I had suggested in 1942 that the grant should be even 1 million rupees a year I am quite sure that there would have been no University. It is possible year by year to push up the grant, whereas one cannot jump at the outset of the quinquennium from 850,000 rupees to about 2 million rupees, which would have been the average expenditure. Therefore in fact the University has gained through having an annual grant rather than a quinquennial grant. It is probable, however, that at a later stage, when the financial situation is less happy than it is now, we may have to ask for a quinquennial grant, in order to prevent the grant being reduced without adequate notice. So long as the grant increases, the annual grant is infinitely to be preferred.

There is one point which has been mentioned by Dr. MacKenzie and by other speakers, the absolute necessity, especially in our conditions, of maintaining good public relations, not merely good relations with the Government but good relations with the public generally, and one of the most important functions of the Vice-Chancellor is to see that public opinion remains sweet. That is necessary because it will be true, I think, of all the Colonies, as it has been true of Ceylon, that the University plays a greater part in the life of the community than it has played in countries where Universities have been established for a longer time. In the present Cabinet of Ceylon, eight of the thirteen members have been students of the predecessors of the University of Ceylon, one has been at Oxford University, and two have been at Cambridge University, so that eleven of them are University men. Therefore the University is a subject of public discussion much more frequently than it is in this country, and accordingly it is very important that we should maintain good public relations. There are two points in that connexion which are especially

important. One is that the University should give every support to the policy adopted by the Government with regard to school education, and the second is that, whenever the Government calls for services from the University of a type which the University can give, the University should render those services to the best of its ability. Public opinion is an extremely important factor in such conditions as ours.

DR. JULIAN S. HUXLEY (*United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization*): I feel that I am here on false pretences, because I have nothing to contribute to the subject of this morning's symposium, but I am very glad to be here and to say a few words, because I have heard a great many interesting things which will be of much value at the Congress on World Universities which we are holding at Utrecht from 2 August to 13 August. It has been suggested that we have been a little hasty and premature in calling that Congress, but one of the reasons why we wished to hold it at the date arranged was that this Congress of the Universities of the British Commonwealth would then have been held just before and therefore a number of members of this Congress who would not otherwise be in Europe might be available for our Congress. At the Congress in Utrecht we shall be dealing with certain technical matters, such as the possibility, which I am afraid is rather remote, of standardizing degrees, and so forth. Our main task will be the general pooling and exchange of views on the functions of the Universities and on how those functions can be fulfilled in the changing conditions of the modern world. We shall also discuss the question of whether the time is ripe for the creation of a World Organization of Universities, comparable, on a world scale, with the Universities Bureau of the British Empire. On such a World Organization, if it were created, the Universities Bureau of the British Empire could naturally represent the Universities of the British Empire as a whole.

In U.N.E.S.C.O. we have to think of these organizational matters, since there are only two ways in which we can get into touch with individual Universities. One is through the National Commissions of the different member States of U.N.E.S.C.O., which is a rather indirect method, and the other is through an International Organization representing Universities. Similarly, we can get into touch with individual scientists or scientific institutions either through National Commissions or through the International Council of Scientific Unions.

I should like to say a few words on the general subject of the organization of Universities and of cultural and scientific activities on an international scale. U.N.E.S.C.O. has been reprimanded for

going too fast and for not going fast enough, and it has been made fun of in various ways. It is engaged in a rather difficult task, which is difficult because it is new. A large part of that task is to try to lift on to the level of international organization and international cooperation those parts of education, science, and culture (to use the terms in our Charter) which should be internationally organized. In order to do that we have to adopt a new pattern of working. We have obviously to employ an international secretariat. By and large, employing an international secretariat, although essential and very useful in many ways, reduces the speed of working and the efficiency of day to day activities by a comparatively large figure. We have to communicate all the time through Governments and through large international organizations, and that takes up an enormous amount of time and introduces many complexities. More important and more interesting than that, at international gatherings and meetings of individual experts, or of representatives, we are beginning to find that we need a different type of representation. At an international educational seminar it is desirable that the people should be of a rather higher standard than those that usually attend a national seminar, so that when they return to their own countries they will be able to exert more influence. It is also highly desirable that a great deal of the preparatory work for the meeting should be done beforehand in the countries concerned, so that the representatives come to the meeting fully cognisant of the work and, indeed, with a great deal of the work done.

With regard to the relations of the Universities and the State, we shall be covering at Utrecht, I hope, cases which have been brought forward here this morning. When I was in Latin America last year I came across a method of financing Universities by allotting to them automatically a certain percentage of the total revenues of the State and not demanding any account of how the money was spent. There was complete autonomy, but, on the other hand, the Universities were dependent automatically on the prosperity of the State.

One question of interest is whether in any nation the State should interfere with the Universities only in the control of the numbers that go to a University wholly or partly financed by the State. I was surprised to find the other day that in France, where the Universities are nominally State institutions, there is no attempt to control numbers either up or down, with the result that the present attendance at the Sorbonne is 46,000, which is a rather unmanageable number.

Then there is the problem of religious Universities, of, for instance, the type of the Islamic Universities, such as El Azhar University in Cairo. Those Universities present a different type of relationship with the State from anything of which I am aware.

Another problem is that of foreign Universities within a nation, such as the American University at Beirut. What is going to be their relation with the State in the country in which they are situated?

One important point that has not been touched on this morning is that there is often an indirect connexion between Universities and the State through the State supporting and financing essentially competing institutions. I am thinking especially of the practice now in eastern Europe and Russia, where the State supports academies to which are assigned a great many functions which we in this country are accustomed to regard as University functions, especially in the field of research. The same sort of problem is arising in the scientific field, in the competition of State-run institutions with University institutions.

I would ask for your support in the work of U.N.E.S.C.O. We are working on the principle that we must obtain the support of all the interest groups in our very large field, and one of the most important of those groups consists of the representatives of Universities.

DR. T. R. McCONNELL (*American Council on Education*): I was asked some time ago whether the presence of representatives of the American Council on Education at this Congress meant that the United States might apply for admission to the Commonwealth. I replied that that was hardly to be expected, but the presence of those representatives here is, I think, an indication of the fact that we in the United States have much to learn from this Congress, and, secondly, that there is a common intellectual spirit among the great English-speaking peoples of the world.

I wish to speak very briefly on the subject which is before the Congress this morning. As you know, education in the United States is a function of the States rather than of the Federal Government, yet the Federal Government is obviously interested in education as an instrument of public welfare and is taking an increasing interest in higher education. This was shown some time ago when President Truman appointed a Commission on Higher Education composed of members of academic communities and foundations and of distinguished laymen who were interested in education. President Truman asked the Commission to consider particularly the function of higher education in modern American life and in international affairs, although he did not limit the province of the Commission to these problems. I shall not attempt to indicate the many topics which the Commission discussed, but I will refer to a few of its principal proposals.

The Commission was especially interested from the beginning in equality of educational opportunity, regardless of race, creed, national

origin, and financial status. I shall not review the data concerning inequality of educational opportunity in the United States, except to indicate that there is evidence of discrimination on the basis of race and on the basis of creed, and to mention particularly the lack of equality due to differences in financial status.

In the State where I live (Minnesota) only one out of three students of the highest levels of ability goes on to any kind of education beyond the high school. As a means of making higher education more widely available to gifted students the President's Commission proposed the establishment of a system of Federal scholarships and fellowships. The Commission urged that such assistance should be provided ultimately for 20 per cent. of the non-veteran undergraduate students in the Colleges and Universities. It also recommended that Federal funds be appropriated for a large number of fellowships for postgraduate study and professional education, which in many instances are now extremely costly.

There was a great deal of discussion in the Commission on the question of whether or not Federal funds should be made available directly to higher institutions for general educational purposes. Funds from the Federal Government are now made available for certain specific purposes, such as research but not for what might be called general educational support.

There was also a great deal of discussion on the question of whether or not Federal funds should be granted not only to the public Universities but also to private institutions. The Commission took the view that, if the Federal Government provided funds for general educational support, these funds should be granted only to the public institutions of higher education and not to private Colleges and Universities. My own prediction (I am indicating this not as a judgement but as a prediction) is that, if Federal funds are ultimately granted to public Universities, it will not be very long before they are made available also to the private institutions. The Commission recognized that, as now, the Federal Government should be free to contract with both public and private Universities for certain services that it needed to have performed.

The Commission asked for large funds for research from the Federal Government for allocation to both public and private Universities. It asked especially for the support of basic or fundamental research. There is now a great deal of technological research, applied research, and military research in the Universities supported by various agencies of the Federal Government. The Commission recognized the importance of applied research but emphasized that it was especially necessary for us to move ahead as rapidly as possible with more fundamental investigations, which should be the particular

concern of the Universities. There are precedents for Federal support of research, for the Government now provides rather extensive funds for agricultural research and agricultural extension through the great Land Grant College system. As you are aware, the United States possesses a great system of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, as well as a group of outstanding private Universities.

With regard to the relation of the State to the Universities, I think we realize that there are pressures of all kinds on both private and public institutions. There are the subtle pressures of benefactors and of a clientele on private Universities, and there are sometimes social and political pressures on the public Universities. The private Universities, in spite of the fact that they are private in control, recognize that they have profound public responsibilities, and I should say that the State Universities are particularly anxious to see the private Universities, both large and small, prosper, because we realize that a system of education that is purely private or purely public is not likely to meet the needs of our people in the near future.

I should like to emphasize that the great State Universities have attained a rather full measure of freedom. There have been occasionally unfortunate instances of political interference, it is true, but I cannot remember any unhappy episode of that kind in recent times in the University with which I am connected. I might mention that, when the Legislature of the State of Minnesota makes a biennial appropriation for the University, it makes it in the form, for the most part, of a lump sum, and that appropriation is spent under the full control of the Board of Regents of the University. That, it seems to me, is an extremely important point. It is not the case in all the State Universities in the United States, but it is the kind of fiscal control which we ought to try to develop in all our public institutions and in all institutions which secure aid from public sources.

SIR WALTER MOBERLY, in replying to the discussion, said: I think we shall all agree that we have had a good and business-like discussion, and it has taken the form, quite properly, of comparing notes and seeing how far the positions in our several countries and spheres are similar. The predominant impression left on my mind is that the resemblances are very much greater than the differences, and that in spite of particular anxieties here and there, the risk of undue political interference is not felt to be very great in the Commonwealth or, indeed, beyond the Commonwealth. That is the first and main point that is left in my mind.

The second point is that this resemblance is largely due to situations elsewhere similar to the one which I tried to depict at the beginning as being ours in the United Kingdom. That is to say,

confidence is due everywhere to the belief not that Governments cannot but that they will not interfere unduly. It is a matter of convention rather than of any constitutional necessity.

Dr. Mountford raised the question whether the picture which I had painted was not somewhat idealized. While listening to him I recalled a much earlier experience, when as a young man I took part in the writing of a book entitled *Foundations* and Father Ronald Knox wrote a criticism of it under the title of 'Some Loose Stones'. Dr. Mountford pointed out some possible loose stones, and it is not for me to cavil at his hesitations, because, as I expressly said, it is right that Universities should be on the watch. On the other hand, I think that the sort of anxieties which are worth taking into account are not so much those which arise out of a scrutiny of words and phrases, and of possible deductions from them, as those which arise out of actions. In so far as the actual operation of grants now or later gives cause for anxiety, that is a serious matter, but, in so far as forms of words give rise to theoretical questions, I do not think that is a very serious matter.

The next general point which I think emerges from the discussion is that, if these conventions on which we rely are to continue, it is all-important—as has been stressed over and over again this morning—that public opinion shall be kept alive and instructed. In democratic countries we cannot work except in touch with public opinion, and, if University autonomy is to be respected, public opinion must come to value it.

I think we shall all agree also that at one point, rather late in the discussion, the Vice-Chancellor of the University of the Panjab struck a deeper note than any of us had sounded before, when he reminded us of the deep issues which might ultimately be involved in the question of University independence, or in other words, of the possible function of the University in keeping alive fundamental moral and spiritual values. Taking a rather pessimistic view, he said that the State might always be a danger to certain super-national values. In saying that he was obviously saying something of the first importance, but I would add one qualification. To keep alive moral and spiritual values is one of the vital functions of Universities, and this is one of the reasons why University autonomy is important and precious, but it would be a mistake to think that this necessarily means that the University's function is primarily conservative. We are living in a time of profound social changes, proceeding at a pace with which there has been no parallel, and that is partly what I had in mind when I quoted the phrase 'rising to the height of the times'. I was not thinking of the ephemeral changes of Government from year to year and this or that or the other bit of political pressure.

I was thinking of the fact that one of the great tasks of a University is to understand and appreciate and to help the whole world to understand and appreciate the real significance, the possibilities as well as the dangers, of the transformation that is going on.

In this gathering the question that has naturally been most in our minds is whether University autonomy is going to be preserved, and that is what we have been discussing. That is a right and an important question for us to have in mind. There is, however, another question, which another gathering, differently composed, might have in mind and which is also important and relevant. It is this: will the Universities, left to themselves and of their own motion, be sensitive enough and quick enough to understand and to meet the really big changes which are taking place out of sight?

What lies behind our discussion is not merely a question about the State. As we were reminded a few minutes ago, there are all sorts of pressures to which Universities are subjected, not merely pressure by the State. The State is just perhaps the supreme instance of the whole impact of the outside world upon the Universities. The question that we have to consider is, what is the rightful place of the layman, since the State stands for the layman as opposed to the guildsman? To a considerable extent and rightly we are all Guild Socialists, but I, at any rate, am not a Guild Socialist pure and simple, and I doubt whether most of us are. The co-operation between State and Universities is simply an outstanding example of the relation between the lay public as a whole and the guildsman, the expert. We have to find the right form of co-operation, and there must not be domination by one party or the other.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am sure you would all like me to thank Sir Walter Moberly very much for his exceedingly clear, objective, and illuminating remarks.

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS *at a LUNCHEON*  
*given by His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom of Great*  
*Britain and Northern Ireland to the Members of the Congress at*  
*Christ Church, Oxford.*

*Chairman:* THE RIGHT HON. HERBERT MORRISON, M.P.,  
Lord President of the Council and a Vice-President of the Congress

The toast of 'The King', proposed by the Chairman, was loyally received.

THE CHAIRMAN: I regard it as a very great pleasure and privilege to preside over this gathering in this fine and inspiring hall, and I am delighted to be here. This is Christ Church, and I have been impressed with the virtues of Christ Church, Oxford, by my Principal Private Secretary, Mr. David Stephens, who came from this place, by Mr. Patrick Gordon Walker, the Under Secretary of State for Commonwealth Relations, who also came from this place, and, with a certain degree of reservation, by my chief Civil Servant at the Lord President's Office, Mr. Nicholson, who did not come from Christ Church but came from Oxford, which is near enough. Therefore I am surrounded by gentlemen who have every reason to advise me that Christ Church is a great College and that Oxford is a great University. As I have said, I am very glad indeed to be here, and indeed nobody could be here and view this hall without a feeling of respect and a sense of tradition, of awe and of reverence for this place.

This is a gathering of Commonwealth University representatives, and I know that I speak for all the Commonwealth representatives as well as for all others present here when I express our very sincere thanks to the Dean and Students of Christ Church for lending us their hall on this occasion. I was about to refer to the Fellows of this College, but I am told that there are no Fellows and that this is not a College but a House. However, that suits me very well! On this occasion it is significant and pleasant to recall the fact that the Dean of Christ Church is an excellent example of interchange between the Universities of the Commonwealth. He is Canadian by birth and was appointed a Rhodes Scholar for the State of Ontario in 1922. He is an alumnus of both Trinity College, Toronto, and Oxford University, and in 1939 Christ Church persuaded him to give up the professorship which he had held for ten years in Toronto. I think that was a good thing for Oxford but not so good a thing for Toronto. My point is that the interchange is a good thing. If from time to time distinguished people from the Universities of the Commonwealth

are able to come to the Universities in the United Kingdom, that is a good thing, and it is no less a good thing when University people from the United Kingdom have the great honour of being selected to go to various parts of the Commonwealth or the Colonial Empire. I wish that there was more interchange of the kind represented by the Dean of Christ Church. I should like to see a free flow, a free come and go in both directions, between people in key positions in the United Kingdom and the Commonwealth. It might be a good thing also if there were a free flow between the politicians of the United Kingdom and the Commonwealth. Whether it would be possible for the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom today to become the Prime Minister of another country of the Commonwealth tomorrow I am not sure. It may be a quite impracticable idea, but as a generality, as an abstraction, as a theory, it is not without attractions. Theoretically it would be possible in the case of Prime Ministers, but it would not be so easy in the case of Lord Presidents, because in the modern designations of Ministers in the Commonwealth the ancient titles of Ministers in the United Kingdom have not been re-created. I think that is a pity. The title of Lord President of the Council has a definite, concrete, constitutional significance, even though the holder of the office does many things which have nothing whatever to do with the Privy Council.

In connexion with these titles there is a piece of research which I wish the Universities would do. I tried to encourage the Cabinet Office to do it, but they are so busy at the moment getting a living for the nation that they will not take on these luxuries. It is a fact that before the First World War of 1914-18 there was in the United Kingdom no Minister of the Crown who was known as the Minister of something, whereas after the First World War there was no new Minister of the Crown created who was not known as the Minister of something. What is the inference? We are becoming dull and utterly incapable of inventing and creating titles which are attractive and significant, and especially are we incapable of inventing pleasing titles for Ministers which mean nothing at all. In this matter I am a Conservative. I wish we could go on with the art of preserving, re-creating or developing designations or titles of Ministers which either have a nice medieval flavour or mean nothing whatever. So we have steadily fallen to European continental status. It is a fortunate thing that the Chancellor of the Exchequer existed before the First World War; otherwise he would without doubt be the Minister of Finance. The designation of Lord President of the Council is an admirable one, of which I am very proud. Then there is the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster. I wonder how many of you could stand up to cross-examination about that title. The title of Lord

Privy Seal has, I can assure you, no practical significance, but it is useful to the Prime Minister when he has a job of work for somebody to do. Then there are the Secretaries of State, a title of dignity. The President of the Board of Trade is the President of a Committee of the Privy Council, and therefore in a sense he comes under me. That thought has just occurred to me, but I do not think that it has ever occurred to him so far! There is the Paymaster-General, who comes and goes. Sometimes he is, and sometimes he is not. At the moment he is amalgamated with the Lord Privy Seal and the Leader of the House of Lords, which seems a perfectly harmless and innocent amalgamation.

We have present here, sitting on my left, Dr. Stallybrass, the Vice-Chancellor of Oxford University. I am sure you are glad that he is here, and I am especially glad. He was the subject of a certain controversial exchange between Mr. Churchill and myself on the third reading of the Representation of the People Bill in the House of Commons. We were discussing the abolition of the University seats, about which I will not say another word—anyway, not here! Whatever we may think about the merits of University representation in Parliament as such, I was anxious to combat the theory that the members of His Majesty's present Government in the United Kingdom were anti-University. We are not, as I will show you in a minute. I was looking round for some impartial witness to quote, who would show that, whatever the controversy about University representation in Parliament, the Government was not against the Universities, when a friend of mine, a colleague in the Government, provided me with a quotation in *The Times* from a speech by Dr. Stallybrass, which said some rather nice things about the Government. But, I hasten to add, it said nothing nice about the Government's attitude to University representation in Parliament, on which subject the Vice-Chancellor has views which are not exactly mine! I therefore quoted this speech, and it was a most interesting experience. It went very well. I am sure that Mr. Churchill was quite convinced that I did not know the name of the Vice-Chancellor of Oxford University, and the Leader of the House of Commons was equally convinced that Mr. Churchill did not know the name of the Vice-Chancellor of Oxford University. But I did know and I was sure he did not know, and I think I was right about that. Mr. Churchill and I played with each other. He said: 'Who is the Vice-Chancellor? What is his name?' I said: 'With all his University cultural education the Right Hon. Gentleman does not know who is the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Oxford and he has to ask a mere elementary schoolboy like me.' Mr. Churchill then became more than ever convinced that I did not know, and so in a sense we were bluffing each

other, but I knew I was all right and in the end I gave the name. But I should be very sorry if I gave the impression that the Vice-Chancellor was a supporter of the Government in the abolition of the University seats. I knew that he was not, and I did not claim that he was, and he has since made it plain that he is not. His letter to *The Times* shows where he stands in that respect, so all is now clear.

We have a remarkable capacity in the United Kingdom and indeed in the British Commonwealth for either solving or side-stepping difficult controversial issues. Some of them we fight about with the utmost vigour and we come to a decision or a solution. Others, which are too difficult or too tricky, we walk round. In this country the Government does not control the Universities, and I am very glad that it does not. I like the independence of the Universities, and I equally like the work of the local education authorities where, believe me, full democracy obtains. The local authority is the master of a good many of us, but if in the primary and secondary schools under the local education authority parents find that the teachers are teaching something to which they object, they write to the education officer or to the local council and a big row blows up. Anything in the slightest degree unorthodox may be raised with the Education Authority at the primary or the secondary school stage. Contrast that with the practice at the Universities where there may be the most amazing teachers of the most amazing doctrines, from some of which I strongly dissent, but they survive. Some of the doctrines are really dangerous political doctrines. Nevertheless, not only do children of the London County Council, aided by scholarships, come here, but the children of the rich and of the aristocracy come here and to Cambridge and run the risk of being contaminated by these questionable people, who possess the most questionable economic and sociological theories. No doubt, however, under the wise guidance of the Vice-Chancellor the undergraduates are kept on the straight and narrow path—more or less!

I like the University atmosphere. I know Oxford best. I know Cambridge, but this is not the place in which to talk about that! I know Oxford well and I know Cambridge not quite so well. Curiously, London is the most difficult of all to know, because it has not a physical, collective, corporate existence, and that is a great pity. What I like about the University life of the country is the intellectual freedom of it, the lack of official regimental Governmental control, and the atmosphere—‘Let us find out the truth; even if it is inconvenient let us find it out’. That is what a University ought to do—not that I am any great authority on the matter, because I am exclusively a product of the School Board for London

and the London County Council at the Stockwell Road elementary school and the Church of England elementary school in Leman Street. I never got beyond the elementary school; I never got to a central school, which did not exist then anyway, and never to a secondary school, and certainly never to a University, until I was invited to speak at the Oxford Union debates. I owe a great deal to the elementary schools which were the exclusive sphere of my education, and I thank them for it. I certainly have not any hatred in my heart or jealousy of the University people. Good luck to them! They have done a great work in the Universities, and I am grateful to them for their work for the collective advantage of the life of our country.

Now as to finance: we are providing £9 million and shall be providing nearly £12 million to the Universities by 1951-2. In this connexion I would refer to the biography of Sir Herbert Fisher, who was a very distinguished President of the Board of Education. You will notice that the President of the Board of Education has become the Minister of Education. I fought against that to the bitter end in Mr. Churchill's Coalition Government, and people said to me: 'How can you defend the title of President of the Board of Education, when you know perfectly well that there is no Board?' I said: 'That is the charm of it; that is the whole idea.' In the biography of Sir Herbert Fisher it is stated that the grant to the Universities is one of the few items of State expenditure which has survived unscathed from successive campaigns for economy. More important—and here the influence of Sir Herbert Fisher counted for much—acceptance of the grant has never yet entailed any sacrifice of intellectual independence, as it has so often done on the Continent.

Our Commonwealth colleagues will be interested to know, if they have not already noticed it, as they probably have, that Parliament has been discussing the British Nationality Bill. This Bill (this is between ourselves) was introduced to me, as the Chairman of the appropriate Cabinet Committee and Leader of the House of Commons, as a nice, innocent, quiet, non-controversial Bill that would go through easily. I said: 'All right; go on; let it go,' but it has not. It has proved to be troublesome. The most surprising things have happened. Their Conservative lordships have blown right up in the air. The Government exercised tact and patience in adapting words so that the words describing citizenship would not be offensive to any part of the Commonwealth, including the new Dominions. We said: 'What do words matter? If this word will please better than another, let us have it.' This is the genius of the British race. It is our genius, this adaptability about words, not quarrelling about words if the substance is all right. We did this, and we thought we were doing absolutely right in accordance with the British tradition of adaptability

and that everybody would say: 'Good boys.' Then the Lords jumped the rails and passed a series of amendments. Then the Bill came to the Commons, and, of course, the Opposition in the Commons, seeing that the Lords had gone off the rails, had to be sympathetic with them, so the Commons Opposition did what the Commons love to do, that is, they got thoroughly mixed up and confused about the whole issue, with the result that a good deal of time was occupied. It is my time, and I cannot afford it. The Bill, however, will go through, and the British Commonwealth will stand up and its unity will be preserved.

I am glad to be here, in my capacity of Lord President of the Council, as the Minister responsible for science and research. In that capacity I have a great deal to do with the Universities, and I should like to thank the Universities in general for the co-operation which they have afforded to me in developing scientific knowledge and scientific education. They have been most helpful and most friendly.

I should like to see a greater and a more free movement of scientists and University people within the Commonwealth and Empire. There is need, for instance, for a general extension of the idea throughout the Commonwealth of a federated superannuation fund for the staffs of the Universities. If we could develop that, it would enable a much greater freedom of flow to take place between the staffs of our Universities.

It is a great pleasure to me to be here. I should like to thank you for the great kindness you have extended to me, and in particular I would thank the authorities of Christ Church for their hospitality and kindness to us.

I give you the toast of the Commonwealth Universities Congress and I wish you every success and good fortune in your deliberations.

PROFESSOR LILLIAN M. PENSON (*Chairman of the Academic Council and Vice-Chancellor Elect of the University of London*) who responded, said: It is a very great honour to be one of those chosen to respond, on behalf of the Congress, to the toast proposed with so much eloquence and so much reassuring doctrine by the Lord President of the Council. There is nothing that could have pleased a meeting of the representatives of the Universities more than to hear the Lord President of the Council (he will forgive me if I refer to that title quite frequently in my speech) say that in his opinion the most important thing in connexion with the Universities is that in this country the Government does not control the Universities. The Government indeed does two things which most people would regard as inconsistent. It gives us about 60 or 65 per cent. of the funds that we require and yet it does not control us. That, after all, is a very

reassuring sign of the times to those of us who feel in these days (as some of us do) that they need to look round for reassurance.

The Lord President referred also to the intellectual freedom which is still regarded as the most important feature of University life. I was rather amused last night, when I was reading some of the literature which was given to the members of the Congress, to come across in the account of the work of the Universities Bureau, which is responsible for this Congress, the following sentence, which I take out of its context: 'The Bureau office is open to all reasonable inquiries.' I would venture to suggest to the Lord President that that, after all, is a definition of the work of the Universities to a very large extent. We are open to all 'reasonable inquiries', a term which I would define for my present purpose as all inquiries which can be discussed on the basis of human reason. So long as it is possible in the Universities, not only in this Kingdom but in the Commonwealth of Nations as a whole, to discuss all reasonable inquiries without let or hindrance, there is some hope for the salvation of the world.

Perhaps it would not be inappropriate for me, as the one representative of the home Universities chosen to respond to this toast, to make a few remarks about what we have been doing during the last twelve years, since the last Congress of the Commonwealth Universities. In the first place (and this is very much present in our minds), we have been struggling to deal with greater and greater numbers of students. I have it on the highest authority (I took seriously the invitation of the organizers of this lunch to sit next to our friends, and I have been sitting next to the Deputy Chairman of the University Grants Committee) that, as far as science and engineering are concerned, we have succeeded in doing what we were asked to do, namely, to double the undergraduate population. We have not quite succeeded in doing that in all other Faculties, but we are well on our way to doing it.

We have also increased the number of Universities in the United Kingdom by one, and that University we are very glad to welcome. The Charter, with which I imagine the Lord President of the Council had something to do, which was recently given to the University of Nottingham, has put a fitting crown on an institution which, as a University College, has had already a long and distinguished career. The University of Nottingham is not, of course, the only University College to become a University. It is not even the first of the University Colleges to attain to University status. Reading set an example to other University Colleges some years ago, and, more recently, almost on the other side of the world, the University College of Ceylon became the University of Ceylon.

Then there is another feature of recent development. The Univer-

sities in the United Kingdom have been co-operating together, by voluntary association, with the object of stimulating the development of University Colleges and Universities in the Colonies of the British Empire, and we have every hope that before very long these University Colleges will emerge as full-fledged Universities, granting their own degrees, and contributing to the peculiar tradition of freedom of the British Commonwealth. As one aspect of this freedom, every University is different from every other University, but somehow or other there are common characteristics among them. It is perhaps appropriate to refer to this today, as in *The Times* this morning I saw, in the second leader, a reference to the Report of the Commission recently sent out to Malaya, under the chairmanship of Sir Alexander Carr-Saunders, which recommends that the institution created by the amalgamation of Raffles College and the College of Medicine should be given University rather than University College status. That, I think, will be particularly welcome to a large number of representatives of the home Universities who have been interested in these overseas developments.

For the rest, we have been pursuing our reasonable inquiries, and I have observed that in recent years, particularly, of course, since the end of the war, these reasonable inquiries have taken to some extent a new turn. One of the discussions which we are to have in this Congress has been, I think, specifically devised to give an opportunity for the exchange of ideas on the broader issues—broader in the sense that they are not a question of specialized research—with which Universities are forced nowadays to be occupied to a considerable extent. We live in a new world, and it is incumbent upon us to re-think our ideas and the basis of our ideas, with due regard, nevertheless, to those long traditions (I agree with the Lord President that long traditions matter a great deal) of University education which have characterized this country.

I thank you, my Lord President, very much for the terms in which you proposed the toast of our Congress and for the honour which your presence here has conferred upon us.

PROFESSOR S. R. RANGANATHAN (*Delhi*), who also responded, said: It gives me great pleasure to join with Professor Penson in expressing the thanks of the delegates to this Congress to the Government of Great Britain.

In India we have a tradition according to which the householder after his midday prayer goes out and collects some guests to sit at his table. During these days of rationing this ritual has become very difficult, and very often if we know someone who will come we invite him beforehand and say: 'Bring your rations with you.' If we are not

able to find anyone in advance, we have to ask someone to let us know when the street is clear of all human beings and then go out and shout for a guest, and then go back and shut the door as quickly as possible. We have read in English papers of the post-war austerity in England, and we thought it must be worse here than in India, but we are glad to find that it is not so. For one who comes to this Congress is surprised at the lavishness of British hospitality. For, ladies and gentlemen, on Sunday last, I weighed the programme paper for our intellectual repast and the invitation cards for the series of luncheons, teas, and dinners. The latter was ten times as heavy as the former. And what is more the invitation for the first full meal was that of the Government of Great Britain.

It is not merely for material reasons that we are obliged to the Government of Great Britain; there is also an educational reason. Let me make my point clear by giving you my own definition of education. I believe that education is the continuous unfolding of the personality of an individual in his own way, at his own rate, to his own fullness. In our Commonwealth it was the Government of Great Britain that first showed us the way of taking responsibility for the education of one and all of the citizens. The other countries of the Commonwealth and, indeed, all the other countries of the world are following in the footsteps of Great Britain in this matter.

It is true that during the last hundred years a good deal has been done for the education of the mind. The mind has been educated so far as to control and harness even the atom, but there is one thing that appears to me to be a fault in our educational system. There is a tendency to provide amply for the development of the body and the mind, but to fight shy of providing for the release of the soul. The degeneracy of religion to a bundle of creeds and rituals and the emergence of competing creeds have made the educational organization mistake creed for religion and eschew creed as well as religion from educational life. This has proved fatal. We find that when the mind goes on developing at this speed without activation of the controlling force, the soul in man, there is some danger. We find evidence of that danger in the outburst of world war in almost every generation. Let us consider this matter. The human frame embodies a trace of the divine and a trace of the devil. The divine, for some unknown reason, does not manifest itself easily. It is said that when the cat is away the mice play, and the devil has it all his own way. Then what is it that happens? The devil behaves like a serpent inside the human frame. It throws out all kinds of poisons; first selfishness, then jealousy, then envy, then hatred, then violence, individual, racial, national, and so on. This serpent should be kept under control, and the only means of doing that is to activate the soul.

We have been fortunate to be contemporaries of the greatest snake-charmer of modern days, Mahatma Gandhi. He showed us the way to stand for truth, to stand on non-violence, to stand by the soul force. We are grateful to the Government of Great Britain for responding to the way in which he tried to charm the snakes in all men. Ultimately Mahatma Gandhi had to die of the greatest snake that he had tried to charm in his many efforts. It was reported that when the news of Mahatma Gandhi's disembodiment was heard throughout the world someone said that it was dangerous to be too good. I say that it is dangerous to be a snake-charmer, for in every country the snake-charmer ultimately meets his death from the snake. It looks as though it was to respect this truth that Mahatma Gandhi disembodied himself in that way.

It is necessary that our educational system should henceforth pay as much attention to the spirit in man as to the mind in man. We are grateful to Great Britain for having shown us the way in this matter too. In the year 1941 or 1942, when the war was in its worst phase for India and Great Britain alike, the Government of Great Britain set apart a day or two of the time of the House of Lords to discuss a resolution of the Archbishop of Canterbury to the effect that there was only one way to prevent war and that was to make our education take care of our souls. It is necessary that we should do that. It is only then that the kingdom of heaven will come on earth, and it is only then that the true spirit of Islam will spread over humanity, and it is only then that we can live the refrain of the Vedas, which is Peace, Peace, Peace, SHANTI, SHANTI, SHANTI.

PROFESSOR R. W. WILCOCKS (*Principal of the University of Stellenbosch*), in responding to the toast, said: I gladly express the appreciation and thanks of the representatives at this Congress for the hospitality which is now being enjoyed by us. I must say to the Lord President of the Council that I have some doubt about my suitability to speak in any representative way on behalf of the delegates to this Congress, and I trust you will pardon me if, in order to explain that reason, I continue for a few moments on a somewhat personal note. The representatives at this Congress come mainly from English-speaking Universities and are themselves English-speaking. My name, which I am informed is in this country an English one, is in my own country a South African Dutch family name, and many of the people at my University habitually use a language which is not English, so the University is therefore in a sense not English-speaking, though I am now using that language—at least, I hope, approximately!

This is not the time to attempt to judge or review the work of the Congress, and I shall make no attempt to do so. Even if the Congress

had by now concluded its deliberations, some time would have to elapse before it could bear fruit and before it could be judged by its fruit. I believe that what can now be said is that the Congress is in a very special sense a sign of the times in which we are living, of an awareness of a common interest among those people who have a common way of thought and a common way of life as an ideal, and I believe that this is emphasized by the participation in the Congress of so many people otherwise diverse. There are among the delegates to this Congress representatives of a number of young and vigorous Universities overseas, Universities which have in the past drawn their inspiration mainly from Great Britain. There are also amongst the delegates representatives of similar young and robust Universities which have their cultural roots very largely in other Western peoples, peoples with similar ways of thought and of life, peoples with a similar respect for the individual and with a similar love of freedom, and it appears to me only logical that on suitable future occasions there should be meetings similar to this but of a more inclusive nature. I like to think of this Congress as being, among other things, a first step which will lead to the creation of a more embracing organization in which these other similar people will be included.

We have in my language, Afrikaans, a saying *Eendrag maak mag*, i.e. 'Unity is strength', and it is our recognition of this principle which makes us feel the need of realizing a more inclusive unity among different like peoples, which would truly represent the community of our interests. I cannot but think that this aim was envisaged when the Congress was organized, as one to be attained some time in the future. At any rate, one of the resolutions adopted at the preliminary meeting at Bristol has this very idea as its goal. In thanking His Majesty's Government for the hospitality with which we are being honoured today, I wish to express the hope that this Congress will help to lead to the realization of this desire.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** I thank you all for your attendance at this gathering today, which is unique and which I shall remember for a long time. We have listened to a series of speeches from representatives of various parts of the Commonwealth, and I know that we have all listened to them with pleasure and delight. This is an extraordinary political combination. We have representatives here from the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, the newer Dominions of India and Pakistan, the Colonial Empire, Ceylon, and so forth. Not one of those countries is exactly the same as another. All of them have differences. Even in the Colonial Empire there are varying degrees of self-government. That is the strength of this

Commonwealth—the fact that we can combine with tolerance and understanding a wide degree of variety.

This is a unique occasion, and this is a beautiful hall, with its windows, its roof and its pictures. Mr. Nicholson and I are thinking about the Festival of Britain in 1951. We should like to erect half a dozen of these halls in various parts of the country, but we should have to obtain the consent of Sir Stafford Cripps and the planners to do that, and we do not stand a chance of getting their consent. If we could move some of these buildings temporarily to other parts of the country and then carefully put them back, it would be a great advantage, but we cannot do that.

I have greatly enjoyed this gathering. His Majesty's Government give you greetings and good wishes, and we thank you for being so good as to come and enjoy the hospitality which we have so gladly given to you.

EXTRAORDINARY GENERAL MEETING  
OF THE  
UNIVERSITIES BUREAU  
OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE

*Minutes of Meeting held at the Examination Schools, Oxford,  
on Tuesday, 20 July 1948*

IN the absence through illness of the Chairman (Lord Harlech), the Vice-Chairman of the Bureau (Dr. R. E. Priestley) was elected to the Chair.

Besides representatives on the Bureau of various member institutions there were present by invitation of the Executive Council other members of their delegations as well as members of delegations of non-member institutions who were attending the sixth Congress of Universities of the Commonwealth at Oxford.

The Chairman welcomed the visitors to the meeting.

At the request of the Chairman the Secretary read the notice convening the meeting, which had been sent to representatives and their institutions, and had been circulated to persons attending the Universities Congress.

The Secretary also announced that proxies had been duly appointed by some representatives as follows:

<i>Representative</i>	<i>Proxy</i>
Professor E. Ashby (Australian National University)	Sir John Medley
Gen. Sir Charles Bonham Carter (Royal University of Malta)	Hon. Dr. R. V. Galea
Dr. E. Marsden (Auckland University College)	Mr. A. H. Johnstone
Mr. J. E. Myers (College of Technology, Manchester)	Professor W. J. Pugh
Professor T. G. B. Osborn (University of Sydney)	Professor S. Roberts
Sir Edward Peacock (Queen's University)	Dr. R. C. Wallace
Mr. L. G. Ray (Rhodes University College)	Professor R. W. Varder
Mr. D. J. Sloss (University of Hong Kong)	Dr. L. T. Ride
Sir John Stopford (University of Manchester)	Professor W. J. Pugh

*Representative*

*Proxy*

Dr. H. M. Taylor  
(University of New Zealand)  
Dr. L. R. Yealland  
(University of Western Ontario)

Professor R. J. T. Bell  
The Chairman or his proxy

1. ANNUAL REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

The Chairman stated that the Executive Council had decided, in view of the long interval since the last Congress and of the lack of continuity in the recent affairs of the Bureau, not to follow the custom of presenting a report on the last quinquennial period but to submit to this Extraordinary General Meeting a report on the work of the Bureau during the last complete working year. The printed Annual Report and Accounts for the year 1 August 1946 to 31 July 1947 had accordingly been circulated.

It was resolved to receive the Report, and, nobody wishing to discuss it, to approve it.

2. CHANGE OF NAME OF THE BUREAU

Notice had been given by the Executive Council that the following special resolution would be proposed—

Alteration to Memorandum of Association:

That the name of the Association be changed to the Universities Bureau of the British Commonwealth.

It was reported that the Board of Trade had stated that it was prepared to consent to this alteration.

The special resolution was moved by the Chairman and seconded by Dr. W. Cullen.

Dr. F. Cyril James (*McGill*) moved and Dr. D. W. Logan (*London*) seconded an amendment that the words 'The Association of Universities of the British Commonwealth' be substituted for the words 'the Universities Bureau of the British Commonwealth'.

After discussion the amendment was put to the meeting and carried. Attention was drawn to the fact that the further change in the proposed name would require the consent of the Board of Trade.

The motion as amended was then put and carried unanimously.

3. ALTERATION OF THE ARTICLES OF ASSOCIATION

Notice had been given by the Executive Council that the following special resolution would be proposed—

That the Articles of Association be altered as follows:

- (i) Article 12. After 'India' substitute '2' for '3' and insert a new line:  
'Pakistan. . . . . 1 representative'.

## (ii) Schedule A. Under UNIVERSITIES OVERSEAS:

In the paragraph beginning Australia, after 'Adelaide' insert 'Australian National University'.

In the paragraph beginning India delete 'Dacca' and 'Panjab'.

Insert thereafter a new paragraph as follows:

'Pakistan: Dacca, Panjab, Sind'.

Delete the paragraph 'Burma: The University of Rangoon'.

## (iii) Insert a new Article 7 A as follows:

'The representative of any Member may nominate in writing deposited with the Secretary a deputy to act for him during any period for which he gives notice in such writing that he will be absent from the United Kingdom; during such period for the purposes of these Articles any deputy so nominated shall be entitled to act as if he were the representative, and the Association shall be entitled to treat him as the representative, and anything done or suffered by him shall be deemed to have been done or suffered by the representative, whether (should the representative be at the time one of the persons appointed to the Executive Council) in relation to the business of the Executive Council or otherwise.'

Mr. R. Littlehales (*Madras*) moved and Mr. P. N. Banerjee (*Calcutta*) seconded section (i) of the resolution which was put to the meeting and carried unanimously.

Sir John Medley (*Melbourne*) moved and Dr. S. H. Roberts (*Sydney*) seconded section (ii) of the resolution which was put to the meeting and carried unanimously.

Dr. F. Cyril James moved and Sir John Medley seconded section (iii) of the resolution which was put to the meeting and carried unanimously.

## 4. MATTERS PLACED ON THE AGENDA BY THE CHAIRMAN

The Chairman stated that he had pursuant to Article 36 placed on the agenda the following recommendations which had been made by a meeting, held at Bristol on 13-17 July, of executive heads of Universities represented at the Congress and which had been circulated with the agenda papers for the Congress—

1. *Bureau Finance*:

(a) That the Universities Bureau should be authorised to impose an appropriate service charge in accordance with the work done upon all member institutions making use of its facilities in connexion with the appointment of staff.

(b) That the officers and Executive Council of the Universities Bureau should, after the budget of the Vice-Chancellors' Committee of the United Kingdom has been separated, prepare a statement showing the appropriate subscription for Universities of various sizes on the understanding that comparable Universities in all of the participating countries will pay identical subscriptions to the Association.

2. *Amendments to the Memorandum and Articles of Association:*

(a) That the formal amendments submitted by the Executive Council be approved with the exception of that relating to the change of name.

(b) That the name should be changed to 'The Universities Association of the British Commonwealth'.

(c) That steps be taken as soon as is legally possible to make the following further amendments:

(i) Article 5 of the Memorandum of Association should be so amended that the expenses of the Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals of Great Britain and Ireland are separately budgeted.

(ii) Article 7 in the Articles of Association should be amended to read: 'The Executive Head of each member institution shall be *ex officio* its representative at all meetings of the Association, or of the Council mentioned in Article 12, but in the event that such Executive Head is unable to attend a meeting he shall have the right to nominate an alternate who shall, by virtue of such nomination, be vested with all the rights and privileges of membership for such meeting.'

(iii) Article 12 to be altered to read: 'The Executive of the Association shall be a Council consisting of sixteen persons appointed from among the Ordinary Members as follows:

From Great Britain and Ireland, 4 representatives; Canada 2; Australia 2; New Zealand 1; South Africa 2; India and Ceylon 2; Pakistan 1; Other parts of the Commonwealth 2.'

(iv) Article 14 to be amended to read: 'The members of the Council representing each constituent part of the Commonwealth shall be appointed from among the member institutions by the appropriate organization of the Universities within such constituent parts, and such local organization in each case shall determine its own procedure for making the appointments.'

It was resolved to give general approval to the recommendations and to instruct the Executive Council to take the recommended steps in connexion with *Bureau Finance* and to call a further extraordinary general meeting in due course, at which it could report on these matters and submit with proper formal notice another special resolution to effect the further alterations desired to the Articles of Association.

5. THANKS

On the motion of the Rev. Professor C. E. Raven (*Cambridge*) seconded by Sir John Medley, a vote of thanks was accorded to the Chairman.

The meeting then terminated.



*Wednesday, 21 July*



## DISCUSSION

### INTER-UNIVERSITY RELATIONS

(INTERCHANGES, CONFERENCES, APPOINTMENTS, ETC.)

*Chairman:* DR. NORMAN A. M. MACKENZIE,  
President of the University of British Columbia

DR. F. CYRIL JAMES (*McGill*), who had been announced as the Chairman of the meeting, said: Sir John Medley yesterday pointed out that the fact that Australia began with the letter 'A' had had an effect on the programme of this Congress by placing him in the position of opening the first session. I take it that the fact that Canada begins with the letter 'C' was responsible for my position here this morning, but, with your consent, I am going to vacate the Chair, because I may have to go to another meeting before the conclusion of the discussion this morning, and, trying to improve on the alphabetical arrangement, I should like, with your consent, to ask my predecessor in the office of President of the National Conference of Canadian Universities, Dr. Norman MacKenzie, the President of the University of British Columbia, to take the Chair this morning.

DR. NORMAN A. M. MACKENZIE then took the Chair and said: If I were a suspicious person I might conclude that Dr. James's readiness to vacate the Chair this morning was in part due to Sir John Medley's efficient interference with the rights of free speech yesterday! However, I know that is not the case, and I am very delighted to assist him by taking the Chair this morning.

By way of introduction, before calling on Sir Hector Hetherington to open the discussion, I should like to say that those of us who have come from overseas feel that we owe a great deal to Sir Hector for the success of these meetings, and I am sure that his colleagues in Britain will agree with that opinion. Sir Hector was Chairman of the Vice-Chancellors' Committee in Britain for several years, including the period during which this Congress and its programme were planned. He came out to Canada about two years ago and discussed with a number of us in Canada the possibilities of a meeting of this kind. He was instrumental to a considerable extent in arranging for the meetings in Oxford last summer, at which Sir John Medley and several of us from Canada met the Vice-Chancellors' Committee to discuss the items that are on the agenda this morning. Sir Hector and I shared the meetings that in a preliminary way discussed these matters, and we are very happy to pay tribute to him for what he has done for co-operation among the Universities of the British Commonwealth.

In calling upon Sir Hector to open the discussion this morning, I should like to remind you that in due course he will present to you or remind you of the resolutions which were agreed upon at the preliminary meeting of heads of Universities in Bristol last week.

## DRAFT RESOLUTIONS ON 'INTER-UNIVERSITY RELATIONS'

*Submitted by the meeting of Executive Heads of Universities held at Bristol on 13-17 July 1948*

### I. APPOINTMENTS

When it is determined to fill a University post by advertisement and it is desired to receive applications from overseas:

- (a) the University concerned should give time (preferably two months) for such applications to be received;
- (b) a single office should be provided in Great Britain and in each of the Dominions for the purpose of distributing information regarding vacancies, and this office should be furnished by air mail with the particulars of the appointment normally circulated to candidates;
- (c) each such statement of particulars should refer to the arrangements in relation to interviews either in the appointing country or in the overseas area, and should indicate whether or not travelling expenses to take up the appointment will be paid; and
- (d) the appointing University should be prepared to have suitable candidates interviewed (at its expense) either at its own seat or overseas.

### 2. SUPERANNUATION

Wherever possible the superannuation scheme of a University should be such as to encourage or facilitate easy interchange between the Universities of the Commonwealth. Where there is no scheme at all the benefits of contributions should be made transferable in individual cases under any new proposal.

A small committee consisting of Sir John Medley (*Australia*), Mr. T. H. Matthews (*Canada*), Mr. H. R. Raikes (*S. Africa*), Professor I. A. Gordon (*New Zealand*), Sir A. L. Mudaliar (*India*), and Dr. K. Mellanby (*Colonies*), together with Mr. C. R. Macdonald, Secretary of the Central Council of the F.S.S.U., was appointed to meet in Oxford to discuss the groundwork of the matter.

### 3. INTERCHANGE OF YOUNG POSTGRADUATES

(a) Universities receiving postgraduate students holding scholarships from other Universities should be prepared in principle to supplement such scholarships in suitable cases by additional remuneration, either in return for performance of teaching duties or otherwise.

<sup>1</sup> The resolutions in the amended form in which they were adopted after discussion are reprinted on pages 89-92.

(b) A standard list of University institutions should be prepared by the Secretary each year, and each University should circulate its Calendars to the other institutions appearing on that list.

(c) (i) A list should be prepared setting forth for each University in the several countries particulars of postgraduate scholarships tenable solely or preferably by students from overseas Universities; (ii) a handbook should be prepared in each country setting forth the scholarships in each institution tenable by students from other Universities in that country.

#### 4. INTERCHANGE OF TEACHERS

While there will be few direct exchanges of University teachers in different countries, those who go overseas on sabbatical or study leave should be encouraged, in return for a small salary, to reside and do some teaching work in a University of the country they visit. Each University should therefore be urged to provide in its budget modest sums to cover appropriate remuneration of such visiting teachers. In this connexion greater use should be made of summer school appointments to enable teachers from one country to visit another for short periods while receiving some remuneration for teaching in such schools.

#### 5. TRAVELLING EXPENSES

The various Foundations should be approached to finance during an initial period the expenses of overseas visits of scholars at work on specific problems and of University executives attending conferences between the Universities of Great Britain and the Dominions; and official bodies (such as the British Council and the various Governments) should be invited to provide funds—

- (i) to enable members of teaching staffs on leave to travel within the Commonwealth, and
- (ii) to facilitate visits of distinguished scholars of one part of the Commonwealth to another.

#### 6. NATIONAL INTER-UNIVERSITY ORGANIZATIONS

The Universities of each country should be encouraged to establish in that country an agency which in addition to its internal functions might act as an instrument of communication with the Universities of other parts of the Commonwealth and to that end should keep in touch with similar agencies throughout the Commonwealth and with the Universities Bureau of the British Empire. The Conference believes that such a system would more effectively serve the purpose of disseminating information than any alternative scheme.

#### 7. INTER-COMMONWEALTH UNIVERSITY CONFERENCE

In the years between Congresses, a system of inter-Commonwealth visits, mainly by Vice-Chancellors or senior executive officers, should be arranged. For example, it is suggested that in 1949 the Canadian Universities may find it practicable, in connexion with a meeting of the

National Conference of Canadian Universities, to invite the presence of representatives of other Universities of the Commonwealth (say, Great Britain 4, Australia 2, South Africa 2, New Zealand 1, India and Ceylon 2, Pakistan 1, the rest of the Commonwealth 1) and of the Secretary of the Universities Bureau. It is hoped that in the following years similar meetings will be held on the initiative of other countries in the Commonwealth.

### 8. LEARNED JOURNALS

The Vice-Chancellors' Committees or other similar organizations in each country should be asked to prepare a check list of publications in which the work in the various fields of science and the humanities is published in that country, and that each national organization be asked to ascertain through librarians or other scholars the extent to which significant work is not now abstracted in the various scientific, technical, and humanistic abstracts, communicating directly with such bodies as are doing the abstracting and calling the gaps to their attention. Lists of publications in each University should be circulated (four copies) to all other Universities on the standard list referred to in 3 (b) above.

### 9. U.N.E.S.C.O.

Each Dominion University organization should recommend to its Government that at future U.N.E.S.C.O. conferences the Government delegation should include a University representative or representatives, and that the travelling expenses of such delegates if not paid by U.N.E.S.C.O. should be paid for by the Government concerned.

SIR HECTOR HETHERINGTON (*Glasgow*): I should like to begin with a word of warm thanks to the Chairman for the reference which he made to my visit to Canada and to what has in part flowed from that visit. This meeting today is to me the realization of a hope that the Congress of the Universities of the Commonwealth would assemble with a prepared agenda, because I am sure that we shall get much further with our business if we have before our minds the main practical points which have to be cleared up in our discussions. It is just an accident that it happened to be I who was in a position to take a little initiative in this matter. The credit for our present situation is very widely diffused, for from the moment when the idea of an informal preparatory meeting was put forward there was nothing but the utmost co-operation in all quarters, and I have been able to sink back into the obscurity to which I belong.

I think there is one further word to be said on this. The idea of a preparatory talk was born in Canada. It was supported in Australia. Some of us gathered together last summer in Oxford to begin the work. Then we met last week in Bristol, as you have heard, and took it a stage further: and you have the results before you. The ideas

drawn from many sources have been organized and presented for your consideration: and that should help. And a further favourable factor has been that not only the issues have been prepared but the material comforts have been prepared as well. The University of Oxford has done a great deal for us, and we are very grateful. And I should like to add, on behalf of all my British colleagues, how very much we appreciate the contribution which Canada has made not only to the origin of this meeting but to the sustenance which we are enjoying at it.

Having said that, I now come to the subject of the discussion this morning. Yesterday morning we were talking about first principles. Today we come, I hope, to the detailed considerations which are involved in solving a series of practical problems. Therefore I propose to spend no time at all in advocating the cause of inter-University relations. The fact that we are gathered here together from all parts of the Commonwealth and the Empire is a reasonable proof that we believe in the interchange of University thought and experience. Of course, we recognize that no University in the Commonwealth thinks only in terms of relations within the Commonwealth. We have with us today representatives of the Universities of the United States, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Scandinavia, and of other countries, and very glad we are to have them with us. A University belongs to all the world. It is in itself an international society, and it draws its life from the scholarship and the science of every country and of every time. Among the free Universities of this world there should be no exclusiveness. On the contrary, especially in these days, we should all join in the fellowship of free learning and of thought dedicated only to the pursuit of truth.

It is, however, natural for us to take a special interest in interchange and intercommunication between the different parts, the different partners, of this strange society which we call the British Commonwealth. We are very different from one another. Each of us is bent on going his own way, yet in some genuine spiritual sense we belong together. We share in a great political and social experiment, and our very diversity means that interchange between us is an experience which enlarges the resources of all of us. Each of us has something to give as well as something to receive.

Hence I take the major premiss for granted and I should like you now to turn to the published text, because all I propose to do is to say a few words to give you the background of the various resolutions. It is a fairly long paper, but I think it is reasonably clear. Its main purpose is to distinguish between different kinds of exchanges and interrelations and to say, briefly, what is required for each. It ends, in paragraphs 8 and 9, with the exchange of ideas, but the first seven

paragraphs are concerned with the more difficult problem of the interchange of people. So let us take them in order.

The paper begins with the question of appointments, that is to say with sending from one country to another incumbents of posts which are intended to last for a long time, perhaps even for the whole period of active service. The method described in paragraph 1 is not proposed as the only way in which appointments can or should be made between the different parts of the Commonwealth. Some Universities have contacts or relations with every part of the Commonwealth, which enable them to do this particular job in a way which is perfectly satisfactory to themselves. We do not suggest any interference with their normal procedures. Paragraph 1 refers only to the situation in which a University wants to fill a post by open advertisement, and wants to receive applications from overseas. Perhaps the most important point implied here is that this procedure should be resorted to only when there is a genuine intention to consider fairly and fully applications received from overseas. We think that harm would be done by advertisements inviting applications from overseas countries, whether the advertisement issues from a home University or from a University in any of the overseas Dominions, unless the appointment is really open to overseas applicants and unless the appointing University is prepared to take the trouble to see that these applicants are properly considered.

When that intention exists, the point which must be met is the need for full and rapid information. The University wants to know all about the overseas candidate and he, on his side, wants to know all about the post which is offered; and a satisfactory appointment cannot be made unless provision is made to meet both those requirements. Hence what is wanted is an arrangement whereby really adequate information can be communicated to the overseas candidate, and equally adequate information about the candidate can be received by the appointing University. That is the whole purpose of the suggested procedure. First, there must be time for the communications to take place. It is no good starting on this procedure unless you are prepared to give at least two months to it, and probably longer. Secondly, there should be in each country a single point of reference. Let us take a simple illustration. The procedure would work in exactly the same way whatever the countries concerned. But let us take an appointment in Great Britain, for which applications are desired from Canada, South Africa, Australia, and New Zealand. The idea is that there should be in each of those countries a central distributing point named in the advertisement to which full information about the post can be sent, so that it may be relayed to candidates as quickly as possible. The information should be complete. Full

information should be given about the post, duties, status, salary, and prospects, and about the conditions of service in the British University in question. Moreover, the requirements about an interview should be stated quite clearly. If, as will normally be the case, an interview is a necessary part of the procedure, the appointing University may well have in each of the Dominions a small interviewing committee or perhaps even a single individual whose judgement as to personality it is prepared to trust. And if a strong candidate appears, it must be ready to use its interview machinery. Unless an arrangement of that kind is made, the system will not operate properly. So much for paragraph 1.

Paragraph 2 raises a very familiar point, namely, that long-term exchanges will not easily be made unless we have co-operative arrangements, integrated arrangements, as regards superannuation. We know very well that that is an extremely difficult problem. We put it forward at this stage more for record than for detailed discussion. I do not suppose that anyone doubts the desirability of an integration of this kind, but it is a highly technical business. All that is suggested in paragraph 2 is that it should be studied further by a group of experts representing the different Dominions.

In paragraph 3 we turn from long-term to short-term or temporary exchanges, first of all at the level of the young postgraduate student. Here there are two difficulties, one of contact and one of money. The first of those is not likely to be serious. A young postgraduate in this country who wants to go, say, to Australia will usually know just where he wants to go and what he wants to do there. He will get guidance and introductions from his teachers. Equally the other way round. The major difficulty is that of money. Most young postgraduates are dependent on the scholarships which they receive from their own Universities; and, although a scholarship awarded by Oxford or Melbourne or Saskatchewan may be reasonably adequate for maintenance there, it will seldom suffice to bring the holder overseas and let him settle in a country where his expenses will be higher than they are at home. The solution which we suggest is that Universities receiving young postgraduates from abroad should be willing in suitable cases, and as far as possible, to give them an opportunity of supplementing the emoluments which they bring with them by doing a little junior teaching or junior demonstrating, or some service of that kind, for which they can receive the appropriate small but helpful payment. The point here is to let the opportunities be known. Moreover, some Universities offer scholarships to overseas graduates. We should like to see these listed in a sensible and practical way. It is easy to prepare a long list of scholarships for which overseas as well as home candidates are said to be eligible. But that is of little use.

They may be theoretically eligible, but in fact because of difficulties of time-table and communication, they have no real chance to advance their claims before the elections are made. What would be really useful would be a list of the scholarships for which overseas candidates alone are eligible or for which they are given a strong preference. Then they would know the awards for which it would be worth while sending in their names.

Paragraph 4 deals with another aspect of short-term interchange—this time of teachers. It is sometimes possible to arrange a one-for-one exchange. But that is rare. For quite obvious reasons you can seldom find two people who fit exactly into each other's posts and time-tables. What is much more practicable is to take full advantage of the fact that many teachers are travelling, or could be encouraged to travel, anyhow—on sabbatical or study leave, or other occasions of that kind. In such a situation, much would be accomplished if some University were to say to an overseas visiting professor: 'If you would care to come here we should be glad to have you, and to assign to you some paid teaching work—not too much, not enough to impair your chance of carrying out the programme which you have designed, but enough to let you earn the supplementary income which would make your stay possible and profitable.' That ought to be an easily workable arrangement: not costly to the receiving University, but valuable to it and very helpful to the visitor. It may make all the difference to his chance of taking leave. Wherever Universities are prepared to operate an arrangement of that kind, it is very desirable that information to that effect should be available in each national office. We suggest that all Universities should be willing to make some provision for supplementary and temporary appointments of this kind.

If all this is done, the remaining question will be the cost of travelling. A teacher on paid sabbatical or study leave will be able to provide for his home obligations and, under the arrangement which I have just described, he will be able to keep himself going in the country which he visits. But he still has to make the journey there and home: and that is expensive. This, of course, touches the problem of all kinds of exchanges. We think that for help in this matter we might perhaps look to two different sources, namely, private and public funds. Various private foundations have shown an interest in this problem—the Nuffield Foundation, which has already done magnificently in this connexion, the Imperial Relations Trust, and the Dominions Fund of the Carnegie Corporation of New York. All of these have helped us most generously with this Congress. There may be others in this country and elsewhere. We have it in mind that these private funds might be willing to help with the expenses of

certain forms of exchange: and we think that we might look to Governmental sources to help with other kinds of exchanges. There is nothing very dogmatic about this. But it seems to us that it would be appropriate for private foundations to help with the expenses of scholars and scientists who are proceeding overseas on specific projects and to such conferences as are described in paragraph 7, and that Governmental sources might help with the general exchanges as we have set them out—study leaves and the like—of members of teaching staffs within the Commonwealth, and also with a second category of exchanges, namely, the visits of very distinguished scholars who would be prepared to make a relatively short stay in some country other than their own. We think that a few visits of that kind each year would be most useful—not lecture-tours, but friendly visits so that a leader in some subject could meet and talk in an intimate way with young workers in his own field.

Now if all this is to be accomplished, there will have to be in each part of the Commonwealth a national office which can keep the necessary contact with all the other parts and facilitate these arrangements. That is dealt with in paragraph 6. There are already the beginnings of such an organization in every part of the Commonwealth, and it is just a question of development.

With regard to paragraph 7, basing ourselves largely on the experience of 1947 and 1948, we think that there is a good deal to be said for planning a further mechanism of more or less continuous contact between the University systems of the Commonwealth. These Congresses bring us together in force every five years. But five years is a long time: and in between Congresses we ought not to lose touch. Hence the suggestion of an annual meeting of representative Vice-Chancellors or senior Deans or other officers in touch with the general policies of their own Universities, who can speak for their Universities in all the different phases of their activity. In paragraph 7 we suggest that when the Universities in one designated part of the Commonwealth hold their annual meeting small delegations from the other parts of the Commonwealth might be invited to attend—in Canada one year, in South Africa another year, and so on. That would be expensive in money. A still greater difficulty is that it would be expensive in time. But we think that if that sort of continuing co-operation could be achieved, valuable results would accrue.

That covers our points about the movement of persons. Paragraph 8 turns to the exchange of ideas, chiefly through learned journals. We put forward a suggestion whereby the scholars in any one part of the Commonwealth might have a reasonable assurance that they were in touch with what is going on in their own fields in other parts of the Commonwealth. It is not always easy to be sure that a scholar

has within his reach all the material which he wants to see. Hence we suggest that this problem should be explored, in the hope that any deficiencies which are revealed may be made good by a rather better library or indexing organization.

Finally, in paragraph 9 there is a self-explanatory point about the representation of the overseas Dominions at U.N.E.S.C.O. conferences.

I have, I think, given you the background and intention of this paper. As I promised, my statement has been bald and matter-of-fact. But I hope it has served to put the points before you in some sort of orderly relation.

THE CHAIRMAN: I should like to thank Sir Hector Hetherington for his very clear exposition of the contents of this paper. I propose to ask Sir Hector to move and Sir John Medley to second each item and allow you to ask questions or comment on it briefly, and I shall then put it to the Congress. In that way we shall obtain your views on each of the items.

SIR HECTOR HETHERINGTON: I beg to move formally the adoption of paragraph 1.

SIR JOHN MEDLEY (*Melbourne*): I am happy to second that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions or comments on paragraph 1?

*Paragraph 1 was adopted*

SIR HECTOR HETHERINGTON: I beg to move the adoption of paragraph 2. The only point of principle there is the first sentence: 'Wherever possible the superannuation scheme of a University should be such as to encourage or facilitate easy interchange between the Universities of the Commonwealth.'

THE CHAIRMAN: I think it would be extremely useful for some University Boards to have a resolution to that effect before them.

SIR JOHN MEDLEY: I second the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: AS Sir Hector Hetherington has pointed out, it will be extremely difficult to get conformity in respect of this matter of superannuation, because each country and in many cases each institution has its own problems and its own ways of dealing with those problems, but I think the principle is a good one.

Are there any comments or questions on paragraph 2?

PROFESSOR F. L. WARREN (*Natal*): I think that if a pamphlet could be issued giving a brief résumé of the various systems of superannuation which are operative in the various Universities in the various countries it would be very helpful.

THE CHAIRMAN: Your suggestion is that we should remit to the office or to some appropriate person or persons the task of preparing a brief pamphlet setting out the superannuation schemes in effect in each country?

PROFESSOR F. L. WARREN: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: I will ask the Secretary to take note of that and pass it on to the Executive Committee. Are there any other comments or suggestions?

*Paragraph 2 was adopted.*

SIR HECTOR HETHERINGTON: I beg to move formally that paragraph 3 be adopted.

SIR JOHN MEDLEY: I beg to second the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions or comments on paragraph 3?

PROFESSOR A. BOYCE GIBSON (*Melbourne*): This is one of the most exciting suggestions which I have set eyes on for some time. It is one with which I am sure all of us overseas will be delighted, and all I want to do is to comment on one aspect of it which has not been mentioned.

Dr. Veale, the Registrar of the University of Oxford, in his admirable note (*see Appendix*) has drawn attention to a different type of student, and it was with this type of student that he was particularly concerned, I think, in his visit to Australia, namely, the young lecturer appointed locally and needing further overseas experience. He need not be and probably will not be the holder of a University scholarship. He will be a young University lecturer appointed and on leave, receiving at any rate most of his salary but requiring some kind of further assistance at, let us say, this end. I put in a particular plea for this type of lecturer, because I think there is an increasing tendency to appoint, in overseas Universities, lecturers on the spot and to send them overseas for further training. I would commend to the Congress particularly this very junior type of lecturer who requires exactly the sort of assistance that Dr. Veale has outlined in

his note. I would suggest that perhaps some reference to this should be included in the final rendering of the deliberations. Otherwise there is nothing much that could be added; paragraph 3 is entirely admirable.

Under paragraph 5, the question is fares, fares, and more fares, as far as Australia and New Zealand are concerned. Fares are in fact the principal obstacle, and if all deliberations under paragraph 3 could be tied up with deliberations under paragraph 5 a really practical solution to the problem, I think, would be produced.

DR. A. W. TRUEMAN (*New Brunswick*): Is not this point covered by paragraph 4, 'Interchange of Teachers'?

THE CHAIRMAN: I think that is probably the case. However, the categories are so close that I do not think it is really important.

PROFESSOR G. H. LANGLEY (*Dacca*): So far as the case of junior lecturers from India and Pakistan is concerned, I do not think it is covered by paragraph 4. Most of the junior lecturers who come to Britain (my Indian friends here will be able to corroborate what I say) take study leave from their Universities and come for further study. I feel that their case should be specially considered by the Congress. It is not an exchange of teachers. These junior lecturers come for advanced studies in their subjects, and if some special help towards travelling and other expenses could be provided I am quite sure it would be a very great advantage to them.

LORD EUSTACE PERCY (*Durham*): I should like to suggest an amendment to paragraph 3 (*a*), that the words 'or in the employment of' be inserted after the words 'holding scholarships from', in line 1, so that the first words of paragraph 3 (*a*) would read as follows: 'Universities receiving postgraduate students holding scholarships from or in the employment of other Universities should be prepared', and so on.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does that meet with your approval, Sir Hector?

SIR HECTOR HETHERINGTON: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Then that will be incorporated in the paragraph.

PROFESSOR T. G. B. OSBORN (*Oxford*): There is one point that I should like to emphasize, as I do not think it has been adequately underlined in this discussion.

As far as I remember, Dr. Veale in his memorandum envisaged a

two-way traffic. I have had the great advantage of being reared in Manchester, serving in Adelaide and Sydney and coming to Oxford ten years ago for the first time. I feel that my colleagues in Britain as a whole do not quite appreciate the advantages that would accrue to members of their own staffs in Britain if they went to the Dominions for a short period of time. It would, of course, have strengthened my staff at both Australian Universities if I could have had for a limited period of time a young English colleague, and I am certain that many of the young biologists that I have met in Britain would have benefited enormously if they could have spent a limited period of time in the Dominions. I feel also that two-way traffic is important because it is, as it were, a sort of giving of hostages. A good young man comes from the Dominions to this country and he may stay here. A good young man goes from this country to the Dominions. He may stay there. Things will balance up to some extent.

A second point is that I think the type of assistance that may be gained by the interchange of young lecturers should be kept rather separate in our minds from the case of advanced students who are concerned with getting D.Phil.s and that kind of thing. From the point of view of benefiting University departments at either end, I feel that we do not want D.Phil. students so much as younger colleagues, men who will stay sufficiently long to throw themselves into the work of the department, to acquire something of the atmosphere of the place. I think that a couple of academic years is to be thought of as desirable.

I do feel very strongly about the desirability of two-way traffic.

DR. K. MELLANBY (*Ibadan*): I have come forward to do a little advertising. We hope that the University College in Nigeria will not be forgotten when people are trying to find places for young post-graduates and junior teachers overseas. We are having very considerable staffing difficulties. One of the troubles about people coming to these fairly small new institutions is that there are not very many people in their subject on the staff, and I think people appointed to Chairs or senior lectureships will greatly appreciate having colleagues who are not necessarily members of the staff but who come primarily as research workers, who can also give a limited amount of teaching. In biological subjects particularly we have a good deal to offer them and they will be able to help us in return.

*Paragraph 3, as amended, was adopted.*

SIR HECTOR HETHERINGTON: I move the adoption of paragraph 4. I am sure that every member of the Preparatory Committee has heard with the utmost sympathy what Professor Osborn has said

about the importance of two-way traffic. That was a fundamental point in our minds all the time, and these recommendations were designed expressly to give effect to it. We do not conceive this as a one-way traffic at all, and we are wholly in agreement with the views that Professor Osborn has expressed.

SIR JOHN MEDLEY: I will second the motion. I have the greatest sympathy with what Sir Hector has said and with what Dr. Mellanby and Professor Osborn have said on the subject of two-way traffic. I would add one further concept, that two-way traffic should be cross-traffic as well. We in Australia have been apt to think so far of two-way traffic as being traffic between Australia and the United Kingdom, but it is clear that it is equally important that there should be two-way traffic between Australia and other parts of the Commonwealth.

PROFESSOR W. ANDERSON (*Auckland*): Whilst I share the responsibility with other members of the Bristol conference for the form of this paragraph, on further consideration and after consultation with some of my colleagues I should like to suggest a small amendment.

The statement is made that 'those who go overseas on sabbatical or study leave should be encouraged, in return for a small salary, to reside and do some teaching work in a University of the country they visit'. Study leave, of course, is quite definite, but we feel that the objects with which a man may go on sabbatical leave are very varied, and, while we agree that he should be allowed to engage in teaching, we think that there should be no suggestion that his activities should be canalized into teaching in particular. I would suggest, therefore, that, instead of the words 'those who go overseas on sabbatical or study leave should be encouraged' (I take it that that is addressed to the receiving University rather than to the sending University, but that is not quite clear as it stands), the wording should be: 'it should be made possible for those who go overseas on sabbatical or study leave', and so on. I also suggest that, while teaching work may be the kind of work which a receiving University is most likely to give the people in question, the word 'teaching' should be omitted, so that it would be possible for them to do any kind of work. The sentence would then read: 'it should be made possible for those who go overseas on sabbatical or study leave, in return for a small salary, to reside and do some work in a University of the country they visit.'

SIR HECTOR HETHERINGTON: We certainly did not intend to suggest that everybody who goes overseas on sabbatical leave should

be herded into this particular channel. It is true, as Professor Anderson says, that people may have very different motives in mind, and sometimes this will not be appropriate. I myself have no objection at all to the amendment. All that was intended was that, wherever this arrangement is acceptable to the teachers themselves and to the receiving University, every effort should be made to bring it into effect.

THE CHAIRMAN: I do not think there was any intention to limit the work to teaching work.

PROFESSOR H. A. INNIS (*Toronto*): With regard to the sentence: 'Each University should therefore be urged to provide in its budget modest sums to cover appropriate remuneration of such visiting teachers', I suggest that the word 'modest' should be deleted.

SIR HECTOR HETHERINGTON: Whatever may be the situation in Canada, the word 'modest' is a good talking point in this country, but I have no objection to its omission.

PROFESSOR I. A. GORDON (*New Zealand*): I am speaking on paragraphs 1, 2, 3, and 4. I want to speak particularly about the two-way traffic between Great Britain and the Dominions, and what I have to say does not fall under any particular head, but I think it is important.

Like all the other representatives of the Dominions here and, I think, many of the representatives of Great Britain, I am enthusiastic about two-way traffic. I myself am part of the two-way traffic that has taken place between one very obvious place in Great Britain and a perhaps not quite so obvious place in the Dominions. There is one point, however, that has not so far been considered, namely, the nature of the two-way traffic. I compare it with the escalators on the London tube railways. There is a continuous stream of men and women going up on one escalator and there is a continuous stream of men and women going down on the other. When you examine the escalators a little more closely, you find that on one escalator there are only younger men and younger women, and that on the other escalator there are only more senior men and a few more senior women. I will not say which are going up and which are going down—but the point is that for many years Great Britain has been the natural centre of science, of research, and of culture for the British Commonwealth. When I first went to New Zealand a dozen years ago all my friends felicitated me on my appointment, but I felt they were saying to themselves: 'Going out to the Dominions!' Having been in a

Dominion for a dozen years, I honestly feel that the Dominions are no longer 'out there'. They are coming intellectually to the centre of affairs. All of them have different facilities to offer, but by and large they have a great deal to offer. The traffic so far has been of a two-way nature, but a limited two-way nature. From the Dominions young men and women come to Great Britain for research work for the D.Phil., for the Ph.D., and so on, and out to the Dominions go more senior men and women, to the Chairs and senior lectureships and the higher academic posts. I feel very strongly that the traffic should be much more mixed and that more younger men and women should go out to the Dominion Universities, which have in total much of value. Some of them have departments which are better than the comparable departments in Universities in Great Britain. Very few of the Universities which I have visited in Great Britain have so eminent a geomorphologist as we have at one of our small Colleges in New Zealand. There are many men and women who have established reputations in the Dominion Universities. I feel that we should take practical measures to ensure that younger men and women are placed for a year or two in Dominion Universities where good work is being done, and it may even be of value for a young man to go out to a Dominion University where good work has not been done. No one, for example, would come out to New Zealand in order to indulge in the higher study of classics, but a man who has taken a First in Greats will gain a very great benefit by coming out to a newer country where Latin does not count highly and where he has to fight for its existence. It is one thing to study classics in an atmosphere of acceptance. It is a very different thing to come out to one of the younger countries, where you have to justify the subject which you love so much, and I think the fact that one or two of the younger classics who have come out to us in recent years have survived is a tribute to their original study in this country. They have had to re-think what their classics stand for, and they have become better scholars, better teachers, and better classics.

There is no question that in the last thirty or forty years there has been a great deal of reluctance on the part of young men to go out to Dominion or Colonial posts; they feel that if they go out to those posts they will be forgotten and will have no opportunity for further work here. To some extent I think the responsibility for that must be borne by the Universities in the United Kingdom, and I welcome very much the recommendations in paragraph 1, because it is only by the adoption of such recommendations that genuine two-way traffic will be established. If you in Britain will encourage some of your good young men and young women to take posts in Dominion Universities and if you will see that they, at a later stage, and New

Zealanders, Canadians, Australians, and South Africans are given an equal opportunity with graduates in this country to obtain posts here, I think the two-way traffic will become genuine and not be simply a series of pious resolutions.

PROFESSOR P. B. MOON (*Birmingham*): I hope that Universities and heads of departments will not forget the advantages that can accrue if they occasionally appoint as external examiners people from Universities in other countries. It helps with the finances of the visits and it enables the visitors to see how the teaching and examining is done in other countries. This is a procedure which has not been adopted very much so far, and I believe it might well be extended.

DR. F. CYRIL JAMES (*McGill*): With regard to the point raised by Professor Anderson, I would suggest that the words 'those who go overseas on sabbatical or study leave should be encouraged' should be omitted and the following words substituted: 'opportunities should be provided for those who go overseas on sabbatical or study leave.'

THE CHAIRMAN: Would you accept that amendment, Sir Hector?

SIR HECTOR HETHERINGTON: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you accept it, Professor Anderson?

PROFESSOR ANDERSON: Yes.

A MEMBER: Is the word 'teaching' to be omitted before the word 'work'?

THE CHAIRMAN: The phrase there will be 'teaching or other work'.  
*Paragraph 4, as amended, was adopted.*

SIR HECTOR HETHERINGTON: I beg to move the adoption of paragraph 5.

SIR JOHN MEDLEY: I second that motion.

DR. A. E. MORGAN (*British Council*): It might be appropriate if at this stage one of the bodies which has been put on the spot in this document, but has been referred to in the mildest terms, said something with regard to this challenge.

Speaking for the British Council, I should like to assure the

Congress that we are very much in sympathy with the proposals contained in this document, and, if you turn to page 46 of the Programme of the Congress, you will see from the last paragraph on that page that the British Council is implicated to a considerable extent, and, indeed, it has virtually said that it wants to come in, if it may, and assist in this admirable scheme.

By way of preliminary explanation, I would suggest that the reference to official and Government bodies calls for a little discrimination so far as my Council is concerned. To 'official body' we should not take exception, but 'Government body' we should repudiate.

We have to look at our general policy, which covers a great number of activities all over the world; therefore, whatever may be our total resources, our resources available for this particular activity are modest, and I welcome the retention of that word, which is a word that we think of a good deal in this country in connexion with spending, though we may not have quite the same attitude towards it when we are receiving.

We are very much in sympathy with all three categories to which Sir Hector has referred, and I need not rehearse those, but I should like to emphasize, even more strongly than he did, the importance of the third category, the eminent scholar and the eminent scientist who go for a short time to move, in no very formal fashion, as lecturers, in the circles of those who will be interested in their science and in their learning. That is something which we should very much like to support.

The British Council is already spending a modest sum—it runs to five figures—on projects which are somewhat similar to this, mainly in bringing scholars from overseas Universities to this country. If the Universities represented here felt that that was the most valuable work that we could do, we should consider confining our efforts to that particular work. If, on the other hand, it was felt that such moneys as we could afford to spend should be used for the wider scheme which is indicated in these three categories, we should be very willing to place at the disposal of the organizers of the scheme such funds as we had available. I must emphasize that those funds are limited; they may run to five figures, but £10,000 will not go very far, in view of the three categories for the whole of the Commonwealth and Empire and in view of the fact that the traffic should be a two-way traffic. That is a matter which we regard as very important. With regard to the cross traffic which has been mentioned, I doubt whether we should be empowered to give very much assistance to that, owing to the limitations under which we operate, but that surely will be a matter to be dealt with by any similar body to the British Council which may be set up in the different parts of

the Commonwealth and Empire. When there are a Canadian Council, an Australian Council, and a South African Council, they will doubtless be interested in the cross traffic to which reference has been made.

The matter in which we feel that we can help is that which is indicated in the last paragraph on page 46 of the Congress Programme and which was mentioned by Sir Hector Hetherington as being a matter of vital importance—fares. The suggestion is that the Universities themselves should, under this scheme, enable men of standing and young men to enjoy the hospitality of Universities of another country and to make contributions to those Universities, but there is still this question of fares. We feel that possibly the most useful contribution which the British Council could make would be in the matter of fares. The alternative, which may be regarded as better, is that we should adhere to our old policy of bringing scholars over here, but that is very expensive. Roughly speaking, without elaborate calculation, I think that if we assisted with the fares in the scheme which is now under discussion we should be able to assist about two and a half times as many people as we should if we adhered to our old scheme of dealing with scholars only and making ourselves wholly responsible for bringing them here, maintaining them here, paying their fees, and sending them home. I think the question of the way in which the British Council can best help is a question that should be considered by the Universities.

Finally, I would say that this matter has been under consideration by the Universities Advisory Committee of the British Council, of which the Vice-Chancellor of Birmingham University is Chairman and on which there are representatives of the Vice-Chancellors' Committee and of a number of the Universities and University Colleges in the United Kingdom. That Committee is already proceeding, with the Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals, towards the establishment of a Joint Sub-Committee to look into the administration of this scheme from the British Council's point of view, so that there will shortly be a machine which will bring the British Council and the Universities in this country into contact on this matter. I think that it would be well to leave anything in the way of detail to be considered by that body, when it knows the views of the Universities on the question of how the British Council can best assist in this work, which the British Council believes to be within its Charter and along the lines on which it would like to proceed.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** Now that we have heard Dr. Morgan speak from the point of view of the British Council, perhaps Mr. Farrer-Brown

would like to say a few words from the point of view of the organization which he represents.

MR. L. FARRER-BROWN (*Nuffield Foundation*): As you probably know, when the Secretary of a Trust is invited to speak to a resolution asking for money he is usually overcome with shyness! Fortunately on this occasion I do not have to guess the mind of my Trustees, because, as I hope most members of the Congress from the Dominions know, they have already committed themselves enthusiastically to financing to the limits of their resources the kind of interchange which has been advocated during this meeting. They have been doing that now for five years at all the levels, to the end that there shall be not only two-way traffic between Great Britain and the other parts of the Commonwealth, but also cross-traffic between the various Colonies and the Dominions. It gives me pleasure to know that at the present time some of our postgraduate scholars from the Colonies are taking advanced courses of study in the Dominions.

Although the Foundation's resources are substantial, they are not unlimited, and it has been necessary for it to be discriminating in the number of awards which it offers. But, at the same time, it has been thought wise to do so, because, in this very important effort, the best results will come by concentrating on quality rather than on quantity.

I venture to suggest that in developing interchange within the Commonwealth we shall all make surer progress if we strenuously avoid mediocrity and are jealous for quality. Many of us will have seen men come here who were not really of first-class promise and were not very well placed, and who have gone back feeling disgruntled. If we can concentrate on men who are of first-class promise and place them under men, either here or in the Dominions, who are themselves first-class, and where there are facilities which are first-class, even though the numbers with which we deal may be small we shall make much better progress.

The Foundation is committed to helping in this matter, and, in order that it may make its contribution in the best interests of the Dominions and Colonies, it is in process of forming small Advisory Committees in the various oversea areas, consisting of men who, we believe, are held in high respect by the Universities but who stand for the most part a little apart, and so can take as objective a view as possible. With the help and advice of those Committees, the Foundation hopes that its programme will grow and that it may expend still further money on this vitally important matter, to which we feel that a private Trust is able to make a contribution.

*Paragraph 5 was adopted.*

SIR HECTOR HETHERINGTON: I move the adoption of paragraph 6. This is simply a recommendation that each national system of Universities should establish, as has already been done in large measure, a central point of communication.

SIR JOHN MEDLEY: I second the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: The only comment I wish to make is that, in the present state of the organization of some of these National Committees, or whatever they may be called, too much should not be expected of them, because they may not possess the secretarial staff necessary for carrying out very detailed functions. I think, however, that their existence, or their creation where they are not in existence, is very desirable and is necessary if the kind of things about which we have been talking are to be made possible.

*Paragraph 6 was adopted.*

SIR HECTOR HETHERINGTON: I beg to move the adoption of paragraph 7.

SIR JOHN MEDLEY: I second the motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think it might be useful if we had some expression of opinion as to the feasibility of this kind of thing. I should like to know whether it is more than a pious hope. If, for instance, those of us in Canada suggested that members of our Association in Britain and other countries should be invited to attend our Annual Universities Conference next year, about the middle of June, would some of them be able to come? Again, if Australia took the same step another year, would some be able to come?

SIR JOHN MEDLEY: With regard to what the Chairman has just said, I am enthusiastically in favour of some such scheme being made a regular feature, and I very much hope that if the Canadian proposal is carried out in 1949 it may be possible to issue an invitation for a similar Conference in Australia in 1950. I shall do my very best to see that that is done.

As far as the feasibility of the proposal is concerned, I would say again that I am in complete agreement with it in principle, and the question is simply one of expense. I do not think there would be any possibility, as far as I can see, of any large delegation from Australia (I mention Australia for obvious reasons) attending a Conference in Canada next year, unless some generous friends came to our help or unless the Governments were prepared to adopt a rather different

attitude towards this sort of thing from their attitude in the past, but I should do my best to see that at any rate one representative from Australia attended the Conference (having been away from Australia for two years in succession I hasten to add, for the benefit of my colleagues, that I should not be that representative!), and, if possible, two would be sent. That is all I can say about the feasibility of the scheme. As in the case of so many other schemes, the question is one of money.

MR. S. G. RICHARDSON (*Leeds*): We should like not only Vice-Chancellors and senior executive officers but also the academic staff to be included in this scheme.

LORD EUSTACE PERCY (*Durham*): As a matter of English, would not it be better to call the Conference 'Commonwealth Inter-University Conference'?

THE CHAIRMAN: Due notice will be taken of that suggestion.

SIR HECTOR HETHERINGTON: I should like to say a few words on two points which have been raised.

This scheme will work if the Universities take it seriously, that is to say, if the various constituent groups think it is worth while to maintain continuous contacts in the inter-Congress years. There are two obstacles. One, to which Sir John Medley has alluded, is money. I am fairly certain that, in the present context, that is not the more serious of the two obstacles. I think the scheme can be financed all the way round. The more formidable obstacle is time, and I should not have thought it worth while to suggest the scheme if it had not been that, with modern air transport, a great deal of time can be saved, though at considerable cost. It seems to me not at all impossible for quite small delegations of senior officers of the Universities to carry out the sort of arrangement that was made for Oxford last year.

On the point that was made about academic staff, all we meant is that the people in question should be people who are in touch with the general life of the University. There are many opportunities for the specialist groups represented within the University to confer. The scientists and others have their own special meetings. What we want is touch between the Universities as whole bodies, and that means that the people in question must be Vice-Chancellors or fairly senior Deans, or other people who are in touch with the whole range of academic policy. I cannot imagine that this will work entirely on the basis of Vice-Chancellor representation, but we mean senior people in touch with the whole range of University activity.

DR. K. MELLANBY (*Ibadan*): With regard to the representation, I think there should be two representatives for the rest of the Commonwealth, and not one representative, as stated.

THE CHAIRMAN: That point is correct and due notice will be taken of it.

*Paragraph 7 was adopted.*

SIR HECTOR HETHERINGTON: I move that paragraph 8 be adopted.

SIR JOHN MEDLEY: I second that motion.

PROFESSOR R. PARES (*Edinburgh*): I am not quite sure whether this is covered by paragraph 8, because I am not quite sure that I understand what paragraph 8 does cover. I edit a learned journal. Incidentally, I should like to say that I hope the person who compiles the suggested lists will remember that not all learned journals, at any rate in this country, are edited from Universities; some are edited by societies such as the Hellenic Society and others are edited for commercial publishers. The learned journal which I edit does not, I am sure, cover nearly all the learned work that is done in history. The work that it does not cover is that which is done in overseas Universities, the reason being that the overseas publishers do not send their books to this country to be reviewed. I know that many of them are commercial publishers and nothing that we say here can reach them, but a great deal of the best work that is being done in history is probably published by the University Presses, and they do not send their books here for review, so we cannot give them publicity. We might have difficulty in providing enough reviewers if all those books were sent to us, but we could try to do so. I hope that, whoever gets the proposed lists, one department of each University which gets them will be the University Press, and I hope that the members of this Congress will do their best to bring it home to the managers of the University Presses that they should send their works about the world, in order to get them reviewed.

I do not think that this requires any amendment in paragraph 8, but I hope that it will be understood as being covered by the paragraph.

PROFESSOR H. A. INNIS (*Toronto*): I find myself in some disagreement with the proposal in paragraph 8, and this gives me an opportunity to express dissatisfaction with the general tone of the whole document. I resent the pawing about of administrators, particularly evident in paragraph 8. All scholars have their own periodicals; most of them

do their work very carefully, and abstracts are made by scholars in various fields in very competent fashion. I can see very little point in having a sort of general over-all proposal such as is made in this paragraph.

I should like, however, to make one point, which was suggested by Professor Pares, namely, the importance of books. I am told that under exchange restrictions it is practically impossible to secure books from various parts of the Commonwealth, and, though it is much easier to secure them from England, they are still extremely expensive. If something could be done on the subject of books I should feel very much happier than I do about this paragraph of the document.

SIR HECTOR HETHERINGTON: I should like to give one word of explanation and, I hope, to remove to a certain extent Professor Innis's fears. This is a suggestion of a once-for-all review. It may be that the job has already been done, that arrangements have already been made whereby scholars in any field can know where to find the work of their colleagues in the same field in other parts of the Commonwealth. If so, so much the better. There will be nothing to do. But we suspect that, although this work may be well done in the sciences, it has not been so well done in the humanities. The idea is that some central body—for convenience, the Vice-Chancellors' Committee—should start this business going. It is not proposed that the Vice-Chancellors should do it, a function for which they would be totally incompetent. But it is proposed that they should try to ensure that some competent body does it. The idea is that that expert body should look over each field of study and see what the situation is. If they find gaps in the arrangements for indexing and for accessibility then they can so report to the specialist bodies concerned, Universities or associations of Universities or associations outside the Universities, or librarians. It will be for the specialists to consider whether anything can be done. What we are concerned with is merely the mechanics of accessibility, and nothing else. We are not suggesting that there should be any kind of supervision either of the distribution of articles or journals or of the way in which this job should be accomplished.

THE CHAIRMAN: I suggest that the Secretary should make a note of Professor Innis's proposal and see that it is submitted to the appropriate authorities for consideration and action in due course. Would that meet your point, Professor Innis?

PROFESSOR INNIS: Yes.

SIR HECTOR HETHERINGTON: Might we amend the paragraph by substituting the words 'to arrange for the preparation of' for the words 'to prepare', so that the paragraph would read as follows: 'The Vice-Chancellors' Committees or other similar organizations in each country should be asked to arrange for the preparation of a check list of publications', and so on? That is all that is intended.

*Paragraph 8, with this amendment, was adopted.*

SIR HECTOR HETHERINGTON: I beg to move the adoption of paragraph 9.

SIR JOHN MEDLEY: I second that motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: This is one of those things which I think most of us would support, for obvious reasons.

*Paragraph 9 was adopted.*

DR. ROBERT NEWTON (*Alberta*): I have a good deal of sympathy with the suggestion which has been made that in this document the Vice-Chancellors and executive officers appear to dominate the situation a little too much. The Chairman put the motion for the adoption of paragraph 7 before I had time to make this suggestion, but, if I may, I should like to make it now; it is that in paragraph 7 the words 'senior executive officers' should be altered to 'senior staff members'. I think that, from the point of view of the published report, it would be better if the words 'senior staff members' were used.

SIR HECTOR HETHERINGTON: I am willing to accept that amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any objection to that amendment? Then that amendment will be made.

## RESOLUTIONS ON 'INTER-UNIVERSITY RELATIONS'

*passed at the Congress of Universities of the Commonwealth on 21 July 1948*

### I. APPOINTMENTS

When it is determined to fill a University post by advertisement and it is desired to receive applications from overseas:

- (a) the University concerned should give time (preferably two months) for such applications to be received;

- (b) a single office should be provided in Great Britain and in each of the Dominions for the purpose of distributing information regarding vacancies, and this office should be furnished by air mail with the particulars of the appointment normally circulated to candidates;
- (c) each such statement of particulars should refer to the arrangements in relation to interviews either in the appointing country or in the overseas area, and should indicate whether or not travelling expenses to take up the appointment will be paid; and
- (d) the appointing University should be prepared to have suitable candidates interviewed (at its expense) either at its own seat or overseas.

## 2. SUPERANNUATION

Wherever possible the superannuation scheme of a University should be such as to encourage or facilitate easy interchange between the Universities of the Commonwealth. Where there is no scheme at all the benefits of contributions should be made transferable in individual cases under any new proposal.

A small committee consisting of Sir John Medley (*Australia*), Mr. T. H. Matthews (*Canada*), Mr. H. R. Raikes (*S. Africa*), Professor I. A. Gordon (*New Zealand*), Sir A. L. Mudaliar (*India*), and Dr. K. Mellanby (*Colonies*), together with Mr. C. R. Macdonald, Secretary of the Central Council of the F.S.S.U., was appointed to meet in Oxford to discuss the ground-work of the matter.

A brief pamphlet should be prepared setting out the superannuation schemes that are in effect in Universities in each country of the Commonwealth.

## 3. INTERCHANGE OF YOUNG POSTGRADUATES

(a) Universities receiving postgraduate students holding scholarships from or in the employment of other Universities should be prepared in principle to supplement such scholarships in suitable cases by additional remuneration, either in return for performance of teaching duties or otherwise.

(b) A standard list of University institutions should be prepared by the Secretary each year, and each University should circulate its Calendars to the other institutions appearing on that list.

(c) (i) A list should be prepared setting forth for each University in the several countries particulars of postgraduate scholarships tenable solely or preferably by students from overseas Universities; (ii) a handbook should be prepared in each country setting forth the scholarships in each institution tenable by students from other Universities in that country.

## 4. INTERCHANGE OF TEACHERS

While there will be few direct exchanges of University teachers in different countries, opportunities should be provided for those who go overseas on sabbatical or study leave, in return for a small salary, to reside and do

some teaching or other work in a University of the country they visit. Each University should therefore be urged to provide in its budget a sum to cover appropriate remuneration of such visiting teachers. In this connexion greater use should be made of summer school appointments to enable teachers from one country to visit another for short periods while receiving some remuneration for teaching in such schools.

#### 5. TRAVELLING EXPENSES

The various Foundations should be approached to finance during an initial period the expenses of overseas visits of scholars at work on specific problems and of University executives attending conferences between the Universities of Great Britain and the Dominions; and official bodies (such as the British Council and the various Governments) should be invited to provide funds—

- (i) to enable members of teaching staffs on leave to travel within the Commonwealth, and
- (ii) to facilitate visits of distinguished scholars of one part of the Commonwealth to another.

#### 6. NATIONAL INTER-UNIVERSITY ORGANIZATIONS

The Universities of each country should be encouraged to establish in that country an agency which in addition to its internal functions might act as an instrument of communication with the Universities of other parts of the Commonwealth and to that end should keep in touch with similar agencies throughout the Commonwealth and with the Universities Bureau of the British Empire. The Conference believes that such a system would more effectively serve the purpose of disseminating information than any alternative scheme.

#### 7. INTER-COMMONWEALTH UNIVERSITY CONFERENCE

In the years between Congresses, a system of inter-Commonwealth visits, mainly by Vice-Chancellors or senior staff members, should be arranged. For example, it is suggested that in 1949 the Canadian Universities may find it practicable, in connexion with a meeting of the National Conference of Canadian Universities, to invite the presence of representatives of other Universities of the Commonwealth (say, Great Britain 4, Australia 2, South Africa 2, New Zealand 1, India and Ceylon 2, Pakistan 1, the rest of the Commonwealth 1) and of the Secretary of the Universities Bureau. It is hoped that in the following years similar meetings will be held on the initiative of other countries in the Commonwealth. (A suggestion by Dr. K. Mellanby that the rest of the Commonwealth should have two representatives instead of one was referred to the Executive.)

#### 8. LEARNED JOURNALS

The Vice-Chancellors' Committees or other similar organizations in each country should be asked to arrange for the preparation of a check list of publications in which the work in the various fields of science and the

humanities is published in that country, and that each national organization be asked to ascertain through librarians or other scholars the extent to which significant work is not now abstracted in the various scientific, technical, and humanistic abstracts, communicating directly with such bodies as are doing the abstracting and calling the gaps to their attention. Lists of publications in each University should be circulated (four copies) to all other Universities on the standard list referred to in 3 (b) above. (A suggestion by Professor Innis that steps should be taken to facilitate the procurability of books from various parts of the Commonwealth was referred to the Executive.)

#### 9. U.N.E.S.C.O.

Each Dominion University organization should recommend to its Government that at future U.N.E.S.C.O. conferences the Government delegation should include a University representative or representatives, and that the travelling expenses of such delegates if not paid by U.N.E.S.C.O. should be paid for by the Government concerned.

MR. A. B. COCHRAN (*Victoria, New Zealand*): There is one point on which I should like to ask for information. It springs out of what Sir Hector Hetherington said about the open field, and it is a question that has often cropped up in discussion among my fellow lecturers. Is there not in many cases a legal obligation on institutions to advertise a post, and does not that operate even when a choice has in effect already been made? If so, how is a prospective candidate to know where he stands? I am primarily asking for information. If there is a feeling that this is a real problem, we might proceed to some resolution about it. It really comes under paragraph 1, and I am very grateful to the Chairman for permitting me to raise the question now.

THE CHAIRMAN: The only practical suggestion I can make is that in such cases a footnote should be added to the advertisement, saying: 'This post has already been filled'.

There has already been circulated a Report by Dr. Veale, the Registrar of the University of Oxford, on a visit that he paid to the Universities in Australia.<sup>1</sup> Dr. Veale is present this morning, and, while he does not desire to speak on this Report, he will be very happy to answer any questions that may be asked about it. I think it is relevant to many of the matters that we have discussed this morning. Are there any comments or questions upon it?

SIR JOHN MEDLEY: I should like to take this opportunity of saying how very much we in Australia appreciated Dr. Veale's visit to us

<sup>1</sup> See Appendix.

and how very much we appreciate also the valuable document which emerged from that visit. I feel sure that all of us here are in agreement with the general lines of that document, and upon them I do not think I need expatiate at all. I only want to say—it would be very graceless of me not to say—that what Dr. Veale did constitutes another debt that we owe to the University of Oxford, and I believe that one concrete proposal which he has made may be the beginning of a great increase in the traffic about which we have been talking this morning. The Report speaks for itself and I have no desire to make any further comment on it. I only want to express to Dr. Veale my thanks and, I am sure, the thanks of all of us for the trouble that he took in preparing the Report.

DR. T. B. DAVIE (*Cape Town*): If, as is possible, the Report by Dr. Veale on the Australian Universities bears the fruit which he himself has indicated would be an ideal outcome of his visit, it is just possible that Oxford and Cambridge facilities for the other parts of the inter-University relationship which we have been discussing this morning may become somewhat limited. I hope that the purely personal relationship between Dr. Veale and the Australian Universities which has been established by his visit will not in any way cut across the more general principles enunciated this morning.

MISS MARY O. STEVENS (*Western Australia*): I wish to raise a very real point, though it may strike you as merely frivolous comment. In paragraph 2 of his Report Dr. Veale says: 'Among the facts which must strike a visitor from Oxford to Sydney or Melbourne are:— (a) that the concentration of learned men and women is lower than in British Universities; and, in Australia generally, assemblies of learned men are difficult. The distance between Sydney and Melbourne is about 600 miles; Adelaide is 400 miles west of Melbourne, and Brisbane is 450 miles north of Sydney.' Western Australia you observe is not even on the map! Nor is Tasmania, which, however, is just at the back door of Melbourne. Western Australia is 2,000 miles away, and our existence is forgotten. We feel that over and over again. Nobody on this side of the world realizes what our distances are, and when someone gives you examples he leaves out the most convincing figure of them all.

THE CHAIRMAN: I sympathize with Miss Stevens, in view of the distances in Canada also.

PROFESSOR J. K. ROBERTSON (*Queen's, Canada*): I feel in a little difficulty, because I really do not know to what extent we are

supposed to discuss this Report on a visit to Australia. I assume, however, that some discussion is in order, and I wish to state that I cannot accept one of the two assumptions that are basic to this Report. The assumption to which I refer is this: 'There is no academic reason why . . . a University should accept a student from another University except for its own benefit.' It seems to me that that is utterly foreign to the whole spirit of our discussion on the free interchange of students. It is quite conceivable that a student might come to the University of Oxford and not confer any particular benefit on that University, but the benefit to him would go without saying. If this is a basic assumption which we are asked to approve by our silence, I wish to say that I could not assent to it.

DR. D. VEALE (*Registrar, University of Oxford*): I should like to say first of all, that this Report is one which in form is addressed from Oxford University to the Australian Universities; therefore it is not intended to be of any sort of universal application. What struck me particularly in trying to deal with this problem was that it was no good trying to suggest a solution which would be equally applicable at all times and in all places. It is quite conceivable that in a few years' time the position at Oxford will have changed radically. At the present time, as is pointed out in this Report, there are at Oxford a shortage of teachers and a surplus of undergraduates. It may well be that in a few years' time the position will be reversed and we may have too few undergraduates and too many teachers, in which case obviously the particular plan set out in this Report would no longer be applicable. It seems to me to be important that the local circumstances should be studied and that plans for the movement of University people from one University to another should be revised from time to time so as to fit the changing circumstances.

That brings me to the point raised by Professor Robertson, with regard to my statement in the Report that there is no reason for a University to receive a student from another University except for its own advantage. I should regret it if those words were stressed as being in any way inconsistent with the purpose of this conference, because, of course, they were not intended to be so at all. The point which I had been trying to make was that, if it is to be successful, any scheme must be one which will run itself under its own impetus. It is no good supposing that the sort of arrangement which can be made every five years, when a Congress of this kind is held, or from time to time when a visitor goes from one country to another country, can be done too often. The essential point to bear in mind, as it seems to me, in all these things, is that the scheme must be one which fits in naturally with the circumstances which are prevailing at the

time at which the scheme is adopted, that the scheme needs to be constantly reviewed as times change, and that the scheme which fits one set of Universities may not necessarily fit another set of Universities.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have been asked to say a few words about the business dealt with at the Extraordinary General Meeting yesterday, as some of those present this morning were not present at that meeting.

The Extraordinary General Meeting and the earlier meetings in Bristol were concerned with some rather fundamental changes in the nature of the organization for the co-operation of the Universities of the British Commonwealth.

The organization proposed is one in which the Universities themselves, by means of meetings of this kind and interim meetings of a less ambitious kind, will have the general control and direction of the Association. There will be a representative Executive Council and an office responsible in the first instance to the Executive Council and, through the Executive Council, to the Association generally. The work of the office will be divided into three parts. In the first instance, it will be concerned with the general affairs of the Association. In a special sense it will serve as the office bureau of the Vice-Chancellors' Committee in the United Kingdom. Its third function, for which *ad hoc* payment will be made, will be that of dealing with appointments or applications for appointments to University posts. In due course, if the Articles of Association can be so amended, the appropriate division will be made.

That leads me to make the suggestion that for the rest of the time at our disposal this morning we might give some further thought to the more general functions of our Association and the office and the Executive Council, because, in my opinion, the effectiveness and the duration of this Association will depend, at least in some measure, upon the services that it can perform for the member institutions.

In my opinion, based on my own experience, the nature of those services is likely to differ for the various countries and for the institutions within the countries. For some, the Association, the Executive Council, and the office will be of very considerable use and value, while for others, because of time and distance, they will be of more limited use and value.

I speak, as we all must, of my own situation, circumstances, and experience. I have found that, with the best will in the world, while it may be possible to arrange for a certain amount of visitation and exchange of University personnel from country to country, it is not always possible within the country, as Miss Stevens pointed out, to make that exchange effective throughout the country. I know that

within the last two years some Universities in Canada have had the advantage of visits from Sir Hector Hetherington, Sir Richard Livingstone, and Professor Hughes Parry, but, while I am sure that my colleagues, Dr. Sidney Smith, Principal Wallace, and others in eastern Canada, benefited greatly from those visits, and while I shall no doubt find, in my associations with those men, that they are better men by reason of those visits, the fact remains that I did not know that Sir Hector Hetherington, Sir Richard Livingstone, and Professor Hughes Parry had been in Canada until some months afterwards. We have at the student level an exchange of Press information, but that information is in the main concerned with items like beauty contests, followed, in appropriate sequence, by 'better baby' contests, and the exchange of Vice-Chancellors goes by unnoticed.

It is in many respects easier and more appropriate for my colleague Principal James to attend meetings in London and confer with colleagues here than it is for him to meet me in Vancouver, because of the distance, as Dr. Kerr pointed out in Bristol last week, and it was only this year that we were able, for the first time in Canadian history, with a great deal of difficulty and a good deal of persuasion, to arrange for a meeting of the Universities Conference on the west coast of Canada. Even at that meeting, the Presidents, Principals, and Vice-Chancellors, or whatever they may be called in our different Universities, were rather noticeable by their absence. I merely state that as one of the effects of time and distance and expense which will have to be considered realistically in terms of the future of this organization, and some thought will have to be given to the kind of thing that, rather appropriately, our friends from the Panjab and from a Dutch-speaking University in South Africa mentioned yesterday at lunch.

Incidentally, I might mention that one of the most interesting and valuable contributions that we have had in British Columbia, of a kind that I hope will be more frequent in future, was a visit a year and a half ago by the Professor of Music at Melbourne University, Australia. I am convinced that our students were more appreciative of that visit than they would have been of a visit by a chorus of Vice-Chancellors. That suggests to me that some of us should be thinking about things of that kind and doing some effective work at that level, so that not only those of us who are Vice-Chancellors know that there are other Universities and interesting people in them, but that our undergraduates, the young members of our staff, and our community generally may equally have the benefit of that knowledge through the visits of outstanding men and women in a variety of categories of interest.

There is one other remark that I should like to make. I am told on unimpeachable authority that today is Sir Hector Hetherington's birthday, and I do not think that we should let this occasion pass without commenting upon it and expressing our felicitations and our hope that Sir Hector will have many more birthdays in company like this.

DR. W. CULLEN (*Hon. Treasurer, Universities Bureau of the British Empire*): That which the Chairman has just said is very much in my own mind, and I should like to say a word about it.

I do not think there are many here today who were present at our Congress in 1936. Will those who were hold up their hands? [About eight members raised their hands.] Those who were there will probably remember that towards the end of the proceedings a vote of thanks to somebody was moved by the late Sir Franklin Sibly, and I had to second it. I remember very well that in the course of my remarks I said, with a feeling of frustration, in spite of the sympathy of my colleagues from overseas Universities (I was then representing the Witwatersrand University): 'What is the next move? Where do we go next? I feel today that we have not even started on the work which was mapped out for us.' I did not know very well myself what I meant, but I want to say this quite deliberately, that the whole of the proceedings this morning and the whole of those to which the Chairman has referred are an answer to what I had in my mind. I think that, for the next few years, at any rate, we have plenty to do and plenty to think about, and I am very glad indeed that an opportunity was given this morning for a very full and frank discussion of what is probably the most interesting subject of all the subjects that we have upon our agenda at this Congress.

There are two men whose names I ought to mention today. They have not only inspired this meeting this morning but inspired what took place yesterday at our business meeting. The first is Sir Hector Hetherington, who, in the memorandum that he circulated to us before the meeting at Bristol, showed the way, and the second is Mr. Foster, who has helped us through. I think we are extremely fortunate as an Association to have Mr. Foster, with his experience of overseas University administration and its problems, here today as our Secretary, and we hope he will long stay with us. I do not know, Mr. Foster, why your Principal allowed you to come, but here you are, and we are thankful to see you here and hope you will long stay with us.

I am very glad indeed that the Chairman has given an outline of what we did yesterday, because I was going to do that myself and he has saved me the trouble of doing it.

Speaking as the Treasurer, I think you will be interested to know that Congresses of this kind are not conducted entirely on good will. In one way and another this Congress will cost the contributors to the fund about £30,000. There are expenses in connexion with travelling, entertainment, and so on, and I think I ought to mention in this connexion that the cost to the Bureau itself, to be paid out of its somewhat limited resources, will be about £3,000. I should also mention that the luncheon to which you are going presently and other luncheons which will follow on the next two days are provided very largely by the generosity of two large industrial firms in England, one is Imperial Chemical Industries and the other is Lever Brothers.

*Thursday, 22 July*



A CRITICAL REVIEW, FROM THE POINTS OF VIEW  
OF AN HISTORIAN, A PHILOSOPHER, AND A SOCIO-  
LOGIST, OF THE STRUCTURAL AND MORAL  
CHANGES PRODUCED IN MODERN SOCIETY BY  
SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNOLOGICAL ADVANCE

PARALLEL MEETINGS WERE HELD ON THIS SUBJECT

MEETING A

*Chairman:* DR. SIDNEY SMITH,  
President of the University of Toronto

THE CHAIRMAN: I seize this opportunity, as one of the representatives from overseas, to join with the other Chairmen and with other speakers in the earlier meetings of this Congress in expressing our deep appreciation to, and gratitude for the hospitality so graciously and generously extended to us by, the University of Bristol and the University of Oxford.

Yesterday a colleague of mine at the University of Toronto, Dean Innis, remarked that it was his feeling that the agenda had been pawed over by administrators and, in effect, that the true scholars in the Congress had also been pawed about by administrators. I must confess that I felt there was some measure of truth in the remark of my colleague, having regard to the type of programme that we had on Tuesday and Wednesday morning. Of necessity the topics for the discussion at those meetings had to do with matters administrative, and the principal actors in those programmes were Vice-Chancellors, Presidents and Principals, and other administrative officers. This morning there is a full opportunity for the men who do the important work in our Universities—the teachers—to participate in the discussion and to make this meeting a success.

Those topics that we discussed on Tuesday and Wednesday morning were of interest and of concern to all of us, but I do suggest—not with any idea of getting into the good graces of those about whom Dean Innis was speaking—that the topic for this morning goes to the very core of our academic undertakings. That topic, as you know, is 'A critical review, from the points of view of an historian, a philosopher, and a sociologist, of the structural and moral changes produced in modern society by scientific and technological advance'.

Speaking of administrative officers, there is a great temptation for one of them to utter again the oft-repeated clichés that we give to many audiences with respect to this particular topic. But I will not

yield to that temptation, because we have here this morning on the paper men who in themselves exemplify a trinity of talents. Those men in a measure, I expect, will represent the views of three continents, while they recognize the unity of our culture. I am sure they will manifest the prevalence of Scottish influence throughout the Commonwealth. They are Professor Macmurray of Edinburgh; Dean David Thomson, a gift to Canada from Scotland—we are now happy to claim him as our own; and Professor Reyburn of Cape Town, a gift of Scotland to South Africa.

I am going to call on Professor John Macmurray, whose scholarship is so well known throughout the Commonwealth. To introduce him to this audience would be like introducing Saint Paul to the Corinthians.

PROFESSOR JOHN MACMURRAY (*Professor of Moral Philosophy, Edinburgh*): The topic of our discussion today concerns the effects upon the work of Universities of what is often referred to as the 'cultural crisis' in Western civilization. This is a vast and a vague subject, which each one of us will naturally approach from his own individual angle and experience. I must do the same; but in opening the discussion I shall aim at being very broad, and if possible largely platitudinous, to provide a framework for discussion.

I take a grave view of the 'cultural crisis'. It seems to me to be the fundamental issue of our time—much more fundamental than the political or the economic difficulties which we have to face. Indeed, it is the cultural crisis which makes these latter difficulties so intractable.

My first point, then, would be to emphasize this as it affects the Universities. As University teachers we tend naturally to see the difficulty as an external one, affecting the general culture of the society from which we draw our students; affecting the students, therefore, so that they come to us lacking that background and foundation without which the University cannot do its proper work upon them. The basis of culture must be laid in early years—in the home, and to a lesser extent at school. It is, after all—that basis—a matter of habits of mind and habits of life; an emotional rather than an intellectual thing; a faith rather than a philosophy. If this foundation has not been laid, then the University has nothing to build upon, and the cultural effect of its teaching is necessarily minimal. All this is true, I think: but it may lead to a complacent assumption that the University itself is not involved in the general breakdown of culture; that its traditional methods and way of life are all right; that the blame is to be placed outside. Against this natural tendency I should like to insist that the crisis in culture is as much within as

without the University; and that any attempt to fix responsibility is to be deprecated. Rather, what we must aim at is a broad general understanding of the nature of the crisis, of its effects upon all the institutions of society—particularly its cultural institutions, including its Universities, and on that basis make some attempt to understand the changes that are necessary to adapt institutions to the new conditions. At any rate, it seems to me healthier to admit, not as an accusation but as contemporary fact, that in our Universities we are failing in our cultural function; though we are increasingly and very creditably successful in conducting departmental research and in training experts in every field. Our technological success is matched by our cultural failure.

Secondly, I should like to advance for consideration the view that this combination of technological success—departmental success—and cultural failure that we are experiencing in our University work is itself the cultural crisis as it appears within the University. In general, the breakdown of the traditional culture of the West expresses itself in the rapid growth and spread of the technological mind. In saying this I intend no slur whatever upon technology, which is admirable and necessary—increasingly so. By the technological mind I mean that habit of thinking and behaving as though all problems were technical problems; as though all difficulties could be solved by more technical knowledge and skill, by better planning and better organization. This obsession with the technological aspect of things means that culture goes by default. If we persistently assume that all failure and defect is the result of doing things in the wrong way, the question whether we may not be doing the wrong thing never arises. Yet this question is the gateway to all cultural reflection. Technology is, after all, the organization of power, which is simply the means of achieving our ends, whatever these may be. Culture is concerned with the evaluation of ends and with the determination of priorities among intrinsic values. Whether in its primary form as a distinctive way of common life, or in the reflective expressions of this in religion and philosophy, art, literature, and science, culture is essentially a common view of what constitutes the good life and a common effort to achieve it. To this technology is naturally subservient and should, in a healthy society, be deliberately subordinated. Without it technology is meaningless—devoid of any significance whatever.

It is, then, my considered opinion that the technological obsession is the crisis in our Western culture. In social life generally it shows itself in a tendency towards the apotheosis of the State, which is, of course, the technological institution of society *par excellence*, the focus of organization and the co-ordinating centre of social techniques.

Cultural institutions, such as Universities, when the technological obsession spreads in a society, begin to be looked upon as subordinate mechanisms in the general technology of the State—their function being to produce the technicians and specialists needed to 'run the country'. They are, that is to say, *gleichgeschaltet*, as the Nazis used to say. Indeed, to save time in elaborating that thesis in its general application, I might merely point out that the final issue of the technological obsession has been worked out with almost logical precision to its disastrous end before our eyes in Hitler's Germany.

Upon the University the effect of this general tendency is felt as a double pressure. There is pressure by the State, backed, often, by financial assistance, to provide greater numbers of trained professional experts in all fields. There is also a perhaps even more difficult pressure to deal with—the pressure of the preoccupations and interests of our students, intent (and too often exclusively intent) on technical qualifications. These pressures we are all aware of. Probably there is little that we can do to change them. All the more important is it to see that the spirit and atmosphere of the University itself should contrast with and counteract them. But these are external influences and external pressures, however powerful they may be. The spread of the technological obsession within the University itself, in its own spirit and outlook, is more insidious and unfits it for its primary cultural function. In my judgement—which may be biased—it has advanced very far. Culture in a University expresses itself in the *unity* of knowledge and in the achievement of that unity through a synthesis of its departments. A multiplicity of independent subjects held together by efficient organization is no substitute for this. The cultural life of the University depends upon each subject being understood, studied, and taught in vital relation to knowledge as a whole, with a vision of its need of the others to complete its own work and to give it significance. Any subject, however technical, taught in this manner becomes a vehicle of cultural education. But when subjects are shut in on themselves and made an end in themselves even the so-called 'cultural' subjects become merely a training in technical pedantry. For not only do they lose their proper cultural significance when they are isolated, but they become concentrated and centred upon their own technological aspects. Perhaps no better example can be given than the fate of my own subject—philosophy. Its cultural function is synthetic and concrete—to express and exhibit the unity of the whole content of human experience as knowledge. In isolation as a specialism among other specialisms it has before our eyes declined to a theory of knowledge and now tends in many quarters to identify itself completely with logic. And what is logic but the technology of philosophy?

As a third point I should like to raise the issue of the genesis of the technological obsession in contemporary life. It is tempting to limit ourselves to considering contemporary and particular causes of the manifestations of the disease which we meet with in our own work. This is natural and proper provided we do not stop there. But the refusal to go farther is sometimes dignified with the title of empiricism, or realism, when it is only short-sightedness. A cultural tradition as old as our own does not collapse overnight; neither can it be restored in a day. In the cultural field a true diagnosis must be a long-term one. Quick remedies in this field are quack remedies.

It is generally accepted, I think, that the breakdown in culture is the result of the rapid rate of technological change in modern society, brought about by the rapid development of science. This view seems to me correct so far as it goes, and it does at least take a large view. But it does not go very far. For it leaves unanswered the vital question why there should be such an incompatibility between technology and culture, or even between culture and science. Surely technology and culture cannot be inherently and in the nature of things incompatible. Why should the use of our increasing knowledge to improve the conditions of social existence threaten culture instead of strengthening and extending it? There seems to be no reason, and, indeed, if it were true that technology and culture are naturally incompatible we should be in an impossible position. There would be only one sane thing to do, and that would be to put a stop to the development of science immediately in the interests of culture. That is neither desirable nor is it possible, for that way lies starvation and complete social disruption.

The truth seems to be that our particular cultural tradition has been too rigid and too unadaptable to assimilate the advance of science. It must be remembered that science had to fight a double battle for its very existence. It had to struggle against the dogmatism of the religious tradition on the one hand: but it had also—and perhaps even more importantly—to challenge the tradition of classical scholarship. Both these struggles were long and bitter. For the spirit of science is incompatible with the spirit of the traditional culture, both in its religious and in its classical forms. In both forms, religious and literary, there is the same demand for certainty, the same over-valuation of the past as the source of standards, the same fear of change. The spirit of science, on the other hand, is forward-looking, experimental, and content to relinquish certainty—and even the hope of certainty—for the probability that is warranted by practical progress. Whatever the deeper reasons, the fact of this opposition is matter of history. Instead of science developing as part of the traditional culture, welcomed and given an honoured place,

it was driven into opposition to it, mostly against its will and inclination; and it has in the long run won its triumph over the cultural tradition only yesterday, and only through the appeal of the technological triumphs which it has made possible. That—so it seems to me—is the real explanation of the cultural crisis in our civilization. We are now dealing with a young generation which is compelled to a choice between a living, triumphant science with its associated techniques and the fragments of a moribund culture which science has been forced—unwillingly—to destroy. I agree with you that this is an unpalatable conclusion: but it has the virtue that it points the direction of advance. The breach between science and culture must be healed, with whatever changes in the cultural tradition may be necessary to make it possible. For it is our cultural tradition that is fundamentally to blame.

These remarks are perhaps not so far removed from the pre-occupations of University teachers as it might seem. The history of the unhappy conflict between science and culture is written into the structure of our Universities in the confrontation of the Faculties of Arts and Science. This represents, at least in theory, a choice for the student between a cultural education and a specialized training as a scientific expert. The choice is one that should not have to be made. In fact, it is not often made, for the student has learnt how to use his arts course as a specialized technical training for professional work. To solve the cultural problem in the Universities some way must be found to integrate scientific and humane studies—not simply administratively or by way of organization, but effectively and in spirit.

Here I must stop. But perhaps I can sum up the practical outcome of what I have said in this way. There are two long-term objectives which I should myself set for the University when it seriously grapples with its primary cultural function. The first is to develop and find the way to put into execution a new conception of a liberal education in which science plays an essential part. The other is for the University to aim at making itself the gravitational centre of contemporary cultural life in the community which it serves.

DEAN D. L. THOMSON (*McGill*): I have to confess that I approach this symposium with a good deal of trepidation, or even, if I may borrow philosophy's most famous quotation from my two colleagues, 'mit immer neuer und zunehmender Bewunderung und Ehrfurcht'. In the first place, I can make no claim to being an historian, a philosopher, or a sociologist. In the second place, I notice with some alarm that the audience includes President Stoddard, of the University of Illinois, whom I heard some months ago speaking on this

topic so brilliantly and impressively that I must certainly be guilty of unconscious plagiarism. Thirdly, the symposium has not only been given a title so long that I have found it impossible to memorize (and I noticed just now that our Chairman was in the same difficulty), but also appears to cover a field wider, one would have thought, than could be surveyed systematically in a single morning. It has seemed to me, therefore, that all I can hope to do is to select and to hold up for your inspection three or four specimen problems chosen from this wide field: they are, of course, problems which I regard as so fundamental as to require study, even if they be familiar.

With your permission, I shall begin with an example of a structural change in our society, and indeed with one which Professor Macmurray has already alluded to, in saying that we must choose science, or starve. It is clear, I think, that without the scientific advances in agriculture our Western world could not support anything like its present population; certainly it could not support such numbers and at the same time retain its present structure, in which only a minority of the workers are directly engaged in the production and distribution of food; in India and in China and in all primitive societies, we find in contrast that the vast majority of the able-bodied are producers of food. It may also be noted that without the advances in food technology and in transportation, we could not supply our great industrial areas with food brought from great distances. Unfortunately, however, these advances in technology preceded the development of the science of nutrition: so that today the foods which can be most easily and most cheaply supplied to our industrial areas are precisely those which have been more or less devitalized and devitaminized to reduce their perishability during distribution. I take this to be the major nutritional problem of the Western world today.

If, however, we look outside the limits of Western society, we become aware of still greater food problems: Sir John Boyd Orr has recently and emphatically reminded us that the ghost of Malthus is not laid. The area occupied by the Western society may be self-supporting, but it is *not* doing as much as it might in contributing to the world's total food supply. The advances in agricultural science and technology have not uniformly led to the production of more food per acre: they have often led to the production of more food per farmer, and have had the unavowed objective of reducing the number of food-producers, so that there may be fewer to share the moneys which the industrial populations are collectively willing to pay for their food. The individual food-producer's natural desire for a high standard of living may not be compatible with fullest utilization of the land. In my personal opinion (but I am no economist) the fundamental difficulty here is that the city-dweller is not willing

to expend a sufficient fraction of his income on that primary necessity, food: there are so many other things that make claims upon his budget. Many of these competitors are products of science and technology; yet, before we begin to assign responsibility and blame, let us recall that many of these competitors are integral to our concept of civilization—educational services, health services, communications, improved housing, and so on. There is a dilemma here, to which I think we shall not find an answer this morning.

My second example of the impact of science on the structure of society can be dismissed more briefly; it arises out of what I have just said. We need have no reservations in viewing the achievements of medical science with gratitude and pride; they have been sufficiently spectacular; the average expectation of life has increased in a century by some twenty years. But are we not too passive in our acceptance of advances in medicine? The common attitude towards some new life-saving discovery seems to be that of a pre-occupied child under the Christmas tree, discovering an unopened parcel with, indeed, some pleasure, but no real turning of attention from the toys already spread across the floor. I see very little sign that our economists and sociologists are thinking hard or constructively about the changing age-distribution in our population; and yet, if we can for the moment cold-bloodedly forget all the personal tragedies of sickness and death, we see that every advance in medicine must make it at least relatively more difficult for young men and women to win a place in the world. To put it crudely, the surviving father either retains his job and keeps his son out of it, or retires and must be supported directly or indirectly by his son's labours. We must expect this problem to become very much more acute: because so far increased life-expectancy is largely due to the conquest of the infectious diseases of early life, whereas medical research is now more and more concerned with the degenerative diseases of middle age, such as cardiovascular disease and cancer. In this case, as before, we need social and economic advances to parallel the advances of science. It is often said vaguely that natural science is outstripping progress in other domains of knowledge: I am trying to indicate precisely certain specific problems of which this is urgently true.

So far I have deliberately emphasized the impact of science upon the material structure of our society; partly because it seems to me that this aspect of today's problem has been rather neglected by the other designated contributors to this symposium—of whom I have taken an unfair advantage, in not submitting a synopsis in advance. Now, however, I wish to turn to more abstract questions.

I do not propose to enter into any discussion of the claims of economics or sociology or history to be regarded as 'sciences'; this

problem seems to me to be largely a matter of definitions. The adjective 'scientific' is quite often applied to all arguments that are rational rather than emotional, or objective rather than *ex parte*, or quantitative rather than impressionistically qualitative. In such usages the term 'scientific' necessarily covers nearly all sound scholarship. On the other hand, the term 'scientific' is at times restricted to the so-called 'natural sciences', which differ from these other fields of inquiry in some fundamental respects. In the natural sciences, for example, we can almost always add observation to observation, experiment to experiment, confirmation to confirmation, for as long as we like; we eventually run out of patience, but we do not run out of instances; whereas in the social sciences the number of instances available for comparative study is ordinarily quite limited. Thus the boundaries of science may be drawn broadly or narrowly, as you will: the word which in our English Bible is rendered 'knowledge' appears in the French usually as '*science*', but surely most of us would feel that the English word 'scientific' would lose in value and precision if it were applied to knowledge of all kinds. I shall not pursue this further; others, no doubt, upon this question 'shall with their goat-foot tread semantic hay'.

Yet such ideas may lead us further. I suppose it would be generally conceded that physics, chemistry, and biology are sciences beyond cavil. It does not necessarily follow that their methodology can be safely extended to all those other fields of inquiry that may be anxious to describe themselves as scientific. I would go further: I would suggest that, since science and technology have undoubtedly become a permanent part of this civilization, and since an increasing proportion of our educated men and women have been and will be trained in science and technology, it is of the first importance this morning to ask whether this training may not encourage habits of thought that can be dangerously misleading when applied to social, political, or moral questions.

Time permits only one example. I would draw your attention to the scientist's habit of expressing his findings in the form of an average. How tall is a man? What is the 'life' of an atom of uranium? The scientist makes a hundred or a thousand measurements, perhaps all different, and condenses his results into an average; this permits him to enunciate general rules, as that men are taller than women, or that uranium is more stable than radium, which have a statistical validity even though, in the specific case, Mr. Jiggs may be less tall than his spouse. This method of averaging and of arguing from averages, implicitly or explicitly, is exceedingly widespread in the natural sciences, and it is derived, of course, from that wealth of available instances to which I have already referred. It contrasts

strikingly with the method of the poet or the artist, which is fundamentally *selective*; I take it that the most primitive, inchoate form of art is a pure act of selection: the pause to admire this view rather than that, this face rather than the other, Hazlitt's 'countryman when he stops to look at the rainbow'. At the higher, creative levels the poet or artist selects the scene or mood which shall be his chosen exemplar, which shall be illumined by the light of his genius.

But to return: there is no harm in an average, as long as we remember that it is merely a statistical convenience. Unfortunately, however, there is some tendency to invest an average value with a sort of moral quality, an aura of correctness and desirability. The planner, for example, would find his task so much easier if there were no variance. It is said that there was once invented a machine by which a man could be shaved in five seconds; it was a kind of mask into which the face was pressed, and upon the pulling of a lever a series of accurately curved razors made a single carefully calculated sweep and the job was done. It was objected that men do not all have features of the same size or shape. 'Well,' replied the undaunted inventor, 'they soon will have.'

Frivolity apart, we are all conscious of a tendency to regiment, to exalt conformity; Professor Boyce Gibson is stressing this very point in the other section of this symposium. Yet the biologist knows that the suppression of variation means the suppression of evolutionary progress; Jung insists that regimentation in one matter provokes a compensatory anarchy in another; and for most of us, surely, that undefinable word 'democracy' includes in its connotation some liberty for the eccentric individualist. Quite often, however, a benefit for the majority, for the 'average', is held to justify harsh treatment of the few; and from that it is but a step to harsh treatment of the many, in the interests of some special group conceived as the pattern to which the society must be urged to conform.

Of course I am not suggesting that all these evils can be directly imputed to that single misunderstanding which we may call the deification of the average: I am, however, suggesting that this misunderstanding does run like a thread through the whole dismal pattern, and that it is an example of a kind of misunderstanding which we must expect to encounter as more and more of our people become educated or half-educated in the techniques of science. Other examples of the illegitimate transfer of scientific notions to wider fields are quoted in Morgenthau's recent *Scientific Man versus Power Politics*, and others could be added to his list. The identification of these dangers may help us to understand more clearly what we have in mind when we urge that education should not be wholly along scientific lines.

Let us not fall into the contrary error of underestimating the value of an apprenticeship in science. *Πάντα δοκιμάζετε*, said the apostle; yet I think that it was not before the rapid rise of modern science that we really grew into the habits of testing *all* things, of challenging axioms, of demanding proof from our authorities, of trying to find objective criteria to replace subjective impressions. Let me quote a sentence from the inaugural address of the scholar who succeeded to Louis Pasteur's chair in the Académie Française: 'I believe, absolutely and without reservations, that truth is the objective of science, and that truth must be reached regardless of the consequences, be they good or evil, fortunate or unhappy.' The speaker was no scientist but a great medievalist, M. Gaston Paris. The spirit of that ringing challenge, and the spirit of free inquiry which it implies, are today common to the whole world of scholarship and a hallmark of our age. A great deal of the credit for bringing this to pass must go to the rise of the natural sciences. Ontogeny repeats phylogeny: and if in the last centuries the sciences have liberated and revived all scholarship, so too they may awaken and inspire the individual student during his academic life.

PROFESSOR H. REYBURN (*Cape Town*): I think it might well be said that the subject on which we have been asked to speak today is vague and embarrassing in the highest degree. I understand it to be the change in the old background and outlook which has been produced during the past generation by the development of scientific and technical resources and interests; and in particular with the way in which these changes affect Universities. The change has been partly one of detail, each advance making an economic and social readjustment necessary, but it has also been one of a general nature, affecting the whole spirit of modern education.

I do not intend to deal with these changes themselves at any length. There are five other men dealing with that topic. Perhaps the most fruitful contribution which I can make to the discussion is to draw attention to certain features in the South African situation which seem to accentuate the dangers of the present transitional period.

The general direction of the changes which have taken place is towards increasing specialism. New highly specialized degrees and diplomas have been instituted, and young men and women entering the new, or partly new, professions to which these credentials lead, have been taught to consider themselves as educated and culturally in need of little or nothing. A corresponding change has come over even the arts degree. It, too, has been carved into a variety of forms, adapted to the particular needs of the future careers of the candidates.

I need not detail any of these changes: they are obvious and well known.

In defence of them it may be said, and it has been said, that these specialized forms of training spring from the old cultural background; they are not mere additions to it, but are integral parts of it, and in spite of the changes which they inevitably carry with them, they still are embodiments of the general spirit of European culture. Thus, although they omit much of the older forms of thought and knowledge, each can claim in its own way to give a liberal education.

I am not sure that this defence is quite sufficient, but there is much force in it; and in this paper I do not intend to examine it. But I would point out that it has a presupposition. The students already trained in those specialized courses can claim, with considerable truth, to be more than specialists and to share in the general culture, because they live in it and are surrounded by it, so that the connexion between the particular developments with which they are most familiar and the general background from which these developments come is constantly before them in one way or another. They absorb the general tradition in many other ways than those provided by the official forms of instruction. This situation is probably so familiar to most of you that you may overlook it and may not realize that it is not found everywhere.

In the Union of South Africa, University education has developed much on the customary European lines, and in general the Universities maintain an outlook and standard similar to those in Great Britain. Certain professions provide a great attraction; and we have the same difficulties of overcrowding and restriction familiar elsewhere. Medicine, engineering, science, and architecture are overburdened. Social science, a recent comer, has developed a professional air, and is a very popular branch of study. In South Africa, too, we give more or less scientific courses as an introduction to commerce; and as a preparation for business a special degree in commerce is preferred to an arts degree weighted in the direction of economics. Some professional courses do, indeed, try to continue the old tradition, law and education insisting on a general degree as a condition of entry to the professional courses. But these are stationary faculties, and are relatively losing ground in respect of numbers.

In these matters we are presumably like most other places—but we have a different background. University education in South Africa was developed with reference to the young man and woman of European descent, and the vast majority of our students are listed in the Census as Europeans. I trust you will bear with me if I use the ordinary terminology common in South Africa. 'European' does not exclude American. Speaking generally, the European regards

the higher forms of occupation as his own proper field. In spite of the stress that has recently been laid on separation in the politics of the Union, it must not be thought that any European desires to segregate himself altogether from the other races, so that in some sections of the country Europeans are to fulfil all the tasks, humble and lofty alike. The bulk of the unskilled labour is not done, and is not to be done, by Europeans, but by a coloured and native proletariat. Nor, on the other hand, is there any responsible section of the community which proposes to extend facilities to non-Europeans which will enable them to practise professionally among or on behalf of Europeans. The general feeling of the whole country is that the non-European who is professionally trained must look for his practice among his own people. In spite of what our politicians say, it must not be supposed that these are matters of party dispute; they are not. They represent the general outlook, adopted even by immigrants within a very short time.

This European class for which higher education was first designed is itself trained on European lines, but its tradition is not altogether European and has a South African flavour or aspect. It is influenced by the social structure and history of the country itself in a way which leads large sections of the community to look at Europe through South African glasses—or sometimes not to look at it at all. I do not intend to discuss this fact, except to say that it seems inevitable. I wish merely to point out that the hold by the average South African on the old European culture is less firm than it might be; and when he comes to deal with the new phases he is not so fully surrounded by other aspects or relics of the old tradition as are the people in Great Britain or on the Continent. A great deal of the old heritage has come down to him; but some of it he has not directly experienced. He has merely learnt about it.

Besides the European, there are three other large racial groups in the Union. First of all, there is the very considerable mixed population generally designated 'coloured'. It is of old standing, and in the main keeps to itself, linking economically but not socially with the European section. This community is stratified to some degree within itself, and it has some few traditions of its own; but on the whole the coloured man in our technical sense of the term follows the European at a distance, speaks his language, works at his trades, plays his games, and learns his lessons, although on the average at a lower level. In this class, however, the standard of education is rising; more and more members of it matriculate, and there is a slow but steady increase in the number of University entrants. Coloured students generally take an Arts or Science degree as a preparation for teaching, but some of them have qualified in Medicine, and one has now

presented himself in the Faculty of Engineering. The restrictions in this regard have been of social and economic rather than academic origin; and it is probable that members of this group will enter other fields at an increasing rate.

The largest section of the population in the Union consists of members of the Bantu races, generally known as natives or Africans. The native population is extremely varied, speaking four main native languages, together with some English or Afrikaans, and ranging from the rare highly educated University graduate to the tribal native—the blanket Kaffir, as we call him—who rubs against European civilization but understands little of it, and thinks very much as his forefathers did before the white man came to trouble him. About half of the native population lives in the reserves, most of the men coming out periodically to work on the mines. The other half is scattered over the country, practising agriculture, living on farms owned by Europeans, or huddling uneasily in or near the large towns.

Educationally this population is very backward. It is important to realize that it has traditions of its own and an outlook on the world which is not altogether that of the European. And although in its positive aspects the primitive culture is rapidly disintegrating, and the old tribal sanctions have largely gone, the native has not become a dark-skinned European. His cultural remnants are not fitted for a civilization, but they are still part of him; so that he tends to think, and feel, and at times to act in a manner of his own.

Education has come to the Bantu in European guise. The first missionaries who set up school for him tried to teach him Greek; and although that soon ceased, the point of view remained. Moreover, it is European education that the native wants, for it has, or seems to have, economic value. He does not want to be trained along the lines of his own culture. Such a training has no real content and no future, and he regards the suggestion of it as an attempt to fob him off with an inferior substitute.

The third non-European group in the Union consists of Indians. The Indian in South Africa has a culture, but it is Asiatic and he does not readily lose it. Some members of this group are Mohammedans, but most are Hindus, many being of low caste. Some are in the Transvaal, but the greatest concentration is in Natal, and there they occupy positions of a wide economic range, from the wealthy employer of labour to the humblest employee or unemployed. The demand from this group for education is increasing, and members of it are pressing toward and into the University.

The attitude of the Universities to these different sections of the population varies. Some open their doors, hoping, it must be

confessed, that too many will not crowd in at once. The amount of social contact which is allowed or desired by public opinion is limited. In Cape Town the Cape coloured man sits on the same benches as the European, and he works with him. But he does not attend the same social functions, and he must find his field for sporting activities apart. The only definite limitation on the academic side from which he suffers is in Medicine, where the limited hospital facilities make it impossible to take more than a small number in the clinical years. In spite of these handicaps the coloured man of ability and grit can get a good University training on ordinary lines in Cape Town. But he does not present himself in any numbers, if at all, at other Universities, and the problem is confined to one area.

The native is, on the whole, in a less favourable position. There are no University institutions in his own limited part of the country, the reserves; and only the detribalized and urbanized native can attend a University at all without going into what for him is in some degree a strange land. A few come to one or other of the Universities, chiefly Johannesburg and Cape Town. Johannesburg, which has special clinical facilities for them, accepts a small number of natives each year for the ordinary medical course, and my information is that they do very well. But most of the higher education for the native is given at Fort Hare, in the eastern half of the Cape Province, which is in effect a semi-official University College, dispensing instruction on ordinary lines, mainly, but not exclusively, for natives.

The Indian, at home in Natal, generally seeks his education there, and the official policy is to develop a separate section of the University for him, keeping him out of contact with the European, but feeding him on the same diet, cooked and served by the same hands.

I do not intend to discuss these policies here, and I merely wish to draw attention to one feature. Even in countries with a relatively homogeneous population, the old traditions have lost some of their force, and a new orientation is taking place. As I have already suggested, in the European population of the Union, that tradition has never been quite so strong as it was in its original home; with us it has always been a little exotic, something from overseas; and one of our chief needs has been to rid it of its externality, and to put us, some 6,000 miles away, in a position to inherit all that is of value in the old culture of Europe. It seems not unfair to say that the newer trends offer us pieces, modern pieces, of European civilization more efficiently than ever, but that the grasp of the central balancing aspect is less strongly emphasized than it used to be, and that the sense of vital continuity with the past is not brought home to modern youth so fully as one would like.

And it is the same rapidly specializing training that is being offered

to the non-European also. He has no personal contacts with the great background of modern knowledge and thought. The Cape coloured man, as I said earlier, has a few traditions of his own, but he has not fully received those of Western civilization. The Bantu student learns what he is taught, and he can often apply it without losing the essentials of his own outlook. He may become a Christian minister or a scientist, and retain his old tribal kinship system. Magic and the witch-doctor are never very far away, and in moments of stress he is apt to show himself a Zulu or a Basuto and not a European. He is coming more and more into the modern world, without an appreciation of the background which that world implies, and the danger is that he may be taught to be a specialist or a technician in that world—without any real understanding of its main features.

About the Indian I know less. From our point of view he has an alien culture; and it may be that we in South Africa can do no more than graft some modern science and craftsmanship on to it, without touching its roots. Much will depend upon the place accorded to the Indian in our social structure in the future, and about that I can say nothing.

But what seems clear is that the tendency to replace the old idea of a central liberal culture by specialized forms, each claiming intrinsic cultural worth, is going to make the development of a common intellectual outlook more difficult than ever in a varied country like South Africa.

THE CHAIRMAN: I invite your participation in the discussion, to the end that you may exemplify your own conviction with respect to the significance and importance of this topic in our work as Universities.

DR. ROBERT NEWTON (*Alberta*): I rise not because I am particularly qualified to discuss any of these very diverse and interesting papers, but because I feel they open up such an interesting topic—the most interesting by far that we have touched on yet. No time should therefore be lost, I think, in starting the discussion.

I shall not venture any comment on Professor Macmurray's paper which opened the series—because it was in a field of which I have even less knowledge than the others—except this. I listened to him almost as one in a dream, uncertain whether to admire more greatly the beauty of his presentation or the clarity and conviction of his thought.

On Dean Thomson's paper I am a little more qualified to make comment inasmuch as he works in a field closely akin to my own. I shall venture, however, to take up only two phrases. At one point

he made the statement, I believe, that scientific knowledge has outstripped other branches of knowledge. To that I would agree, but I am sure Dean Thomson will also agree that even more important than the growth of these other branches of knowledge is growth in wisdom and character. The development of science and technology has had the effect of putting more and more power into the hands of a few people, and it has become of critical importance that the increasing power should be used unselfishly and wisely. There are instances in the minds of all of us where such power has not been used either unselfishly or wisely.

That brings me to another problem—which is perhaps more characteristic of State Universities, such as I represent—namely, the problem of the religious illiteracy of our students. That kind of illiteracy is, I believe, characteristic of an increasing proportion of our whole population. That is not primarily the responsibility of the Universities. Our Charter as a state University prohibits us from teaching religion. It does not, however, prohibit us from teaching sacred literature, and I must admit that I am appalled at the almost complete ignorance of our students with respect to the contents of the Bible. I do not even know whether some of them would have got the point you, Mr. Chairman, made so well in introducing Professor Macmurray when you said something about introducing Saint Paul to the Corinthians. I fear even that might have gone over the heads of some of our students: I hope I am wrong, but I am afraid it is so.

Dean Thomson used the phrase also, 'deification of the average'. He deplored that: I think we all do, because it could only have the effect, even if it seems almost inevitable that we should work by averages in this very complex world, of pulling us down to a dead level of mediocrity. The old saw that variety is the spice of life was never truer than it is today, and that multi-meaningful word 'democracy' that he referred to must for us be interpreted in a way that provides adequate scope for variety. I am sure we are all happy to note that this aspect of variety was very well illustrated by the three papers that we have listened to.

Professor Reyburn again talked in a field of which I have no direct knowledge. He and his colleagues have very special problems in the University of South Africa arising from the impact of racial complexities on educational matters. He did make one statement, however, that struck home to me. Again I had a guilty conscience. The Bantu, he said, wants European education because it seems to to have economic value. That, unfortunately, is the outlook of most of our own students. Hence the increasing dominance of our professional faculties. Somehow or other we must restore the balance. Professor Macmurray gave us a very important suggestion along

that line. And since I am afraid we cannot divert any large number of students from the professional faculties to Arts, just because of the predominance of the economic consideration, we must strive to make our professional courses more truly educative.

MR. IFOR L. EVANS (*Wales*): I have listened with the greatest interest this morning to three admirable contributions, and am sure we are all of us grateful to our friends for what they have said. There are, however, one or two points which may seem platitudinous but are even so possibly worth mentioning.

We in Great Britain are half-way between the welter of destruction in continental Europe—and particularly in parts of Germany—and the relative technological prosperity of newer worlds. We are half-way between the two, and unless we look at the destroyed half, I think we are in danger of forgetting the only point which I would venture to add to Professor Macmurray's contribution—the inherent value of the conservative principle in our Universities. We are, after all, the conservators of a great cultural tradition; and though we should endeavour to preserve only what is best in our changing inheritance, a glance at those areas where there is a welter of both material and spiritual destruction makes one realize the value of carrying on at all.

The second point I would like to make is this. I do not myself fear the influence of any branch of learning, however specialized, if it is studied and taught in the proper spirit. It seems to me that the fundamental point is not what we study but how we study; not what we teach but how we teach it. And here, frankly, I feel a trifle pessimistic. We have in the world today, I understand, over five million students at institutions of University or quasi-University rank. Can we really conceive of a sufficiency of good teachers to cope with such numbers? The gift of disciplined imagination is essential for work of true University character, but it is somewhat rare. Therefore it seems to me that the tendency to increase numbers and go on increasing numbers, without regard to this vital limiting factor, is the fundamental danger which must be resisted at all costs. In some Universities the pressure is much greater than in others, but I am myself convinced that all Universities should concentrate more and more upon quality and more and more upon what is essential in our cultural tradition. That tradition, whether humanistic or scientific, must constantly be interpreted and viewed as a whole. It is in that spirit that I welcome one particular remark of Professor Macmurray: that there is no specialism more dangerous than a narrow specialism in an arts subject. Humanistic studies have a great deal to learn from the spirit of scientific inquiry, just as science has much to learn

from the spirit of tradition; and I fail to see why there should be any inherent opposition between the two.

DR. A. J. CRAIG (*Malta*): It is again with some temerity that I venture to add a modest contribution to the discussion this morning after the very admirable opening papers. But there is this point that comes to my mind. Professor Macmurray has presented the subject for discussion as a grave cultural crisis, and it is often presented to us in such a fashion as to make us think that this crisis is something that has arisen now and is presenting itself afresh to our generation. To my mind behind that outlook there is a subconscious longing for the past. I think there has always been culture on the one hand and technology on the other. If they do not progress at the same rate it is nobody's fault, and there is very little we can do to remedy it. It would be wiser to accept the fact that we cannot stop change and we cannot stop progress. It would be saner to take the dynamic view of our civilization and to realize that an equilibrium will always reach itself. Things always reach their own level. If we do that and remind ourselves that the most powerful biological means of survival is adaptation it will give us a better outlook for adapting our own selves to change. I think the lines we should think on have been very admirably presented to us by the second speaker, Dean Thomson.

DR. E. G. MALHERBE (*Natal*): As I listened to the various speakers on this rather wide question, I could not help asking myself: what can we as University executives and, for that matter, we as professors, *do* about it? The problem has become a very complex one in recent times because we have (*a*) on the one hand—owing to the fact that the Universities are taking in so many more students than they used to do—a much wider variety of abilities, talents, and tastes to cater for, and on the other hand (*b*) a much wider range of courses and subjects which our Universities offer.

As an illustration of (*a*) let me mention the simple fact that when Professors Davie, Wilcocks, and I were at College, there were *in toto* only 1,800 University students in the whole of South Africa. Today there are over 18,000—a tenfold increase, where the population increased only  $1\frac{1}{2}$  times. Obviously amongst the 18,000 there is represented a much wider range of abilities and needs than amongst the 1,800. Add to this the racial complications due to the awakening of the non-European peoples to which Professor Reyburn referred.

With this (*a*) set of variables we must now correlate the other (*b*) set of variables in the curriculum. Apart from the many new subjects in the applied fields which have gained entrance to and respectability within the monastic precincts of the University, we

find that the subject matter even in the accepted fields of science and culture has been split up almost into atoms—small bits of subjects, each one having a high priest who regards that bit of a subject as his domain and who fights to get as many students as he can to take that particular bit—sometimes without regard for their particular needs or aptitudes. Students today are faced with far greater difficulties than in previous generations when they were a selected group having a choice between only a few fixed courses. Even when students are left to their own devices they more often than not simply take the courses their friends take. Sometimes their choice is based on even more superficial grounds. This happens particularly in the early undergraduate stages. The result is that for many students things do not pan out very happily. They are often confused and filled with feelings of frustration. It often happens too that the able student who could have done well at almost any subject, specializes today too soon in a narrow direction and thus misses getting the broad background to which his capacities would have entitled him before digging himself into a narrow groove.

The fundamental problem, therefore, which faces the Universities today is that of *student guidance*, i.e. to work out the best permutations and combinations between these two sets of variables (*a*) and (*b*). In doing so we must consider above all the effect which such a process will have upon the individual student, particularly upon his character and personality. The aggrandizement of a particular department and even the advancement of knowledge in a particular subject should be secondary to this main consideration. This is the first matter to which we, as University heads, should give our attention.

The second point I wish to make is that, because of the tendency in our Universities towards specialization, we turn out University people who have no common denominator—call it culture if you like. It is possible for men and women to graduate from our Universities today without having had any common academic experience. I feel this is wrong. I do not mean that all students should be stereotyped according to the same mould. On the contrary. What I mean is that we should turn out men and women from Universities who at least can talk the same language—figuratively, of course. Half our troubles internationally and in practical affairs are due to the fact that leaders no longer speak the same language, i.e. they possess no common cultural and moral standards to which one can appeal in times of crisis and on the basis of which mutual understanding and compromise can be effected.

Dr. Newton has just mentioned that students no longer know the Bible. That is a deplorable fact also in South Africa. In the olden days that at least was our common denominator. When biblical

allusions and quotations were made, they were generally understood and appreciated. Then there was also the period when the classics constituted the common cultural denominator of all University men. Today this is no longer the case, either with the Bible or with the classics.

As we are training leaders in the technological fields, the need for a common cultural background becomes more necessary in proportion as these fields become more specialized.

Even our common school education has become afflicted with a disease—syllabitis, if I may so call it. It suffers from a compartmentalization of knowledge into so-called 'subjects'. These are crystallized and often fossilized in text-books to such an extent that they become vested interests. In consequence staff and students often fail to see the interrelations of these subjects. We trust to luck that students will themselves be able to piece together this jigsaw puzzle from these bits and pieces. Very few ever see the whole picture.

Education is life. Life changes. Many of these subjects—i.e. chunks taken from life—need continual re-orientation and revitalization.

What I am getting at is to stress the need for devising some common revitalized course, or régime of study, which should be taken by every student whether he is qualifying himself for a profession or being trained as a research worker. No single 'subject' or even a mere stringing together of 'subjects' in their present form fills the bill. They will require a good deal of rethinking.

Attempts have been made in this direction in some American Universities. Much more needs, however, to be done in the re-synthesis of certain fields of knowledge before such a régime of study can be rendered suitable to serve as the common experience which I have in mind for all University students.

It is not, however, entirely a matter of content. An equally important constituent of this common denominator of experience is *the attitude of mind* which is developed towards learning. This can be cultivated only by the good teacher. Here I feel that Vice-Chancellor Ifor Evans has put his finger on the vital spot when he said that in the last resort it is the impact of mind upon mind through a good teacher that matters. We, therefore, need men at the University who not only know their subjects, but who have thought around those subjects so as to appreciate also the interrelationships and the marginal fields between those subjects.

Such a general course, if properly taught, could serve a twofold purpose:

- (a) It will be exploratory and serve as a basis on which to choose a suitable curriculum. It will open vistas which the student would ordinarily never have seen.

- (b) It will provide that common denominator of culture which I am hoping will link all University men together and increase the chances of better understanding amongst our leaders in the various fields of human endeavour.

PROFESSOR J. K. ROBERTSON (*Queen's, Canada*): When I first looked at the subject for this morning and the names of the speakers who were to lead the discussion in both Sections A and B, I must confess to being a little surprised that the most fundamental of all the sciences—physics—had no representative. I do not know whether it was because the recent applications which have so bedevilled the world had relegated the physicist to Coventry or not, but as a physicist whose ancestors were born north of the Tweed I rise to make one or two comments.

I find myself in amazing agreement with Professor Macmurray, and I may add that this—with my fellow colleagues in the arts faculty—is rarely the case. I can recall only one item on which I disagree. I do not think that the true spirit of science was ever in disagreement with the classical tradition—the original one, not the pseudo or what I might almost call the 'snooty' one of the nineteenth century.

Disagreement between physicist and philosopher on the really fundamental question raised as to how we can do something to prevent the disaster from getting worse and to synthesize the sciences and the humanities brings me to the first of two concrete proposals. It is exemplified by the University of which I have the honour to be one of the representatives. In our faculty of arts—which includes the fundamental scientist—the subject of philosophy is compulsory for all students. And I would humbly suggest that this is one of the best ways that I can conceive of, of making sure that it will not be the technological aspects of any subject which will be predominant.

The second relates more nearly to the physicist, because I think the physicist is in a very strategic position. On the one hand, his applications tie him up directly with the engineering side, the technological side; but on the other hand—and this is what sometimes my non-scientific brethren forget—the physicist is equally tied up with the whole past tradition of humanism. Indeed, the mantle of the early Greek philosopher fell, I think, as much on the physicist as on the philosopher. I feel, therefore, that on this very, very serious question we are debating, the physicist has a strategic position. I do not for one moment suggest that physics should be a compulsory subject like philosophy, but I do suggest that the physicist can do much to prevent technology getting the upper hand.

Those were the only two points I wished to make, and I feel that the physicist has now at least been vindicated.

DEAN H. N. FIELDHOUSE (*McGill*): After listening to Professor Macmurray and to Dean Thomson, I should like, very briefly, and as an historian, to draw together two things: Professor Macmurray's remark that this crisis of our culture is a great deal older than the technological devices of the last hundred years (I was glad to hear him say this) and Dean Thomson's remark about lifting over the methodology of the natural sciences into other fields.

May I say, first, that, in these remarks, I intend no denigration, needless to say, of the natural sciences. (It is a part of our difficulty that the positivists tended to raise the methods of the natural sciences into a universal method, so that any criticism of this misapplication of scientific method has run the risk of being mistaken for a criticism of science itself.)

What I am concerned with is the fashion which is very widespread on our side of the Atlantic: the fashion of assuming that—the development of the physical sciences, which in themselves are morally neutral, having put weapons of enormous power in our hands—it is for the social sciences (modelling themselves on the physical sciences) to show us how to make a wise use of those weapons; a fashion which peeps out from the claim of Mr. Elton Mayo that 'if our social skills had advanced step by step with our technical skills there would not have been another European war'.

Briefly, I take this demand (that social science shall provide us with a new secular religion to save us from the destruction with which atomic science now threatens us) to be the latest stage in the successive disillusionments which have followed upon the various forms which rationalism has taken in the last century and a half.

The twin assumptions of rationalism, I take it, were, first, that reason can reach the truths of ethics and politics by logical deduction, and secondly—and what I think is much more questionable—that it can, of its own inner force, create reality in the image of these truths. It is true that the earlier rationalism took these assumptions from *a priori* premisses while later rationalism tried to give them a basis in experimental science, but common to them both has been the belief that the social, no less than the physical, world can be understood through rational processes and that, once understood in this way, the social world can be rationally controlled.

From this assumption—that no inherent disability prevents us from knowing all that there is to know, so that our ignorance is only quantitative and can be overcome by the increase of knowledge—came the perfectibilism which was common to the French 'philosophes' of the Enlightenment and to the classical English liberalism of Mill: the belief that most of the problems which concern mankind could be solved now if enough informed men would apply the laws

of reason, and that all problems will be solved when more research and instruction have given more men the capacity to apply the laws of reason.

I suppose that this first stage of rationalist perfectibilism—this belief that evil resides not in man's passions but in lack of reason, so that our problem is not the difficult one of reforming the passions but the relatively easy one of improving the reasoning faculties—I suppose that this first stage had run its course by, roughly, 1914: and I take the present faith in 'social science' to be an attempt to put a new perfectibilism in place of the old.

I should not like to be thought to be criticizing social science. My criticism is only directed towards the notion that social studies become scientific by copying the methods of the physical sciences: and I should like to ask our United Kingdom colleagues how far that notion has gained ground here. It has gone very far in North America: so far that a leading sociologist has said that it is difficult not to be somewhat amused by the general tendency to put all faith in more research as the solution of our problems. It might have been amusing when, early in this century, Lester Ward could look forward to the day when we should abolish parliaments and legislation would 'consist in a series of exhaustive experiments on the part of true scientific sociologists and sociological inventors working on the problems of social physics from the practical point of view': but we have lived to see E. L. Thorndike call on Governments to 'make more use of scientific methods in arriving at their decisions, especially the method of the weighted average'; to hear Delisle Burns define the principles of democracy as being 'merely the principles of science applied to public policy'; and to be told that 'if six hundred scientists working together can produce the atom bomb, then six hundred scientists could be put to work on the job of inter-group hatreds'. When E. L. Thorndike says that man 'has the possibility of almost complete control of his fate, and that if he fails it will be by the ignorance or folly of men', one is left wondering at the magnitude of that 'if'; and I, personally, am reminded of the student who said that Napoleon *only* made four mistakes—in dealing with Russia, dealing with England, dealing with Spain, and dealing with the Pope. I would suggest then (1) that our danger does not lie in the great development of the physical sciences in the last three hundred years but in the rationalist optimism about the possibilities of reason in social matters to which that development gave rise, and (2) that now that the experience of this century has brought the problem of evil to the front again too sharply to let us go on in that older perfectibilism, we are grabbing at the notion that if the social studies will turn themselves into social sciences (i.e. will model themselves on the

physical sciences) they can supply us with the secular wisdom to make a wise use of the tools which the physical sciences place in our hands. I should suggest that this notion mistakes the nature both of physical science and of social study and that it mistakes the role which each of them is capable of fulfilling in society. We need the reminder (which in our University curriculum the humanities are perhaps best able to supply) that there is no folly of which men are not capable, and that, when social science has given us its last statistical average, there remains the problem of the human will. Our generation has seen education for peace produce—not peace, but ideas about peace—and we should know that information about society produces—information about society.

President Newton has tried to recall us to a sense of sin. I should like to recall us to a sense of humour: and if someone suggests that they are the same thing, or, at least, spring from the same source, I should be inclined to agree.

DR. R. C. WALLACE (*Queen's, Canada*): The discussion has in large measure become a matter of professional University men dealing with their own particular subject—that is, University education—and naturally so. I would subscribe to Vice-Chancellor Evans's statement that any subject well taught gives a cultural education. But the problem is that the contacts with other fields and with other people and other ideals come rather late if at all, and the widening of these contacts is the responsibility for the University man, the teacher, and the administrator.

The only point I want to make is this: I think we have been somewhat at fault in attempting to do the widening at early stages in University life. At that particular time there is not the interest there, nor the experience on the part of the students to enable them to accept these ideas readily. We might at a later stage and during the last years of University life—and I speak of those taking the humanities as well as those taking such subjects as the engineering courses—use their own experience which they find, during the years, necessitates the widening of their contacts if their personalities are to develop as they should. Then we shall, I think, find that they will accept readily these subjects that we consider are subjects that widen culturally, in the sense that they relate but do not belong to their own particular experience and education—much more readily and much more effectively than at the earlier stages.

Our experience, for instance, is that the engineers, the applied scientists, do very much better in the subjects that we wanted them to take, that have human values, in their later than in their earlier years. They have learnt from experience, in working with men during

the summer months, that these subjects are of very great importance to them in the future.

My reason for rising is not to enter the wider field with which Dean Fieldhouse has dealt so well but to suggest that it may be well for us, as University men, to think more of what could be done in the later years in the medical schools, the schools of engineering, the schools of social science, in the humanities, to send our men out better equipped to deal with knowledge as a whole and what it means in our civilization.

THE CHAIRMAN: In relation to the point made by Dr. Wallace of Queen's University, and having in mind that maturity in the student is needed for the synthesizing process, I wonder whether anybody from the United Kingdom could tell us about the ex-service personnel and whether the yearning for knowledge is more marked than in the days between the two great wars. Do you find that their maturity, their additional experience, is making for a synthesis? Have you any testimony in that regard to put forward?

MR. IFOR L. EVANS (*Wales*): I think it is hard to generalize. My own impression is that there is certainly more maturity: the students are on the whole much keener. They sometimes work too hard in a narrow restricted definition of the term and the academic level tends to be somewhere about a good second class. That is my general impression, but I do not know whether my colleagues will agree. The students are for the most part very keen, but they have to engage in academic disciplines not devised for their age and experience. Some of us here will recall a very similar situation after the First World War. This time I fancy that there is a larger proportion of married students and this adds enormously to the complexities of the problem. Many of those who would like to go on studying are compelled to think of the economic side and find employment as soon as they can: but that is common form everywhere.

THE REV. PROFESSOR C. E. RAVEN (*Cambridge*): With reference to what Dean Fieldhouse has said of the other side of the Atlantic, the kind of arrogant optimism which led to the utterances which he quoted has, so far as I can judge, almost entirely disappeared both in the field of science and in the field of student life. We are suffering very much more from an almost complete despair on this side when we face the kind of thing that Professor Macmurray put before us: the fact of the divorce between our religious and moral cultural tradition and our new scientific techniques by which we have to live.

I do not myself take at all a pessimistic view of the situation, because

so far as I can judge in the University worlds themselves—at the student level and among my own pupils and my colleagues—there is more of a sign of hope than the Vice-Chancellor of Wales has indicated. The extraordinary response to courses of lectures in philosophy and the very large increase in religious attendance in my own University, both of which are characteristic of the last two or three years, spring, I think, from a new sense that we are up against problems which we cannot afford to ignore and which we cannot solve in isolation. There is a readiness to come together and face the question—the question, for instance: what is the function of a University?—in a way that I do not remember at all in the past. One sees it in all sorts of ways—the appointment by our scientists of a very strong syndicate in order that they may report upon the whole teaching of science with a view to bringing it into relationship with philosophy, with history, with life, with civics, and so on. Then there is the significant fact of the appointment of a theologian like myself on to the Board of Biology—a trivial point but a thing which could not previously have occurred. I think it would no longer be necessary at this moment for us to say what a very distinguished Scottish professor said to me after the First World War. I shall never forget Professor Bowman saying to me, after a great League of Nations Union meeting in Glasgow, where he and I had spoken, ‘You know, Charles Raven, it is all nonsense—you and I and hundreds of other people going round the country trying to persuade statesmen to meet at Geneva and industrialists and trade unionists to meet in Council chambers, as though we could establish peace that way.’ Then he added, ‘So long as a third of mankind thinks that life is a thing to be escaped from; and another third thinks it is a thing to be exploited and enjoyed, and only a remnant of us Christians thinks that it is a thing to be redeemed; as long as you have three radically incompatible ideas of what constitutes the good life, you cannot have peace, you cannot have education, you cannot have Universities.’

I think that there is no need to say that quite as strongly and brutally as he said it twenty years ago, because I believe the fact of this morning’s discussions, the temper of the discussions, the whole set-up of this conference of ours, does mean that we have at last become aware of the immense gravity of the situation that confronts us, and I believe that the student world is similarly awake. How far are we in a position to satisfy the need? Professor Fieldhouse and I, working it out from the historical point of view, may or may not agree that this desire for a synthesis is the prerequisite condition for attaining it. Still less is it probable that we should agree about the terms of that synthesis. But I do not feel that we need take a defeatist outlook when on all sides, among educationists and those being

educated, there is this expectation and demand. We are asking at last the right kind of question, and that is the prerequisite for reaching a solution.

CHIEF JUSTICE O. S. TYNDALE (*McGill*): It is with considerable hesitation that I speak, because academically I am only a Chancellor. But at the same time I have been a professor and I am a member of the Judiciary. All I want to do is to give you one piece of information which may be of interest to some of you relative to what Professor Robertson said a few moments ago. I am very proud to say that the Order of Advocates of the Province of Quebec, some years ago, decided to make it a rule that every applicant for permission to study law in our Province must first have taken a complete Arts course, and in his curriculum he must have included a course in philosophy.

MR. J. H. NICHOLSON (*Hull*): In my opinion there is a place in University education for what I would call personal affirmations. While we rightly desire, as a matter of obligation, to represent fairly and objectively views we may not—or even do not—hold, we sometimes neglect or overlook what seems to me also to be vitally important—the fact that our students have a right to expect us to have opinions of our own. We should not be too frightened of giving ourselves away, even outside our own fields.

My own view, for what it is worth, is that you cannot create a *cultural* synthesis by the methods of a sociological laboratory: by fitting one bit of knowledge on to another bit of knowledge. There must, I think, be something personal in it. We should obviously teach our subjects objectively and represent fairly other people's views and as far as we can in that exposition we should cover the whole relevant field of knowledge. But we should also find an opportunity of expressing what faith we ourselves have and sincerely hold.

I do not think myself that we are ready yet for a general synthesis. I think we have lost on the side of humanism what the scientists have found. They clearly have a belief in knowledge as one at bottom; we have lost the sense of culture as one at bottom. In the last analysis that loss is obviously related to the loss of religious faith, not necessarily of any particular kind, but the fundamentally religious view of the Universe as one and *therefore* of knowledge, and all the branches of knowledge, as one.

It is easy, of course, for anyone who has a fairly orthodox view of these things to give it expression through established corporate means. I am thinking rather of the man who is a seeker, who is finding his way; who believes in the fundamental unity, but has convictions which he may not yet have formulated. By the very fact of his search-

ing, he has perhaps more in common with his students than they or he are prepared to recognize. He should be willing to express both his doubts and such faith as is in him, distinguishing always clearly and fundamentally between his obligation as a teacher to present fairly and objectively whatever falls within the field of knowledge in which he is teaching, and his right as a man and his obligation as a University teacher, to give to others such faith as he finds in himself.

PROFESSOR R. PEERS (*Nottingham*): Your question about the ex-serviceman leads me to wonder whether we are not expecting too much of the Universities and of our students.

First of all, I think there is something for which we must look to the schools. The students coming to the University must obviously have an adequate foundation upon which to build the new knowledge which they are seeking to obtain in the University for specific purposes. The present-day predicament of the Universities arises to a very large extent from the growth of knowledge in modern times. That has forced upon the Universities the need for specializing. And it has been forced also upon the students.

If we are to be in a position to pass on this growing burden of knowledge—if I may so describe it—from generation to generation, and if we are to enable our students to play their part in a civilization which depends to an increasing extent upon the acquisition of specialized knowledge—and that at a very high level—the Universities must, in the short period of undergraduate study of three or four years, carry out their task of teaching, however well or ill prepared the students who come to us. To do this successfully would be a reasonable expectation, provided the conditions were favourable. But how far are the students adequately prepared for that essential specialization in the University before they come to the University? And how far have they achieved the kind of maturity during their careers as undergraduates that will enable them to acquire a philosophy of life?

That leads me to say something about the position of the more mature student—the ex-service man, who, I think, illustrates this problem much better than the normal undergraduate students who came to us before the war. The ex-service student has to get through a particular period of preparation, of difficult preparation, and he has his eyes fixed constantly on the need for establishing himself in the world in which he has to play his part. He has very little time to do anything but obtain the necessary equipment of knowledge and the necessary qualifications to enable him to play that part. That may be a bad thing. It probably is. It would be very much better in this present age if we could spread the period of study over much

longer periods of time. But again economic necessity forces a particular attitude upon students and through them on the Universities.

But is that the last word? Is there not a wider function that the Universities have to fulfil, a function which is not related merely to the training of undergraduates? Have they not to be, in their areas, or in their countries, centres of inspiration, centres which will provide for mature discussion at higher levels on the part of those who are seeking the kind of knowledge in which we as Universities are interested? In other words, I think we have to think much more in the future about the functions of the Universities in relation to their communities in the field of adult education. There is a tendency, I think, in this country, for some of the newer University institutions to work out a new conception of the University—of a University not as a unitary institution but as a body which has linked to it all kinds of associations of mature people who are interested—and with no professional object in view—in particular fields of study. They come together in their different associations in all parts of the area of the University, but they come to the University for vacation courses. The Universities are now building up residential adult Colleges to which such people can come for periods of time to renew their faith, if you like, and to indulge those interests which at earlier stages are excluded by the sheer necessities of economic preoccupation.

I believe that these developments in this country will enable the Universities much better to fulfil this wider function which is rightly demanded of them. Only, I think, in that way—by spreading the period of study, by increasing the possibilities of leisure and extending the purposes for which that leisure is used in the community—will the University be able to perform its larger functions, which it has to perform if the world is to be saved from itself.

PROFESSOR T. M. KNOX (*St. Andrews*): In the subject we are discussing reference is made to the moral changes produced by technological advance. I think perhaps it is time someone said that there are none. Technological advance does not produce moral change, at least I do not think so. Technology, after all, is science in the service of man, and a great deal is going to depend on the ends to which it is applied and the way in which it is applied. Men of low moral standards will use technology in one way, while those with higher moral standards will use it differently. As Professor Macmurray pointed out, everything depends on the choice of the end, and we are not likely to choose proper ends unless we make a proper study of man.

It is just there, it seems to me, that the present difficulties really arise, because man is not only part of nature and therefore a type,

as Dean Thomson pointed out, but also an individual, a mind or a spirit. Amongst the revolutionary paradoxes which Professor Macmurray brought forward and christened platitudes was the assertion that what we have failed to do in our cultural tradition was to assimilate science. I think that is a paradox because I should have thought that science in the ages of human history was part and parcel of culture and not in any way whatever opposed to it or needing to be assimilated into it. In particular in the modern world—in the last 300 years—science has occupied a rather central position in culture, as theology had done in the 300 years preceding that time.

What I think we have failed to do so far is to assimilate what one might call history—at any rate the whole study of man not as part of nature but as mind, as individual, and so forth. I speak with diffidence about what science has done, but it seems to me that science in its more recent developments has in fact done a great deal to assimilate the conceptions of history, a new discipline now perhaps 150 years old. The biological sciences obviously have taken over historical categories wholesale in doctrines of evolution, and as far as I can understand the popular text-books on modern physics there are a great many historical categories introduced into that discipline also. Again, the sort of materialism which is now in fashion at least calls itself dialectical and makes an appeal to history in that way.

But the real defect, I think, is to be found in theology and philosophy which so far have failed, I believe, to assimilate history as a new and important department of human knowledge. There are certain types of theology in fashion which still seem to think about man as a static species with a static nature of its own and a very bad nature at that. And there are certainly many types of contemporary philosophy which seem to have forgotten that man is a thinker and to reduce the whole of philosophy, as Professor Macmurray said, to some sort of technology. Consequently I think the challenge of the time is essentially to theologians and philosophers to assimilate not only science, as they have well done in the last 300 years, but history too.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any comment with respect to the point that Professor Reyburn made? I found the latter part of his paper bringing to my mind a new thought. I conceived that this topic that we have for discussion here today was related entirely to the maintenance and enhancement of the richness of our Western civilization. Professor Reyburn made it clear to me that there was another aspect—the impact of that civilization on the races in Africa and other parts of the world. Are there any South Africans who would care to comment on that?

PROFESSOR R. W. WILCOCKS (*Stellenbosch*): I will try to reply to your question. I must say, to begin with, that what I have to say raises rather than answers questions. In general the state in which we are seems to be that of having questions rather than answers to them.

It has been put to us that the problem before which we stand is a matter of knowledge. There have been enormous advances in scientific and technological information with resulting extreme specialization, and it has been indicated by speakers that what is wrong is the consequent narrowing of man's mind in particular specialized directions so that the solution must be found in a wider—or, say, a deeper philosophical—knowledge. I merely want to put the question whether the solution is a matter of knowledge. Here I have just 'scraps' that I can contribute to the discussion.

Our point is that we cannot prevent specialization. Modern life demands it and we cannot avoid it. At the same time specialization does enable people to do jobs and to do them well, and I believe that doing a job well is a character-forming influence of enormous importance. What is really wrong with our lives today is that the fixed foundations on which our forebears lived to a considerable extent and which was formative of their lives have dropped away. What the individual needs is a consciousness that he is a member of a larger community in which he has his part to play, a society in which he has a function to fulfil. I believe that in the South African situation the real problem facing us is the lack of this consciousness on the part of all the peoples of the country, and that the individual too often does not feel that he is living a life in which he is realizing himself. This is the problem rather than the acquisition of more knowledge, even of a little more of philosophy.

I believe that there are forces in human society which are struggling hard to give the individual a place in which he feels—in which he can feel—that he is leading a useful life. I do not know how the problem is to be solved. We can only believe, as a matter of faith, that if we struggle hard enough, the human race will in the course of time succeed in approaching ever closer to a solution.

DEAN D. L. THOMSON (*McGill*): Many years ago, when I was an undergraduate in France, I had the opportunity of attending one of the Gordon Bennett balloon races in a field near Paris, where, in the course of an hour or two, some two dozen balloons, all of different sizes and shapes, rose into the sky and disappeared in various directions, covering a surprisingly large sector of the welkin. It was an interesting and in some ways rather beautiful sight, but a little frustrating as a sporting event because, of course, one could not know

who the winner was until the last of the contestants had successfully re-established contact with the earth.

I am a little reminded of that experience this morning. We have seen a very large number of *ballons d'essai* launched in the air, and they have disappeared in a wide variety of directions. In this case, in fact, we have the added complication that they did not even start from the same launching ground. So to sum up, I can think of no words more appropriate than those used by the dodo in *Alice in Wonderland* in very similar circumstances, when he said, 'Everybody has won, and all must have prizes.' I, of course, except myself.

Having regard to the amount of time this morning that has been taken up in the discussion by various speakers from my adopted country, I shall make comments upon only one aspect of the discussion. I, of course, very heartily accept and agree with the suggestions made right at the beginning by President Newton and right at the end by Professor Wilcocks that we are not merely concerned with the question of new information but rather with the question of the formation of wisdom and character. But if we are to translate today's discussion into concrete terms of University administration and syllabic structure in any way, it becomes a little difficult to know just how to bring this to bear. I take it to be one of the anfractuosités of the academic mind that when confronted with any apparent deficiency in the equipment of the student, someone at once proposes the offering of a course to remedy the deficiency. I recall very well attending a meeting of a Faculty of Medicine where a discussion began with complaints about the spelling of fourth- and fifth-year students and ended with the suggestion that they should be required, in preliminary training, to take not merely English I but also English II, regardless of the fact that English II dealt with Chaucer and Shakespeare, neither of whom are very good models for spelling. After that experience of mine, I have a slight mental reservation against the point made by Professor Robertson as to the all-embracing virtues of a compulsory course in philosophy—or in physics, which perhaps he had also in the back of his mind, or in any other subject whatsoever.

It is—as several speakers, particularly Vice-Chancellor Evans and, I think, Principal Malherbe, have pointed out—not only a matter of establishing a course but of making sure that it is taught by a really good teacher. From the rather restricted number of instances today we might conclude, perhaps, that all philosophers are automatically good teachers.

I do not wish to take any more time. I have made a number of notes that I will not attempt to deal with. At the end of the page I have scrawled down the word 'culture'. I cannot now remember why, and the only thing I want to say about it is to remind you of

the definition that culture is the state of mind produced by the things one has forgotten.

THE CHAIRMAN: I will now ask Professor Macmurray to pronounce the final benediction.

PROFESSOR JOHN MACMURRAY (*Professor of Moral Philosophy, Edinburgh*): I should like, in the first place, to say that I have found—and I hope many of us have found—in the discussion this morning ground for considerable optimism. The general unanimity of outlook underlying it, the general agreement on most of the issues we have been discussing, have reassured me a great deal. Perhaps you will excuse me if in pronouncing my benediction I emphasize one or two things that the discussion has stressed in my own mind with particular reference to what I myself said at the beginning.

First, the discussion has strengthened a conviction which I tried to state and which seems to me fundamental: that we have to avoid the confusion between a University proper and a polytechnic institution. The difference between these two is that the latter achieves an assemblage of different subjects and the other a unity of thought and knowledge. The fundamental problem is not how we can provide for the study of a large number of different subjects, but how we can give them, in the service of the student, a common form, a single inner and spiritual tone.

I would select, in the second place, for emphasis a point which has been made but which I think should be made more strongly: the difficulty as it faces the University and the solutions which are within the control of the University are quite secondary. The University is involved in the cultural crisis because it is part of the society and one of the institutions of the society which suffers from it. The basic unity of culture is not the one which appears in the University as a unity of truth, but that more fundamental unity without which no sense of the unity of truth can be attained—the unity of a common life beyond the University. If the society which the University serves is not itself integrated in a human unity of life, there is no foundation on which the University can build its unity of truth.

In spite of all we have said about the Universities and what they might do, it remains true that what we can do depends upon something largely outside our control: upon processes going on in society; processes of disruption and processes which in the long run will heal the disruption in the unity of the common life.

In my opening address I set, as one of the objectives of a University seeking to overcome the cultural crisis, a new realization of the place of the University in the cultural life of the community around. Others

have stressed the point in discussion, with special reference to extra-mural activities. Extra-mural work, is indeed part of what I had in mind, but only part. The University has no monopoly of culture; it needs to receive as well as to give. Too often the University tends to be a museum of dead culture, while the living cultural activities of today go on beyond its walls, sometimes even in a spirit of antagonism to this dead hand of academic tradition. For its own renewal the University must bridge this gulf. Our Universities will not succeed in doing effective work in the cultural field until contemporary culture, not only at the points of popular interest, but even more at the points of creative advance, as in literature, drama, and the arts as much as in the sciences, gravitates naturally to the University as its spiritual home.

Lastly, I should like to say that Professor Reyburn's contribution really fills a large gap in our treatment of the theme before us. By raising the problem in South African terms, he has reminded us of a general feature of the situation which we tend to forget: that part of the malaise of our own civilization is that it is ceasing to be self-contained. Until the present time we have been able to look upon the process of world culture and world development as the taking over by the rest of the world of West European civilization. We now face the fact—and it is, I think, one of the really fundamental facts in the situation—that this is not going to happen. We are faced with a conflict of different cultures, a conflict which will go on and deepen. The future re-establishment of the unity of culture as an effective force is not going to be achieved without a fusion of these different cultures. The conflict of our time between Soviet Russia and the Western democracies is not so much a matter of Communism, which, after all, is a Western product. It is rather a conflict of two different and differently developed cultures which do not understand one another because their fundamental values in the common life are different. Such conflicts will face us more and more; and we shall have to think of the long-range problem of re-establishing effective culture in the common life at the same time in terms of achieving the kind of culture that is valid for the world as a whole.

THE CHAIRMAN: I know that I may thank, on your behalf, the men whose names were on the paper for remarkably fine contributions to this symposium. I do so.

## MEETING B

*Chairman:* MR. H. R. RAIKES, Principal and Vice-Chancellor,  
University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg

THE CHAIRMAN: The speakers this morning are Professor Boyce Gibson, Professor of Philosophy at Melbourne University, Professor Firth, Professor of Anthropology at the University of London, and Professor Innis, Professor of Political Economy at Toronto University. The subject for discussion is 'A critical review, from the points of view of an historian, a philosopher, and a sociologist, of the structural and moral changes produced in modern society by scientific and technological advance', a very important subject, which I am sure will prove extremely interesting and provoke a wide discussion.

PROFESSOR A. BOYCE GIBSON (*Melbourne*): The objection may be raised to the outlines of my paper which appear in the Programme that I have not answered the question that was asked. I was asked what changes had been effected in certain fields by science, and I find that what I have done is to argue that certain things which have happened have not happened as the result of science. My justification for that is that science has been very widely blamed for a state of affairs which now exists, and I do not think that science should be blamed for it. At any rate, it is that aspect of the extremely wide set of problems before us this morning that I propose to discuss.

By way of preface, I might say what I believe science actually has contributed, so as to fill the gap which lies between me and the Programme. In the first place, science has produced a distaste for the vapid emotionalism which was common at the end of the last century and a desire for an austere hard beauty of outline. Much of the change in art and architecture in modern times is the result of the general spread of the scientific attitude. Science has also brought about a repudiation of pretences, such as has been uncovered by the psychoanalysts, and through the techniques to which it has given rise, it has also produced an increasing integration of thought and action. These are all eminently to the good and should be placed to the credit of science.

But the difficulty about science, as all Vice-Chancellors know, is that it is very expensive. To do their work properly scientists have increasingly to be financially dependent on those large aggregations of power which are the principal danger to our civilization. In that sense, science under modern conditions can be carried on only with the aid of something intrinsically dangerous to the humanist tradition. It is only in that way—and it is a very indirect one—that science has helped to produce our present evils.

Now there exists in western Europe and in its orbit overseas a long tradition which is conveniently known as humanism. It is not easy to define, but perhaps the centre of it is the high value that it sets on the human person, and the mark of the human person, as it has always envisaged him, is a capacity for disinterested endeavour and for seeing things not simply from his own side but as a whole. In that way the humanist tradition embraces art and science, but perhaps its centre is an attitude of persons towards persons which has various sources and correlations. It is linked with the utilitarian conviction that no one should suffer needlessly. It is linked with the Christian and high rationalist traditions that no child of God or rational being should be treated with despicery. It is concentrated in Kant's famous dictum that we should always treat men as ends and never as means only. That is the tradition in which science itself has been reared, and it is the main source of our best Western evaluations.

This tradition has never been unbroken, but we had once hoped that it was gaining ground, but for some time now it has evidently been losing ground. This development has often been attributed to science, and the main point that I have to make this morning is that it is not due to science but is due to the absence of something else. It is due to the decay of the humanist philosophy, and to the emergence of a new and rival philosophy which may best be described in general terms as the philosophy of the Whole, and is expressed in the political field by the conception of collective man. It is a philosophy in which the irreplaceable hopes and fears, oddities, and originalities which endear us to each other are subjected to the levelling impact of standardized emotions; unfortunately, only too often by our own enthusiastic surrender. Very often it is in the name of 'humanity' that we are encouraged to ride rough-shod over men, and thus the new philosophy smuggles its contraband under the old flag.

I make no secret of my belief that it is this philosophy which is the main danger to civilized society, but I have now to ask myself why science is so often blamed. A few rather trivial and secondary reasons may be given first.

In the first place, there is the sheer pressure of time. People who are engaged in science very often find they have not the time to interest themselves in other things, and they sometimes end by losing the inclination for them; Darwin, in his old age, acknowledged that he had ceased to enjoy Shakespeare. One may be diverted from a humane way of living simply by not having the time for it.

Another minor point is that at any rate the natural sciences concentrate on the inanimate, and indirectly encourage those who pursue them to treat human beings in the same way.

I do not believe there is much force in these arguments. There is, however, a warning. It is clear that scientific education—all education is or should be scientific education in one field or another—needs to be spread over a broad field. There is too much ‘knowing more and more about less and less’. And we certainly have to bear in mind the danger of transferring our ways of thinking from one field to another. But these are things that we can take in our stride. They are not the real point. I should, however, for what it is worth, record my impression that the scientists and technologists of my acquaintance are not particularly barbarous, and if other people agree with this verdict, as I think they will, that should help to show that science is not the cause of the trouble.

The serious charge is that science has no sense of values, and the reply that I want to give to that is in two stages; first, that science has a sense of values, though perhaps not one that can embrace the whole field of living, and, secondly, that, if by way of supplement the scientists coquette with the new philosophy of the whole or the collective instead of remaining true to the humanist tradition, they will endanger their own activities and their own prospects. Despite, or perhaps because of, a certain austerity of demeanour, science is on the side of the angels.

The first point is that science has its own sense of values. The scientific life has its own sure sense of honour, which makes it, by its very nature, resistant to mass pressures and careful only for the truth. The scientist proceeds by way of hypothesis and experiment, and his object is to find out what correlations actually prevail between one kind of event and another. He is not going to be put off by anyone who tells him that this rather than that must be done, or even that it must be done in this way rather than that. His scientist’s success in neutralizing interest and passion in this way is one of the great triumphs of civilization, and when he is confronted with mass pressures, such as supported the ‘Aryan biology’ in Nazi Germany, he has to say that he will not fall in. If he did fall in, he would be giving up his reason for being. This is a definitely ethical attitude and an important part of our modern ethic.

The scientist’s sense of values is seriously endangered when people engage, as they frequently do nowadays, in what I have unkindly described as ‘blather’ about ‘the social function of science’. I find that when people talk about the social function of science they imply that society is a very good thing and that science is privileged to be its humble servant. I do not believe that. The integrity of the scientist is, by and large, far greater than the integrity of any existing or any possible politician. To talk about the subordination of science to society seems to me to be talking about the subordination of the best

to the second best, the subordination of the scientific conscience to more or less dubious social purposes. It is much nearer the truth to say that society exists for the sake of science than to say that science exists for the sake of society. I do not think that anyone with a scientific conscience can take any other point of view.

Science, however, though an indispensable ingredient in the good life, is not the whole of it, and those who talk about the social function of science have this much to be said for them, that science cannot afford to be indifferent to the impact upon it of other human activities. That is to say, the scientist has to be prepared to defend, as a citizen, his honour as a scientist, and to use his citizen prerogatives to that end.

This is particularly clear when we come to two modern fields, scientific technology and the social sciences.

The technologist is, on the whole, in a more difficult position than the pure scientist, in that he is much more clearly producing to order; he is much more governed by a demand that is not primarily his own. This may not matter. In the oldest of the technical studies, namely, medicine, there is a rather close intrinsic link between the technical achievement and the humane tradition. Medicine, when all is said and done, is concerned with the promotion of vital activity and the relief of suffering in individuals. This is still true, though more indirectly, of public health services and so on, for it is individuals in the long run who are the beneficiaries. The medical man, therefore, has not to face the problem to the full extent. The physical and engineering technologists seem to be in a much more difficult position, because they are more and more in the service of those large aggregations of power in the face of which the humane tradition has to be constantly vigilant, especially when they bring it gifts in the shape, for example, of earmarked grants. They cannot, therefore, afford to be indifferent to the impact of the rest of civilization. The scientist, to maintain the integrity of which I have spoken, has to concern himself with the organization of society, not because society is more important than science but in order that science may be properly safeguarded by the external conditions under which it has to work, instead of being frustrated or interfered with. I repeat: the scientist has a social function, which is to see that science is secure, and that, it seems to me, should be a cardinal feature of University policy.

Now we come to the social sciences, and here I want to make an apology for missing one important point and overstressing another in my printed paper. The point which I did not mention and which is clearly important is this: the social scientist, like everybody else, has a scientific integrity, and he is in more danger of being interfered

with than even the most useful technologist. Most of the conflicts about academic freedom which have occurred in Universities have been concerned with the field of social science. Here the scientist has to dig his toes in. He has, no doubt, to be objective and good-tempered about it, and he must not be defiant in such a way as to become intolerant when he achieves power, but he has, all the same, to insist on his right to a scientific objective approach. Success in that will mean another great advance in civilization, as great an advance as the advance beyond the passions and interests of individual life in the natural sciences. I want to make that clear before I go on. The social sciences are a very important part of the integrity of science. At the same time the social scientist is rather in danger of thinking, as other scientists did fifty years ago, that the very important truth that they have to tell is the whole truth about the field in which they are engaged. They are tempted to think that their statistics, averages, generalizations, and cross-sections are the whole truth about human nature.

I want to suggest that, if that is what they think, they misconceive the procedure of science as a whole. What scientists are doing—and it is highly illuminating—is to disclose the constant characteristics of situations, in this case a human situation, but each of these situations (and each participant in them) is peculiar and personal. Social scientists who remember this have a leading part to play in the development of the humane tradition. Those who forget it may easily sell the past, not because they are good scientists, but because they are bad philosophers and embark on philosophizing blithely and without proper preparation. I repeat: I do not accuse social scientists *en masse* of doing that. I merely say it is a danger inherent in the situation, and I do believe that some of them have done it.

To conclude, science is part of the humane tradition. As such, it has an integrity which it has to safeguard, both by exhibiting it on all occasions and by opposing social tendencies which seek to constrain it. It is only in so far as it has failed in these tasks that it has contributed to the decline of the tradition to which it belongs, and I want to emphasize the extent to which science does belong to that tradition, how far its integrity does depend on the frame of mind which the humane tradition has created. The scientist needs the support of the kindly tolerance, the unrhetorical wisdom, the unostentatious common decencies which have supported it in the past and will support it in the future. Without that, scientists cannot hope to retain that austere sense of evidence and scrupulosity of argument which are the very breath of their being. That they should surrender these things consciously is unthinkable. The only danger is that they may surrender them without quite realizing what is

happening, in the intensity of their own pursuit. That danger can be averted if they are sufficiently conscious of what they are doing and philosophize about their own situation.

PROFESSOR R. W. FIRTH (*Member of Academic Advisory Committee, Australian National University [Professor of Social Anthropology, London School of Economics]*): It will be quite obvious that, although I occupy the place of an historian in the Programme, I am no historian. I am here as a social anthropologist, empirical and somewhat pedestrian. If I have to be classified I think I should be called a proto-sociologist, the forerunner of the sociologist who is to follow me.

We have been invited this morning to make a critical evaluation of structural and moral changes. Such a review implies a standard, which can only, I think, be a personal one. For this discussion I am prepared to assume, rather dogmatically, and, I am afraid, very loosely, that this standard must have a social referent. How far do the changes which we are discussing affect the ultimate stability and harmony of society and how far do they contribute to a system of social justice or a system allowing creative freedom to the human individual? Broadly speaking, those are the criteria that I want to apply.

Modern science, as we know, has become a social force. It is not simply a process of dispassionate systematic inquiry and a body of refined knowledge. Its achievements have given it authority, and in popular eyes it has a mystical and almost a magical value. By holding to its technical standards, it has a moral value also in its own sphere. What are the results, then, where the power of science over men is translated into the power of technology?

It is quite clear that a new technology must mean in many ways a new structure of social relations. A factory system, mechanization, obviously means a concentration of human effort, a special organization of workers' lives. Whether they live in slum or in garden city, their linkage with an industrial technology governs not only their employment but also their family life, their recreation, and even their political and their religious ties. It is not merely a local influence. Modern technology draws its raw materials from all over the world. It creates a commercial structure of an international type, with its roots in the daily activities of even the most remote and primitive peoples. I wish to speak of this later, but first I want to say something about the relation of morality to science.

The function of morality is to sanction social relations, so it is easy to assume, I think, that new technical and social structures produce new moral rules. The technological drive for the raw materials of industry gives a direct incentive to the emergence of moral ideas.

Development not only gets prizes for efficiency and industry; it also gets moral approval. Reducing nature to the service of man is a sacred task. Peasant peoples who resist having their lands disturbed for the extraction of gold or other minerals are not simply short-sighted economically; they are held to be wrong morally; they are the enemies of progress. The ability to control breeds ideas about the rightness of control. Economic security has been often approved, as Jane Austen illustrated it, by the conversion of property into gentility. The rugged individualism of the earlier stages of industrial capitalism found its justification not only in the economic doctrine of *laissez faire* but also in the moral precepts of wealth and high station as a calling and blessing of God, requiring as a makeweight no more than a measured charity. It is true that personal conduct and class ideals did not by any means always coincide in this respect. As a Scottish clergyman has put it, 'The Almighty is obliged to do many things in his official capacity that he would scorn to do as a private individual.'

How far do science and technology really produce a new morality? Scientists are part of an organization, society, and this conditions the use they make of their instrument. The confused and conflicting aims and values of men, their personal and social background of experience, dictate what shall be done with the products and potentialities of science. Tawney has pointed out that what makes modern industry is not the machine but the brains which use it and the institutional framework in which it is set. Only in a broad way, then, can any set of moral ideas be said to be produced by a scientific or technical system. If we are looking for an antithesis, we might argue that scientific and technological developments themselves originate in and are governed by moral attitudes. Moral approval of intellectual curiosity and of attempts to increase man's command over nature have led science on at every step. Scientific and technical development may be canalized by moral rules associated with a religious system. Historically, the watchful eye kept by religion over science needs no documentation here.

This means that I see difficulty in trying to isolate precisely what moral changes are produced by scientific and technological advance. The relations between morality and science are reciprocal. Morality is as much the guardian of the tree of knowledge as of its fruits. For this reason I have felt that I cannot try to interpret the subject of this discussion too narrowly.

How closely are our technical and our moral systems integrated? The essence of morality is action according to principle. This means the possibility of choice in conformity with what is believed to be right, or selection on the basis of balance of advantage. Nowadays is it principle that we lack or capacity for choice? It may be argued

that we have enough moral blue-prints to enable us to use science and technology in conformity with what we regard as our ends, if we can only define them. Two thousand years of philosophy, Eastern and Western, pagan and Christian, have surely given us enough in the way of moral concepts and moral rules for action to confront any development of science. It is not a new moral outlook that is needed; it is decision to abide by the ideals that we already have. Colloquially, it is not goals but guts that are required. Attainment of one end means sacrifice of others. The Western world is in a quandary today not for lack of moral objectives but because it cannot make up its mind what objectives should be in the forefront. Some of us want to secure all the rights of private property at the same time as we acknowledge the validity of the principles of distributive justice. We want to conserve all possible traces of the traditional and the antique at the same time as we sketch out a new aesthetic design for living. We want to be prepared to defend ourselves by force of arms if necessary, and yet nowhere in this country can a troop-training area be found which lovers of nature do not regard as a sacred trust. We try to combine anthropomorphism towards animals with treatment of them as an economic resource and a material for scientific experiment. We make a compound of individual self-interest and social reciprocity and call it business ethics. We want to blend the principles of reason with the dogmas of a mystic transcendental value system. In short, we are attempting in the Western world to compromise between diverse ideals with differing moral components. In this country indeed we have made this compromise itself into an ideal, the English virtue of compromise.

Ultimately, however, we cannot expect compromise from science. Its search for truth is cumulative. Its values are international. We cannot escape the implications of scientific discovery, and we cannot reverse the processes of technological development. They may be halted for the moment, they may even be dissipated by war, and their achievements may be congealed by some form of institutional action, but the process never really turns back on itself. Hence compromise is futile if it is conceived as a permanent measure. It is valid only if it is conceived as a transition.

One general trend of organization in modern society may be assumed to be in the direction of greater control over the individual handling of property rights. But is it, as Marx argued, the true democratization of authority in control over the means of production? Is it a political entropy which is the inevitable outcome? Will the economic machine necessarily be firmly founded on the broadest possible basis, the working masses? Are we, as Lenin said, 'marching to the very end of the division of society into classes'? We in England

know that we are witnessing one phase of the struggle to establish the broadest basis without all the sacrifices that are called for by a revolutionary theory. What we do not know is whether we are in process of trading efficiency for freedom. We see in Russia, as in her satellite countries, the working masses represented by a narrow party leadership. Progress in technology has helped to give them their opportunity, by providing one initial condition for revolt, an obvious inconsistency between ownership and use of the means of production. It has given them a human material which by advances in the techniques of propaganda can be led to see its strength. Above all, it has given them the means of maintaining power once it has been seized. Whatever be their idealism, rights to the direct services of others for what is conceived as the common benefit become the set of goods for the possession of which they struggle. To the property of the bourgeoisie in personal goods succeeds the property of the executive in personal power. Their rule is not a technocratic one or a managerial one. It is a bureaucratic rule, with, it may be, monocracy as the concealed spring. Is this an example which cannot be avoided on the organizational plane? Does it demand a moral counter-offensive?

As a proto-sociologist, I want to illustrate some of these general reflections from a comparative field. Until almost yesterday, these problems were thought to belong essentially to the Western world. Yet they apply now with almost more force to the Oriental peasantry, on the one hand, and to the less-developed peoples, such as those of Africa, on the other hand. All these peoples have been subjected to an intensive dosage of Western applied science, so rapidly in some cases that, in terms of consumer technology, they have leaped from the hoe to the tractor plough and from the canoe to the aeroplane in a generation. Poor, often ridden by debt, educationally backward, socially and politically under-privileged in a number of ways, they are now beginning to articulate common aims and to realize that change can be not merely wished for but enforced. Some of them have been touched by Christianity, but many of them retain their own religious forms. To most of them it is the economics and not the religion of the West that appeals.

The modern colonial system, held together by world markets, rests essentially on the scientific knowledge and the technical achievements of the Western industrial revolution. While these achievements are not necessarily denied to the colonial people themselves, they are primarily at the command of representatives of the controlling power. They are not thoroughly integrated into the local economy and social system, so they tend to promote class structures marked by sharp differentiation, with little mobility. Racial characteristics often

symbolize social inequality. The two groups in contact have different moral standards, whether about polygamy, the position of women, the claims of kinsfolk, or the general status of work as a social need. As contact develops, the new technology gets a firmer grip on the peasant. The South African peasant leaves his farm for the mines, the Malay takes to growing rubber, the Ashanti on the Gold Coast grows cocoa, and they step into the orbit of the Western industrial system. The new skills and the cash nexus of wage labour or commercial crop production create forms of organization unknown to those societies before. New chances arise for individual initiative and industry, and new systems of contract and ownership are forged to meet the demands of the new economic relationships. Perhaps most significant of all, impersonal relations on an economic basis tend to replace the personal relations on a social basis, which characterize the traditional society. As in the break-up of the feudal system in Europe, only some of those who held superior status in the traditional system can hope to get it or hold it in the new. Some structural displacement inevitably takes place. If it were only the reduction of those who held power in the old régime it might be fully approved. But the emphasis on individual rights and individual initiative throws much weight against some of the basic relations of small groups in the traditional society. Family life in particular is threatened. The labourer going into industry or commerce has had either to separate from his wife and children or to house them in unsuitable surroundings. In the novels of Mulk Raj Anand we can read about the appalling surroundings of the Indian industrial worker. They may be neither typical nor contemporary, but similar conditions are reflected in the story of the growth of industry in China. Here human beings, including women and children, were treated as economic and not social material because capital was dear and labour was cheap. The solidarity and moral values of the traditional Chinese family system have acted to some extent as a buffer in this situation, but even these have been eaten into in the process. A similar situation is found in Africa. The temporary urbanization of African mining employees has thrown strains on the native family system which it becomes increasingly unable to bear without legal provisions and other social assistance. The old ties are breaking down and a new system is taking their place, a system in which the individual rather than the group is regarded as being the factor of prime importance.

The new technology does not of itself create the psychological foundation of a new morality. But its structural results favour the expression of some elements in human personality until now restrained, which take on the shape of newer demands and obligations, backed by sanctions of right and wrong.

There is also another side to the introduction of science and the new technology into these societies. The people who accept them for economic purposes may be those outside the community. The impact of them may be resisted by the elders and the over-privileged and also by the society as a whole. Backwardness may be not simply technological; it may also be a continued orientation to traditional values. Such backwardness is brought into relief in a society such as that in Malaya. There the old traditional Malay attitudes are faced by those of the Chinese, who seize with enterprise and avidity all the opportunities presented to them by the new technology. Here is a situation in which the recognition of the value of conservatism can easily be mistaken for or pass into a morality of backwardness. I would argue that it is very easy for a Colonial Power in these days to support in effect a morality of backwardness from what are regarded as the best interests of the people concerned.

The humanitarianism of the nineteenth century, which was in itself a reaction from the asperities of the industrial revolution, was responsible for a vast improvement in the social conditions of the backward peoples. But more than social betterment is necessary if we are going to implement the moral values which we have. Action in the colonial fields must follow on a clear realization of our objectives. The colonial territories, at least in British eyes, are destined to self-government, yet, especially by reason of the contraction of our resources, they have become increasingly more important to the metropolitan country. We can perhaps detect the crystallizing of a view that the new programmes of colonial development, with regard to food production, for instance, should be primarily in our own interest in this country. It is true that such ideas are always phrased in terms of the mutual benefit to be derived. But we are in danger, I think, of trying to harness together diverse interests which are bound to pull apart in the end. As a short-term programme, we can justify our action, but, if we are really aiming at self-government, we must recognize that British social and economic privilege cannot long survive the opening of the political door.

There must be a moral basis for action, but it cannot be of a dual kind. We cannot love our neighbour and ourselves with the same intensity. If there are any fundamental principles of right and wrong, basic to our conduct in society, they must apply to everyday affairs and they must operate through an institutional expression. The principles of morality cannot remain indifferent to social change. They must be geared to the new social and economic situations. I have said that in application to the colonial field, but I think it also has a wider application.

Religion is often appealed to as the only source of a morality which

can measure up to the magnitude of modern technological advance. But in the Western world religion has by its compromises allowed some of the most important symbols of distributive justice to pass to its opponents. Christianity, since its inception as an institutionalized form of religion, has always been faced by two dilemmas: what to do about wealth and what to do about political power. Its founder was uncompromising. He wanted none of either, but the Church has been walking on a tightrope ever since. For those who advocate Christian faith as a basis for the cure of modern ills, the first requisite is a positive economic industrial morality, which will emphasize the importance of sacrifice of traditional privilege. For those who believe that the foundations of morality are social and humanistic and need no religious backing, the challenge is still of the same order. Science has as its one supreme value intellectual freedom and, as its aim, understanding. It proceeds by reason, and therein lies its strength. In the world today, including the colonial world of which I have spoken, what may be called the system of permissive democracy is in peril. To retain it and enlarge it, and not to have it replaced by a democracy of obligatory form, we must recognize that the implications of modern science and technology require the translation of a political democracy into a social and economic democracy.

PROFESSOR H. A. INNIS (*Toronto*): I find that the general thesis on which I have worked in the course of my paper is not closely parallel to that of the two papers which have already been presented, partly because in his original letter Sir Hector Hetherington suggested that we should work out our own lines of approach. I may therefore appear to have gone off at a tangent in relation to the general theme. I have some feeling of satisfaction in that the two papers which have just been presented have gone off at tangents, and perhaps there is no reason why mine should not do so also. I have in some sense tried to integrate the paper in relation to the others, in spite of what I have said, by suggesting the importance of science and technology in relation to the whole field of knowledge.

Mechanization has emphasized complexity and confusion; it has been responsible for monopolies in the field of knowledge; and it becomes extremely important to any civilization, if it is not to succumb to the influence of this monopoly of knowledge, to make some critical survey and report. Therefore my thesis has brought me to the conclusion that science, technology, and the mechanization of knowledge are in grave danger of destroying the conditions of freedom of thought, and, in destroying the conditions of freedom of thought, bringing about the collapse of what we like to think of as Western civilization.

I should perhaps explain my bias, which is with the oral tradition, particularly as it has been reflected in Greek civilization, and I want to argue the necessity of recapturing something of its spirit. For that purpose we should try to understand something of the importance of life or of the living tradition which is peculiar to the oral as against the mechanized tradition, and we should pay greater attention to the contributions of the Greek civilization. Much of this will smack of Marxian interpretation, but I have tried to use the Marxian interpretation to interpret Marx. There has been little effort to push Marxism to its ultimate limit, and I hope, in trying to push it to its limit, to show something of its limitations.

I propose to adhere rather closely to the terms of the subject of this discussion, namely, 'a critical review, from the points of view of an historian, a philosopher, and a sociologist, of the structural and moral changes produced in modern society by scientific and technological advance'. I ask you to try to understand what that means, because I am sure all of us have spent a great deal of time in trying to do this and that the results have not been altogether happy.

In the first place, I would suggest that the phrasing of the subject reflects the limitations of Western civilization. With an interest in economics, I should probably be disowned by professional historians, philosophers, and sociologists and expected to present the point of view of an economist. I admit that I am not accepted in any of these categories, because they all have some suspicion of an individual who ventures to go beyond his own particular interests.

Knowledge has been divided in the modern world to the extent that it is apparently hopeless to expect a common point of view. In following the directions of those responsible for the wording of the title of this discussion, I propose to ask why Western civilization has reached the point that a conference largely composed of University administrators should unconsciously assume division in points of view in the field of learning and why this conference, representing the Universities of the British Commonwealth, should have been so far concerned with political representation as to forget the problem of unity in Western civilization, or, to put it in a general way, why all of us here together seem to be what is wrong with Western civilization. Some of you may remember James Thurber's story of the University professor pointing to a student and saying to him: 'You are what is wrong with this institution.'

In the remainder of this paper I shall be concerned with my own interests in the economic history of knowledge. In this my dependence on the work of Graham Wallas will be very evident. He pointed to the danger that knowledge was growing too vast for successful use in social judgement, since life is short and sympathies and intellects are

limited.<sup>1</sup> To him the idol of the pulpit and the idol of the laboratory were hindrances to effective social judgement, arising, as they do, from the traditions of organized Christianity and the metaphysical assumptions of professional scientists.<sup>2</sup> He assumed that creative thought was dependent on the oral tradition and that the conditions favourable to it were gradually disappearing with the increasing mechanization of knowledge. Reading is quicker than listening and concentrated individual thought than verbal exposition and counter exposition of arguments. The printing press and the radio address the world instead of the individual. The oral dialectic is overwhelmingly significant to subjects whose subject matter is human action and feeling and is important in the discovery of new truth, but is of very little value in disseminating it. The oral discussion inherently involves personal contact and a consideration for the feelings of others, and it is in sharp contrast with the cruelty of mechanized communication and the tendencies which we have come to note in the modern world. Quantitative pressure of modern knowledge has been responsible for the decay of oral dialectic and conversation. The passive reading of newspapers and newspaper placards and the small number of significant magazines and books point to the dominance of conversation by the newspaper and to the pervasive influence of discontinuity, which is, of course, the characteristic of the newspaper, as it is of the dictionary. Familiarity of association, which is essential to effective conversation, is present but is not accompanied by the stimulus which comes from contacts of one mind in free association with another mind in following up trains of ideas. As Graham Wallas pointed out, very few men who have been writing in a daily newspaper have produced important original work. I think we may conclude with the words of Schopenhauer: 'To put away one's thoughts in order to take up a book is the sin against the Holy Ghost.'

The impact of science on cultural development has been evident in its contribution to technological advance, notably in communication and in the dissemination of knowledge. In turn it has been evident in the types of knowledge disseminated, that is to say, science lives its own life not only in the mechanism which is provided to distribute knowledge but also in the sort of knowledge which will be distributed. As information has been disseminated the demand for the miraculous, which has been one of the great contributions of science, has increased. To supply this demand for the miraculous has been a highly remunerative task, as is evidenced by the publications of publishing firms concerned with scientific works. The average reader has been impressed by an emphasis on the miraculous and the high priests

<sup>1</sup> Graham Wallas, *Social Judgment* (London, 1934), p. 29.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 161.

of science, or perhaps it would be fair to say the pseudo-priests of science, have been extremely effective in developing all sorts of fantastic things, with great emphasis, of course, on the atomic bomb. I hoped to get through this paper without mentioning the atomic bomb, but found it impossible.

Geoffrey Scott has stated that the instinct of reverence for science dislodged it from the supernatural world and attached it to the natural world, with the result that the interest in religion has been very greatly weakened. Bury described the rapidly growing demand in England for books and lectures, making the results of science accessible and interesting to the lay public, as a remarkable feature of the second half of the nineteenth century. Popular literature explained the wonders of the physical world and at the same time flushed the imaginations of men with the consciousness that they were living in the era 'which, in itself vastly superior to any age of the past, need be burdened by no fear of decline or catastrophe but, trusting in the boundless resources of science, might surely defy fate'.<sup>1</sup> 'Progress itself suggests that its value as a doctrine is only relative, corresponding to a certain not very advanced stage of civilisation, just as Providence in its day was an idea of relative value corresponding to a stage somewhat less advanced.'<sup>2</sup> I think we may well heed the words of Geoffrey Scott when he said: 'It is thus the last sign of an artificial civilisation when nature takes the place of art.'

The effects of obsession with science have become serious for the position of science itself. It has been held that the scientific mind can adapt itself more easily to tyranny than the literary mind, since 'art is individualism and science seeks the subjection of the individual to absolute laws',<sup>3</sup> but Casaubon was probably right in saying that 'the encouragement of science and letters is almost always a personal influence'. The concept of the State in the Anglo-Saxon world has been favourable to the suppression or distortion of culture, particularly through its influence on science. Science has been under the influence of the State and it has become more difficult for scientists with the same political background to communicate among themselves, and for those with a different political background it is practically impossible, because of the importance attached to war. Mathematics and music have been regarded as a universal language, particularly with the decline of Latin, but even mathematics is a tool and has become ineffective for purposes of communication in a highly technical civilization concerned with war.

I can refer only briefly to the significance of mechanized know-

<sup>1</sup> J. B. Bury, *The Idea of Progress* (London, 1920), pp. 375-6.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 352.

<sup>3</sup> Albert Guerard, *Literature and Society* (Boston, 1935), p. 80.

ledge, as affected by science, to the Universities. Reliance on mechanized knowledge has increased with the demands of large numbers of students in the post-war period. Henry Adams wrote: 'Any large body of students stifles the student. No one can instruct more than half a dozen students at once. The whole problem of education is one of its cost in money.'<sup>1</sup> We have been compelled in the post-war period, with the larger number of students, to depend on text-books, visual aids, administration, and conferences of University administrations such as we have here. They imply increasing concern with the written mechanized tradition and the examination system, of which Mark Pattison remarked that 'the beneficial stimulus which examination can give to study is in inverse proportion to the quality of intellectual exertion required'.<sup>2</sup> We can subscribe to his reference to 'the examination screw which has been turned several times since, till it has become an instrument of mere torture which has made education impossible and crushed the very desire of learning'.<sup>3</sup>

Finally we must keep in mind the limited role of Universities and perhaps recall the comment that 'The whole external history of science is a history of the resistance of academies and Universities to the progress of knowledge'. Leslie Stephen, referring to the period at the end of the eighteenth and in the earlier part of the nineteenth centuries in England, when there was no system of education, said: 'There is probably no period in English history at which a greater number of poor men have risen to distinction.' 'Receptivity of information which is cultivated and rewarded in schools and also in Universities is a totally different thing from the education, sometimes conferred even by adverse circumstances, which trains a man to seize opportunities either of learning or of advancement', to mention only the names of Burns, Paine, Cobbett, William Gifford, John Dalton, Porson, Joseph White, Robert Owen, and Joseph Lancaster.<sup>4</sup> Compulsory education increases the numbers able to read but does not contribute to understanding. Some of you may remember the comment in a discussion on literature by University graduates: 'Literature? Sure; we took it in the senior year. It had a green cover.'<sup>5</sup> Education is apt to become 'merely the art of reading and writing, without training the mind to principles of any kind, and destitute of any regard for virtue or even decency'.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *The Education of Henry Adams* (Boston, 1918), p. 302.

<sup>2</sup> *Essays by the late Mark Pattison* (Oxford, 1889), i, p. 491.

<sup>3</sup> Mark Pattison, *Memoirs* (London, 1885), p. 305.

<sup>4</sup> Cited A. V. Dicey, *Lectures* (London, 1914), p. 114.

<sup>5</sup> H. W. Boynton, *Journalism and Literature* (Boston, 1904).

<sup>6</sup> Cyrus Redding, *Fifty Years, Recollections* (London, 1858), ii, p. 316.

We are compelled to recognize the significance of mechanized knowledge as a source of power and its subjection to the demands of force through the instrument of the State. The Universities are in danger of becoming a branch of the military arm. The problem of Universities in the British Commonwealth is to appreciate its implications and to attack in a determined fashion the problems created by a neglect of the position of culture in Western civilization. Centralization in education in the interests of political organization has disastrous implications. This becomes one of the dangers of a conference of British Commonwealth Universities, because, as Sir Hector Hetherington pointed out yesterday, the search for truth is much broader than that which can be undertaken by any political organization. Referring to the dangers of centralization, Scott wrote over a century ago: 'London licks the butter off our bread, by offering a better market for ambition. Were it not for the difference of the religion and laws poor Scotland could hardly keep a man that is worth having.'<sup>1</sup> The problem is perhaps even more acute for the broader English-speaking world, with its common law traditions. The overwhelming influence of the United States as the chief centre of power emphasizes the serious limitations of common law in making politics part of law and of emphasizing the position of the State, particularly in those nations with written constitutions. In Roman law countries, notably France, culture has had an opportunity to expand, politics have become less of an obsession, and leadership has been given to Western civilization. Culture survives ideologies and political institutions, or rather it subordinates them to the influence of constant criticism. Constant whining about the importance of our way of life is foreign to its temper.

The Universities should subject their views about their role in civilization to systematic overhauling, and revise the machinery by which they can take a leading part in the problems of Western culture. For example, we should extend our scholarships to Universities on the Continent. Lecturers should be encouraged to write books as a means of compelling them to give new lectures. The Universities must concern themselves with the living rather than with the dead.

THE CHAIRMAN: On your behalf, I should like to thank the three opening speakers very warmly for their addresses, which I am sure will stimulate an active discussion.

DR. C. J. ELIEZER (*Ceylon*): I speak rather diffidently, for I am not an historian or a sociologist or a philosopher. I am only half a physicist and half a mathematician. The reason for my speaking is that I was

<sup>1</sup> *The Journal of Sir Walter Scott* (Edinburgh, 1890), ii, p. 256.

not able to follow certain points in Professor Gibson's conclusions. He started by saying that he was going to show that science has a sense of values. It seems to me that his argument really showed that the scientist has a sense of values, which is, of course, quite a different thing. To say that the study or pursuit of science as we know it today would, by itself alone, lead one to a sense of values appears to me an unrealistic assumption.

Let me give an illustration. Previous speakers have spoken of the value of the individual. Now, we have learnt in the past few decades that scientific laws are really statistical laws. The study of such laws could hardly be expected to lead to an appreciation of individual life.

At a time when the relationship between the sciences and the humanities is somewhat critical, I do not feel that Professor Gibson's analysis is strong enough to meet the situation. In the Universities the scientist is becoming more and more a specialist. This Congress should give the lead in suggesting how these specialists in science may be given a more balanced education in the Universities. At present the scientific courses in most Universities are arranged in such a way that it is almost impossible for a student, if he wants to be a good scientist, to do anything else but devote his entire time in the University to his specialist subject. The situation is becoming worse and worse. I do not think that scientists can be expected to grow up with a really strong sense of values. The reason why the scientists of today have a good sense of values is that the background of their education was considerably influenced by the humane studies. Two thousand years of Eastern and Western philosophy have given a background in which a certain sense of values is accepted; but the rapid changes at the present time are creating a situation in which the same background will no longer obtain. We are moving into a materialistic and technical civilization, and attention should be given to the relationship between the sciences and the humanities.

DR. C. E. BRUNTON (*Liverpool*): When I read the abstract of Professor Gibson's address in the Programme I felt that I must come to this meeting and give him a cheer, as it were, whether I spoke or not, and each time I re-read his abstract I felt more inclined to thank him for his debunking, if I may use that expression, of the philosophy of the collective man.

The point that I want to make now is a small point in the general discussion of this subject. I think that the difficulty is partly due to the fact that the categories of science are not applicable to the description of conscious activity. We, for instance, know a certain amount about electric currents going along nerves inside our brains, but I think I am right in saying that these brain-waves, if you like to

call them that, do nothing whatever to explain our consciousness and that we have no particular words which will enable us to qualify or compare or quantify the consciousness of one man at different times or the consciousness of different people at the same time. I think that there is a really important task for somebody here, to try to find words which will express human consciousness and what it means, because, until we can explain, without too much symbolism drawn from the material world, the ordinary human consciousness, it will be extremely difficult to explain human relationships without dropping into this activity which is described as social science.

It is because of this difficulty of getting words in which to express human consciousness that we find it so difficult to explain the way in which we and others are moved. We have not been helped by each psychologist inventing a vocabulary which pleases him but with which most of his colleagues disagree. I hope, however, that the psychologists will help us to get further in this way and will persevere in trying to describe, in terms with which all of them can agree, some of the things that are of most importance in connexion with human nature.

There is one passage in the abstract of Professor Firth's paper to which I should like to refer. He says: 'It is not a new morality of formula that is needed. It is a clearer perception of the need to implement moral principle by moral action.' I am reminded of the address given at lunch on Tuesday by Professor Ranganathan of Delhi, who said that it was very difficult to be a snake-charmer and to understand and control the part of our nature which was least helpful to civilized society. That seems to me to be the second most important question for some of our thinkers to consider. How are we to get sufficient courage to do what we know is the right thing?

MR. R. F. CURREY (*Rhodes University College*): I really have no right to be in this Congress, amidst this galaxy of Vice-Chancellors and professors. I am merely a member of the governing body of a small University College in South Africa. But I am by trade a schoolmaster, and one of our problems in all the schools just now, I think, is that in science the Universities have taken the standard to such a height, not merely for scholarships but even for the entrance examination to the Universities, that it is necessary for us in the schools to allow boys who are going in for science to start specializing a very great deal earlier than they ought in the opinion of many of us to do.

I do not see a way out of this difficulty, but I am quite sure the result is that a great many trained scientific workers go into industry, into research work under the Government and elsewhere, and into teaching posts in Universities and schools, whose education at the

University and before they went to the University has necessarily had to be specialized and narrow. I note that in the admission examination to Colleges at Oxford men who are going to read science, medicine, or engineering are required, as a general rule, to do one language paper (an unseen translation) and a general paper. But, judging by the results, I have gained the impression that no very great importance is attached to those papers, whereas very great importance indeed is attached to the pure science papers. There is therefore an irresistible pressure on us to allow boys who are going to read science to start specializing very early indeed. Inevitably, as it seems to me, they get watertight compartments inside their heads at such an early age that it is only in the case of those with the finer minds, a very small minority, that those watertight compartments are ever broken down afterwards.

I should be interested to hear from those with University experience whether they have any suggestions to make in this connexion and whether they feel this to be an evil, as it seems to me to be. Some of us would like boys and girls who are going in for a science scholarship at a University, or even for the entrance examination for admission to the science schools of a University, to be required to take a paper in arts—a language, literature, religious knowledge, or some substitute for those subjects—and we should like the result of this paper to be taken into account in the award of the scholarship. It should not be merely a fifth wheel to the coach, as I think it is at present. It may be that this would inevitably lower the scientific standard, which would no doubt be lamentable. But I think that the Universities have now pegged the standard of science so high (they may be justified, because their achievements are so remarkable) that men who go out to live what may be called scientific lives in a narrow sense, in industry, in research, or in education, have had their minds cast too early in a very deep, but a very narrow, mould. I should be grateful to hear from those who teach science in the Universities whether they think that that is an evil, as it seems to me to be, and whether there is any way out of the difficulty.

PROFESSOR P. E. DUSTOOR (*Allahabad*): I am not an historian, a philosopher, a sociologist, or a scientist, and just because I am none of those things but only a teacher of literature I should like to raise a few questions.

I should have thought that the question before us demanded certain answers; but these have not really, for the most part, been attempted. The question of a critical survey of the moral and structural changes brought about by scientific and technological advance is a practical question. Professor Firth certainly attacked it vigorously

and well, but I wonder why nobody in the course of the discussion has raised certain questions which are obvious. For example, Professor Firth rightly spoke of the centralization brought about by industrial life today. People work in factories: what bearing has that on modern living? I wonder why the question was not raised at the same time of the decentralization of home life brought about by modern technology. For example, we live more and more in the suburbs, away from the large cities, so there are two forces at work. We go to London to work and we live in the suburbs, because, thanks to the railways, refrigeration, and so forth, we can live away from the city and yet enjoy all the amenities of town life. What bearing has that on social living? Mr. Priestley discusses these problems in his *Autobiography*.

Although it is certainly true that morals are affected by social and scientific changes, the real question is not whether morality in the sense of an accepted way of life changes (undoubtedly it changes), but whether the newly accepted way of life is more, or less, ethical. For morality and ethics are not quite the same thing, and I imagine that any critical survey of the problem would tackle this question of whether the new morality is more ethical or less ethical. I am sure we should discover that, while we have gained in certain directions, we have lost in others. I therefore stand here not to answer questions but to raise them and to bring the whole discussion to a more practical level. Let us ask ourselves how living is affected by new technological advances, and whether the new kind of living is going to be a better kind of living or a worse, a more ethical or a less ethical kind of living.

MR. M. RUTHNASWAMI (*Annamalai*): I hope the gentlemen who read the papers this morning will pardon me if I give expression to a practical preoccupation. It is this: what are we going to do in our Universities to correct this scientific specialism, this popularity of science which makes the students at our Universities neglect the humanities? I shall speak to you from my own experience in India. At most Indian Universities the problem is to find accommodation for the students who knock at the doors of the science classes. We have to refuse admission to numbers of people. They have a feeling that science will pay. They have a feeling that science will somehow promote the economic progress of the country. Therefore they knock at the doors of the science lecture-rooms and neglect the more humane subjects, such as history. It is not from a sense of personal grievance that I am speaking, because I was once a lecturer in history, but I think it is a great loss to the undergraduate world when students specialize more and more in science subjects and neglect the humanities.

Even among the humanities the more materialistic subjects are the more popular; for instance, economics. There is a feeling among Indian students that bankers and heads of business firms are all looking out for economics graduates, although a bank manager once told me that the less educated candidates for his bank were the more he could make out of them, because they came fresh to his bank and were willing to learn, whereas the economics graduates had ideas.

I do not know whether it would be possible to have a common core of subjects from the high school onwards which every student would have to take before finishing his pass or his honours course. We in the present generation have lost this common core. I believe that in the old days men like Mr. Gladstone not only read the classics but went through a mathematics course, and they therefore had a sense of values and a sense of judgement which stood them in good stead in every walk of life.

If it is possible, I should like this meeting to give an expression of opinion on this subject for the benefit of the heads of Universities in India and those that have to do with the framing of courses in India. I speak for India and also for the East, because I think the East is also confronted by this problem.

There is another cause for the popularity and the prosperity of the science subjects, that is, the growing influence of materialism and materialistic philosophies in the East. I once asked a friend of mine, the editor of a learned journal, why he did not continue his study of the Vedanta from the Christian standpoint, and he said: 'What is the use of it? There is no future for the Vedantic philosophy in India. The future of India is with Communism.' It is Communism that we shall have to fight or to argue against. On account of these new forces the cause of humanism, I think, will be lost if we do not frame a common core of studies which, without neglecting the claims of science, will give a place to the humanistic studies, which in the long run will enable us to have a sense of values and also a sense of judgement.

DR. K. C. BAILEY (*Dublin*): We feel very strongly in Dublin about this question of extreme specialization, and I should like to say a few words on the principal measures that we have been taking for years and will still take, I hope, to fight against it.

In the first place, some of our best entrance scholarships are given, not on a specialized course but on a general course, and we thereby try to encourage the schools that feed us to teach their pupils a series of subjects, including both science and the humanities, if they want to get these best scholarships.

In the second place, we require every student, whether a professional student, an honours student, or a pass student, to take a particular general examination half-way through his course. It is an examination which is very frequently criticized within our body by those who want more specialization and who say it is a waste of time for a student to be diverted, even for two months, to work for an examination in such subjects as Latin, French, English, and so on, if he is taking science. Many of us, however, think that that is not so, and we insist that science students shall take this general examination, also that students who are studying modern literature or classics or economics shall take this general examination, which includes scientific subjects, admittedly to a low level, but still they attend lectures in them and are required to know a little of some scientific subject before they go on to their degree. One of my colleagues, in defending this system, said: 'I believe it opens windows to them, or at least to some of them, into worlds which they have not known before.'

I am a chemist myself, but I feel very strongly on this question, and I believe that Universities should tackle it seriously and insist that even the scientist shall turn aside for a short period in his course in the University to study something quite different, which may give him at any rate a hobby or some other kind of interest for the rest of his life.

PROFESSOR LILLIAN M. PENSON (*London*): I have only one reason for taking part in this discussion; that is, that my subject is modern history, and perhaps because my subject is modern history I had anticipated a rather different turn to the discussion from that which it has taken recently. My own conviction has been for some time that it is really more important for the teachers in Universities to widen their knowledge than it is for the students to widen the number of subjects they study. The real difficulty in teaching modern history at the present time is the fact that for some reason or other (not necessarily anything to do with science) modern society has become so immensely complicated that the historian is liable to lose his way a little. There was a time when a great historian could say without shame that history is past politics, but any modern historian who said that today would be ruled out of court at once. In other words, we have been absorbing for the last fifty years the effect on modern society of the knowledge which belongs to the sphere of economics. Progress in economic thought and in economic analysis has transformed the view of modern society which it is the duty of the historian to trace. As scientific knowledge expands we know so much more, or we could know so much more (most of us do not, and that is the

difficulty) about the working of the human mind in the world in which the human being operates that, when we as historians come to consider how we are going to focus our attention on the main points of development of the past, we are faced with the difficulty that there are so very many points of development which we might choose. Therefore I may perhaps be forgiven if my impression of what has happened to modern society is, first and foremost, that it has become immensely complicated, and it seems to me that the resolution of these complications (which undoubtedly include the moral aspect, to which reference has been made), and the analysis of all the trends which have come together to form our modern society, are essential before we can say much as historians to contribute to the solution of this problem.

MISS MARY O. STEVENS (*Western Australia*): I have been very much interested in the three papers which were read and in the discussion which has followed them.

Like Mr. Currey, I feel that I have not much right here, because I am a high school teacher. My reason for being here is that I am a member of the governing body of the University of Western Australia, and I am interested to hear that Universities elsewhere are facing one of the many problems which have been confronting us of late years, that is, the problem of making sure that the arts students, who are rapidly becoming the minority now, shall know something of the developments in science and that the science students shall have some knowledge of the humanities.

As a high school teacher, I know that specialization in most of our schools begins at about the age of fifteen or sixteen, and from then onwards those who expect to take up science, engineering, or medicine seldom do anything except English outside the mathematical and scientific subjects. As a teacher of English and history, my feeling is that their ignorance not only of those two subjects but also of economics, the social sciences, and so on, is deplorable.

In Western Australia we are considering at the present time the possibility of making a common first year for all the courses. Of course, the extra year would mean a great deal of extra expense, to the student in particular as well as to the University, and that so far has been the obstacle. I was particularly interested in what Dr. Bailey said, and I feel that that gives me something in the way of a practical suggestion to take back to my University. If we cannot institute a common first year, possibly we shall be able to do something along the lines followed in Dublin, because we are very conscious of the need for broadening the knowledge of both the arts and the science students.

PROFESSOR A. H. TOCKER (*Canterbury, New Zealand*): I have been particularly interested in the turn which this discussion has taken, because it has brought out some of the practical problems which interest me most.

The question is not so much where the world is going; I feel that the situation is changing too rapidly to admit of any ready decision on that point. Our question is, what are the Universities going to do about it?

In New Zealand we are extremely isolated, and it is difficult for us to keep in touch with what is happening elsewhere. I expect that many other people at this Congress, like me, came here with the idea that they might learn something from others on matters of this type.

At the end of June I attended a meeting of the Academic Board of our Federal University, and there a Sub-Committee submitted a Report on this question of how to ensure that the specialist scientist or technological trainee got something in the way of a cultural education, and how the student of the humanities could learn something of the methods of science. It was suggested rather tentatively that there should be an extra year in the University course, in which the science student might learn something of the humanities and the humanities student something of science. The objection raised to this by a good many people was that, if this sort of thing were imposed on students who did not want it, it would be just another task to be done as perfunctorily as possible and another examination to be passed—just a barrier. We could not help feeling that the only real solution of the problem would be so to organize the life of the University that something of the humanities would be taught with the scientific and technological subjects and something of scientific method would be introduced into the teaching of the humanities. I rather fancy that the older Universities in this country have met the problem by so organizing the life of the students that they are exposed during the whole of their career at the University to influences which give them a broader general education.

I was particularly impressed with the attitude of many ex-service men who were students before the war and who had had injected into the normal period of their student life three, four, or more years of active military service. They had seen the world and collected a great deal of experience, and their minds had been cleared of much that had previously clogged them. They were for the most part directly interested in getting on with their own particular avocation. I remember one man who had a good general education and a very wide experience as a soldier. He came back as a captain, on crutches. He had known all sorts of human difficulties, he had had to handle other men, and in some directions he was very much better

educated than some University professors. He came to us to qualify as an engineer. We could have imposed on him a course in English, Latin, Economics, or something of that kind, and it would have been just a job to do, a hurdle to be got over. We must think of our students and of what they are preparing to do. Some are very interested in, and will devote themselves wholeheartedly to, scientific and technological subjects but are not interested in English history and that sort of thing, and they would gain no real advantage from having to undertake University study of such subjects.

I feel that it is the subjects and their presentation that are at fault, rather than the students, that in many respects we have been living in the past and are still thinking of past methods. Perhaps we in New Zealand are particularly at fault in that respect. I think that we must look to our students and consider what they need and what they want. We professors are not always the best judges of what they need, particularly when we are dealing with people whose experience is as wide as that of the ex-service men. I rather fancy that here the problem has been solved in some cases by building up the desirable University environment and by regarding University education as by no means confined to the particular subjects which a student studies for his examinations. In the younger countries, where there is tremendous pressure on very limited personnel resources and accommodation, that is not possible in the same degree, and there is a real problem involved in how to get the breadth, the balance, the judgement, the old liberal tradition, and the tolerance which seem to be characteristic of the Universities here, and how to maintain those elements in University education in face of the very strong desire for and great interest in scientific and technological advance.

I do not know what is the solution to this problem. I have heard a little this morning which may help towards a solution. It may be that the best method is for each of us to go back to his own place and use the materials at his disposal as best he can and to the best advantage. This is an aspect which interests me and, I fancy, will interest a good many other people.

PROFESSOR A. W. P. WOLTERS (*Reading*): I wish to make one remark following on what Professor Tocker has said. He took engineering as an example, and I should like to point out that engineering has a history. It has been bound up for centuries with human activities. It has played its part in the development of civilization. Might not part of the answer to this question be that in a subject such as engineering and in all the sciences and technologies we might include in the courses the humanistic aspects of those subjects?

I believe that there would be a greater educative value in that method than there would be in forming an artificial synthesis which to many students would seem just an artificial hurdle put in the way of their getting a degree.

MR. J. R. DARLING (*Melbourne*): I am a simple schoolmaster and my mind is not quite agile enough to bring together the various points about which I have been stimulated to think during this discussion, but I should like to utter one word of warning from the point of view of the schoolmaster.

Any attempt to provide a so-called liberal education by increasing the number of subjects which boys have to take at school and eliminating what is called specialization will merely emphasize what is the real root of the trouble at the moment; this is, in my opinion, the overcrowded curriculum and the overcrowded syllabus. That is the case all the way through, at school and at the University, and that is why I very much welcome the remarks made by Professor Wolters. I support his suggestion that the solution to the problem before us must be found in the proper teaching of all the subjects, scientific and humane, with the proviso that the people who teach the subjects must themselves be educated people. The main virtues of a liberal education seem to me to be thoroughness of scholarship and a certain amount of leisure in learning. At the present moment there may be a certain amount of thoroughness but there is no leisure. There are two possible ways in which this problem might be tackled. I do not know enough and I do not know whether anyone knows enough to say whether there are bits of the syllabus in the various subjects which could be cut out. For instance, are we now teaching in every subject a good deal of detail which is no longer really necessary for the learning of that subject? That may be so or it may not. The other way of tackling the problem is by increasing the length of time at the University, but then we are faced with a social or economic problem in the case of the individual student.

Therefore I say that we must allow specialization, even in scientific subjects, provided that we do not make that specialization fill the whole time-table. I do not think there is any way of ensuring that people have a liberal education, if we mean by 'ensuring' it examining them to prove whether they have had a liberal education. The only way in which we can give the students an opportunity to get a liberal education is by allowing the Universities and the schools and the students the time in which the students can secure it for themselves. If we allow that measure of freedom, there will be a certain number of people who will obtain degrees and qualifications without getting a liberal education, but at any rate we shall not make it

impossible for people who go through the Universities to be educated, and that is the danger with which we are faced at the moment.

There is also another problem; the attempt to apply the influence of science in our generation has been to make everybody try to apply the same kind of rules to every type of subject. I always shun the apologetic way in which historians and economists defend themselves against a possible charge that they are not as intellectual as scientists. I think that has become a danger in the last few years. The real influence of the scientific world upon the learning or the way of thought of the world has been this desperate attempt on the part of historians, economists, sociologists, and others to compete in a field which is not really theirs. That may be an heretical, old-fashioned, and foolish thing to say in so august an assembly as this, but has not that removed, for instance, in history the emphasis from people? 'The art of biography is different from geography. Geography is about maps; biography is about chaps', and I still feel that history also is about chaps and that the attempt to pretend that it is a scientific study in which chaps play a merely fleeting and unimportant part has done more than anything else to destroy the humane approach to life and to bring about what Professor Boyce Gibson referred to as the worship of collective man. That line of thought, which I am afraid I have expressed very badly, seems to me to be more interesting than the more practical, mundane, and difficult problem of the control and direction of curricula in schools.

PROFESSOR S. MATHAI (*Secretary, Inter-University Board, India*): I have been a teacher in India of a very unscientific subject, English Literature, and from my own experience I feel that the solution to the problem before us is not, as one or two of the previous speakers have suggested, to add other subjects, because I have found that there is a tendency today for all subjects, scientific and otherwise, to be taught in a highly specialized mechanical way. For instance, a student of Shakespeare is much more concerned to find out the history of Shakespeare's second-best bed than he is to read and enjoy the plays of Shakespeare. I had the privilege of being educated at Oxford, and I found I had little time to enjoy English literature, because I was so busy in becoming a scholar and trying to become a learned man in the subject of English Literature. Therefore I think it is a mistake to imagine that by teaching English literature, as it is taught today in most places, to a student of science we shall make him a more liberal and a more human person.

I believe that the problem before us is a very old one and that people long before us were concerned with it. We are all familiar with Tennyson's lines 'Let knowledge grow from more to more, But

more of reverence in us dwell', and I feel that that is where our problem lies. We have lost the sense of reverence for human personality and for things about which we do not know anything. In fact, I think that specialization, whether in scientific subjects or in the so-called arts subjects, tends to produce a kind of contempt for what we do not know and the feeling that what we do not know is not worth knowing.

I do not think there will be any complete solution to this problem, but I think that an amelioration of the situation might be achieved if we could find, for teachers in schools and colleges, men who were not specialists to so great an extent and would not encourage in their pupils a tendency to ignore or belittle the wide area of knowledge of which they do not know anything. I feel that one great danger of modern education, certainly in my own country, is that there is such a tremendous pressure on teachers to become learned and to write books (because if they do not write books nobody knows that they are learned) that they have no time for leisure. It is important to provide leisure for the pupils, and it is equally important to provide it for their teachers. The teachers should have leisure not only in their actual time-table but also in their minds, so that they will have a desire and an opportunity for more free intercourse with their students. The tutorial system, on which this University prides itself, must become a little more real than it is at the present moment, so that a student may 'barge' into his tutor's house, even though his tutor may be very busy in producing his next book. There should be more give and take of ideas and information. I think that is really the way to deal with this problem of culture. I feel that the problem is one of culture rather than one of knowledge.

PROFESSOR W. ANDERSON (*Auckland*): There is a small point that I should like to raise arising out of Mr. Darling's remark that history is the study of chaps as opposed to maps. That connects up with a point in Professor Gibson's speech, the conception that science deals with the general or universal whereas the humanities are concerned with the individual and with idiosyncrasy generally. My point is that that is not a correct antithesis. The study of the individual can be just as mechanistic and naturalistic as the consideration of the constant or general. We have today in the educational field, under the head of scientific psychology and pedagogy, just that kind of determination of the individual in mechanistic terms that is as definitely removed from the humanistic attitude as in any more general study.

With reference to Professor Gibson's general thesis, it seems to me that the question is this: Are we to define personality in terms

of idiosyncrasy, as he seems to do, or in the traditional terms of rationality?

LT.-COL. H. J. BUTCHART (*Aberdeen*): I venture to suggest that we in the Universities are a very small fraction of the total population of the world and that what we teach or do not teach does not really get to the root of the matter. It has been well pointed out that life today is a very complicated matter, and I think that Professor Firth has stated the problem very clearly. The more progress we make the more does the occupation of the working man, who, after all, forms by far the largest proportion of the population of the world, become mechanized, with the result that his work becomes more and more repetitive and monotonous.

The question that I wish to put to the leaders in this debate is this: How can man attain happiness? I suggest that a man can attain happiness only by doing something not merely to the satisfaction of his employer but to his own satisfaction; in other words, a human being is put into this world for a purpose, and that purpose can be attained only if he does something to the best of his ability. Each one of us has a best, no matter how poor it may be. The new humanism, to which Professor Gibson has referred, tends more and more to give people, particularly the working man, leisure, and I suggest that that will never bring him happiness. I further suggest that the advancement of science, by making the average working man's occupation more a matter of routine and repetition, makes it more difficult for him to do something which will give him real satisfaction and show him that he is fulfilling the purpose for which he was sent into the world.

PROFESSOR A. BOYCE GIBSON (*Melbourne*), in replying to the discussion, said: I shall not refer very much to the practical questions which have been raised, which will probably be dealt with by others. I will merely say that I agree entirely with the approach suggested by Professor Wolters; I think it is the only possible approach to this problem. The introduction of compulsory subjects from an alien sphere has been tried at Melbourne and it has been a conspicuous failure. The Faculty of Science gave it up, but the Faculty of Arts has continued to demand a scientific subject; its object is entirely laudable but its method has been entirely futile. Just two years ago we changed over and instituted a course in general science for arts students, which I think has been a conspicuous success; it is taken by a scientist qualified both as a biologist and as a physicist, and it really is showing the arts students what science is about. I think that a working out of science towards the humanities, in the way that Professor Wolters suggests, is the proper counterpart to that.

The student will probably develop all sorts of interests if he is given time, as has been suggested. One very practical way of dealing with the problem is to insist that in a non-residential College there shall be a free lunch-time of at least an hour and a half, and if somebody says he will have to catch the 5.5 train home he should be told quite firmly: 'You will have to catch the 5.45; it just cannot be helped.' The ordinary students' associations in the lunch hour do a great deal of the job. Incidentally, I would commend a society of fourth-year medical students that exists in the University of Melbourne; the students meet once a fortnight in each other's houses to discuss everything except medicine. I once addressed a meeting of this society, and the audience was one of the finest that I have ever known.

With regard to the theoretical issues that have arisen in the discussion, I would refer first to Professor Anderson's remarks. The study of the individual can be mechanistic, as the examples given by Professor Anderson show, but I feel worried by being asked to choose between taking personality as consisting of idiosyncrasy and taking it as consisting of rationality. John Stuart Mill faced this problem and defended idiosyncrasy in the famous third chapter of his *Essay on Liberty*. I believe that he was right. The people who have criticized him, as Professor Anderson would, I think, by implication criticize him, have usually identified rationality with the will of a larger whole, or something of that sort, and have in fact made the State the supreme arbiter. That is what I want to avoid. Incidentally, the idiosyncrasies of people are the basis of their reasoning; everybody has to be rational in his own way. To try to standardize them seems to me to be wrong. I adhere therefore to idiosyncrasy, with the qualification that it *can* be rational and is the only basis for real drive and enthusiasm in reasoning.

Dr. Brunton and one or two other speakers have drawn attention to the difficulty that scientists sometimes experience in that they deal with generalities and not with the individual case. I am inclined to think that as science is developing there is a loophole here. Science is now dealing so much with generalities that it is not dealing with the individual case at all. It is talking in terms of statistics, for example. Statistics do not tell you much about the individual except that he is to be found in a certain area, and in any case we all know that. Nobody disputes that the individual is limited and conditioned by the area in which he operates, but statistics do not tell us just what any individual that is sampled is like. There is a strong suggestion that physicists are doing the same thing; I am not sufficiently knowledgeable to comment on that, but, if they are doing the same thing and if there are slight quirks and oddities in atoms, I for one

am very pleased to have my estimate of human nature reinforced by a study of inanimate nature. In any case, I imagine that statistics tell you what you might expect to happen and do not tell you about the particularity of the thing. It is important that scientists should supplement their statistical analysis with acquaintance with individual cases. The methods which they employ do not commit them to the interpretation of individual cases as mere cases of a general theory. The statistical analyses on which science is more and more concentrating provide a limited loophole for freedom and individuality. I think there is the basis of a synthesis here which was not available to our fathers. I agree that scientists must have acquaintance with individuals, which is acquaintance of a very peculiar kind, and I should add that I see no reason why this should not be entirely compatible with the sort of generality in which science engages. Recent discoveries seem to make that probable.

Finally, there is the question raised by Dr. Eliezer about science and the value of individual life, and that links up with the discussion of the menace of specialism, to which many speakers have alluded. There is, of course, an alternative menace of dilettantism, of sheer woolliness, and from that, at any rate, our specialists have saved us. It is a real menace. Our specialists at least think properly about the things they think about. There are other people who swing from one thing to another and never think properly about anything, and they are a danger. I think that the tendency of speakers in this discussion to regard specialism as the main or the only menace is rather dangerously to ignore the antics of the unqualified amateur. I distinctly believe in doing one thing really well, and I should add that the tonic effect over a man's whole nature of having a special skill is considerable. With that warning I agree that it is a good thing to confront life on many sides, and I agree that specialism has to be watched with that end in view.

It is true, I suppose, that science will not bring us face to face with all the values of individual life, but my point was and is that it brings us into relation very closely with one of them that is very important and one without which the humane life will dissipate into a series of dilettante's speculations. That is the contribution of the specialist, and it is something. I agree that science needs to expand, but I think, as Professor Wolters does, that it must expand from its own base. One of the things that I most regret in the modern University is the segregation of philosophy in the Faculty of Arts. That is a most unhistorical segregation. The whole history of philosophy shows that the main impetus to new ideas in philosophy has come from close acquaintance with the working practical sciences of the day, and I should like to see philosophy occupy a general position in the

Universities, and not a position in a special faculty. We might possibly lend our assistance there. Apart from that, there is the other great culture-building subject, history, and Professor Wolters has shown how working at the history of a technical subject may bring out its humane content. I have a theory, which is insulting to everyone but philosophers and historians, that knowledge consists of two intersecting straight lines; the vertical one is philosophy and the horizontal one is history, and everything else lies somewhere between their points of intersection. Worked out in institutions, that might do something to mitigate the difficulties that have been mentioned on the practical side.

# THE BALANCE OF RESEARCH AND TEACHING AT UNIVERSITIES

*Chairman:* DR. W. T. S. STALLYBRASS,  
Vice-Chancellor of the University of Oxford

THE CHAIRMAN: I think everybody is now agreed that in order that a man may teach well, he must do some research; and almost everyone is agreed that a man must do some teaching if he is to research well. The whole thing, as so often, is a question of balance. And on that I, at any rate, need instruction. I know nobody more fitted to instruct than Dr. Currie, who is going to talk to us this afternoon. He is a rolling stone, and has had a career not only in industry but also in the Department of Agriculture and the equivalent to the Department of Scientific and Industrial Research. He then became that unfortunate thing, a professor, for some ten years or so, and is now Vice-Chancellor of Western Australia. I will ask Dr. Currie to give us our instruction.

DR. G. A. CURRIE (*Western Australia*): It is not for me to instruct: it is for me to open the subject. That I am exceedingly happy to do because it is one that is quite close to my heart. It is still an urgent matter in Australia, for the older Universities there may be less urgency in it. The urgency concerns the University staff in time and in funds for research. I know that the really important thing this afternoon is the Test Match with 180 for no wickets for England, but I am delighted to see that University men are sufficiently interested in their own craft to come here in preference to that cricket.

Although the Chairman has already stated that there was an acceptance of the idea that the teacher must do some research in order that he should do well, I think I will go over the argument, because there has been some publication recently—shall we say of a contrary nature?—that is very stimulating. Also those who went to Meeting A this morning will have heard Professor Macmurray putting the crisis of our age very cogently before us; and I, of course, believe that this experimental attitude of inquiry, this ardent ferment of the mind, is one of the essences of the University, although I am fully aware that it does come into conflict with the comfortable structural format of any culture. I also agree that it is impossible to live in a human society if you break down the cultural ties with the past completely and if that leaves no faith to live by.

The inquiring mind is not enough unless it has some stable foundation. With that I can agree entirely. But another philosopher has

set this question very acutely before us—Ortega y Gasset—and has said in such startling terms that the research scientist is no teacher, that we must, indeed, examine his argument before accepting entirely the thesis that the essence of a University lies in research, the attitude of inquiry, the creative mind.

In order to give you the views so sharply opposed, I will quote shortly from the work of two modern writers—one of them the man already mentioned and the other, who may be here in this room for all we know, because his anonymity has been so carefully preserved that I have not yet discovered who he is. He writes as 'Bruce Truscot'.

Truscot says: 'The essence of a University education consists in constructive and creative mental activity. Its spirit should be the spirit of the discoverer; its primary aim to stimulate the inquiring mind.'

Ortega y Gasset says in effect: 'The trend towards Universities being dominated by inquiry has been disastrous. It has led to the elimination of the Universities' prime concern, which is "culture".'

Here I would put a note of caution: his main argument is really that this culture should be the very essence and centre of our University teaching. He sees culture as central; training for the professions as ancillary; and research also as belonging properly to the University but separated from teaching sharply, and Institutes of Research being there for postgraduate study quite apart from the teaching of undergraduates. So there are the two different points of view.

Truscot's whole argument is that our University teachers, all of them, should be active research workers—that without research their minds become stale and dead; that they present material as inert, passing from one to another lifelessly. In the spirit of research—and he does give rather a wide interpretation to the word research—and only in that spirit can really vital teaching take place.

For Ortega y Gasset there are three phases of University work—cultural transmission, the very essence of the University; ancillary professional training, essential but ancillary; research institutes separate from teaching but essential to give life to the whole organism. For Truscot the very centre of our University is the inquiring mind, and the attitude of the inquiring mind can only be transmitted by minds active in inquiry. He speaks of factual research as in the science faculties, and re-interpretation, textual criticism, scholarly appreciation, creative criticism as in the faculties of letters.

Truscot argues that many professors have been men fertile and productive until Chairs, soft and easy, have been provided for them. After they have attained to their Chair an analysis shows a lamentable falling away from their pristine activity. So far as I know, that is true in many places.

Looking for something to knit these two contrasted theories together, I found in Whitehead this statement: 'The justification for the University is that it presents the connexion between knowledge and the zest for life by uniting young and old in the imaginative consideration of Learning.' I think for me, at any rate, that gives a good key to our proper attitude in teaching. Here I have to suggest my credo that the imaginative consideration of learning which I believe to be crucial is only possible in those who are still actively learning and—shall we say?—doing research. I do not like the word, but it is the simplest single word to use for this activity of searching for new knowledge, so research we will call it.

There, then, are the arguments from Gasset, and from Truscot, and then the statement from Whitehead which for me at any rate gives life to the whole thing. I come down on the side, again, of Truscot in saying that I feel that the University staffs—all, perhaps, except at the lower demonstrating level, and I myself would think even our demonstrators—ought to do research, and in that active ferment to acquire their own inspiration which carries the spark from the teacher to the taught. The very essence, then, is this carrying of the spark. And the spark seems to me incapable of being transmitted unless there is fire at the heart of the originator, and that fire can only be kept alive by active work.

In Australia the problem of a proper balance between research and teaching has become acute because, for instance, in our own University Act it states: 'we will teach those liberal arts and useful sciences which will contribute to the well-being of the people.' There is no suggestion there in the Act that any research should be conducted. We have never been challenged yet by anybody for doing research work (everybody agrees that research is one function of a University), but it would be possible in a legalistic Senate, for instance, or shall we say a legalistic Cabinet looking into University affairs for someone to say that research is not mentioned in the Act. The tradition of research is established, however, in our University, and that is why a meeting like this is so valuable. It is valuable because the intellectual ferments from the centre can go to the limits of the Commonwealth, and our particular limit, as one of our Senate members pointed out the other day, is the loneliest limit in the world.

We are 3,000 miles from our neighbour University in Ceylon and 2,000 miles from our neighbour in Melbourne. The intellectual ferment is harder to keep alive at the periphery than at the centre, but without research opportunity it would cease altogether.

Strictly speaking, we appoint people to teaching-posts for teaching purposes, but we expect them, as they do in all Universities with the European tradition, to do, shall we say, one-third or one-half of their

time, in research. If we are to give them that amount of time free from teaching to do research we must increase the staff numbers and improve the staff-students ratio to do so, and all that means greatly increased funds.

Recently—it is not so very long ago, perhaps fifteen years—the Australian Council for Scientific and Industrial Research managed to get £30,000 set aside for the six Universities to divide amongst themselves to do research strictly in the University. Since big numbers of students have come in after the war our teachers have been overwhelmed by teaching to such an extent that the research side has fallen back, and particularly the science men have become very alarmed at this. They have even challenged the Vice-Chancellors' Committee with being rather inactive in getting sufficient funds to employ full-time research workers who might give one lecture course per annum and also to increase the staff-student ratio in the Universities to permit the teachers who are capable of research—and those who are not—of doing it. We have managed, through the Commonwealth Universities Commission and the Vice-Chancellors' Committee, to increase the amount for research from the Commonwealth Government up to £82,000 a year, divided amongst State Universities. The Vice-Chancellors, being gentlemen, have given to the smaller institutions a higher percentage of the moneys than they had any right to expect, but that is only an internal arrangement. The actual amount of £82,000 over a number of years is still too small, we think, to encourage research at the Universities at the level that we want.

Now, what do we want? Science men in Sydney, in a report privately circulated, said they wanted about two hundred thousand extra a year to increase this side of the University's activity. In the other Universities they say that they should share up to half a million, but these figures are guess-work. It is of great importance that the staff-student ratio should be improved. Some years ago we attempted an analysis of the actual work which our staff was doing. The philosophers said, when they saw these tables of logistics being sent round to them, 'Of course, you cannot possibly find out the hours anybody is working, or if you do it does not mean anything'. And they said, darkly, 'This administrative canker is biting at the very root of our education'! But apart from the philosophers we nevertheless did get everybody to render a return. I am not going to quote to you the actual analysis. One of the men in this room was amongst the hardest working men in the place; and he was the awful example, I fear, of the man whose hours are so heavy that if we were to ask him to do special research he could not do it. Here are some of the figures from one particular teacher. New and formal lectures, exclud-

ing repeat lectures, amounted in the whole of the 30 weeks of the session to 24. Tutorial hours (in science faculties laboratory hours would be counted) 180 hours for the 30 weeks. Setting work and marking set work, criticizing essays, setting examinations, and a good many other things were lumped together as 580 hours. Research work he says he does in his spare time! Administrative work took 200 hours. The total is just about a thousand hours of 'required activity' during the three terms. Now, this one of the worst examples of a man who has worked himself to the stage that he could not do independent work except that which he does in the preparation for his teaching work, which itself I think might come into the category of research as set out by Truscot.

An average for the whole University came out like this. The science men on the average worked 23 to 30 hours per week on required work. In all faculties we found that the average work required of teachers per week, that is, required work of the type I have analysed for you—was approximately 20 hours, ranging from one particular discipline which had about 8 hours a week to another which had 27. If you assume the working week is anything you like from 30 to 40 hours—and one of the science men had a required week of 37—then you see that in some cases time is available for research if a man cares to do it, in others not. The science men made a more recent analysis in which they are plainly doing 30 hours required work a week now, and that, of course, seems to me to be so excessive that it would keep them from doing research at any decent level. But the variation is tremendous in different Universities. Here are some figures for staff-student ratios from Australian Universities. Departmental heads and Vice-Chancellors will know their own staff-student ratios and can compare them. To make a proper analysis one would, of course, need to know the number of honours, final, second year, and third-year men as well as first-year students, but I am taking the gross figures only.

In Botany in three Australian Universities the staff-student ratio was  $1/31$  in University A,  $1/72$  in University B, and  $1/54$  in University C. In Chemistry the ratio was  $1/80$ ,  $1/63$ , and  $1/43$ . In Psychology it was  $1/70$ ,  $1/86$ , and  $1/73$ . In Agriculture, which in every State has been given staff deliberately for research work and funds for that purpose, we have a very different picture. In University A there was 1 staff member to 2 students; in University B 1 to 9; in University C 1 to 13; and in University D 1 to 8. So Agriculture is extraordinarily well-staffed. It has the time for research and the money for it.

These figures would, I think, incline one to believe that even if people wanted to do research—and they do want to, and still do it—the demands made on them by teaching are high, and possibly too high. An overall picture shows of some departments in which the

demands of teaching are so heavy that research work cannot be done; others in which it can be done and is done; and others in which the time is available but research is not done.

So we come to Bruce Truscot's implied suggestion that a man not doing research should be dismissed. He says also that in order to get research work done, there should be greater care about new appointments and promotions. If a man has not done research work he should not be promoted. He suggests short-time appointments. We have tried them: three years for lecturers; five years for more senior men up to professors whose appointments are permanent. Short term appointments mean nothing with us because a sentimental departmental head, a sentimental faculty, or a sentimental Senate do not turn a man out if he is teetering on the border of being useless. (I understand they are more ruthless in Canada.) This short-term appointment is not effective unless a man has shown some grave deficiency in behaviour.

As for annual reports on work done. Again for sentimental reasons they are only moderately effective, I think, in stimulating research, although they are effective in making one department look at another and say, 'They are doing better work than we are. Perhaps we had better do something about it.'

The sabbatical year we believe in to help men to keep up their research interests, but we find men cannot enjoy their sabbatical year on their present salaries. We think a man has a right to a sabbatical year, but he simply cannot take it unless he get moneys from outside to help him. We are trying to give every man a grant to enable him to take it, even in the midst of this present pressure of teaching, so greatly do we believe in it, remote as we are, and so essential is it to get contact in order to keep intellectual ferments alive.

I gave you the general philosophical argument for research at Universities at the beginning, then some awful examples of the teaching burden and its effect on research, and now in a moment I will deal with another special example from Australia, where we are trying to get more research money from the Commonwealth in order not only to give moneys to departments to have full-time research workers who will do only a minimum of teaching, but also to increase the staff so that every member shall have something like half his time for research. First perhaps as a slight digression, let me tell you of a point of view opposed to my own. A man talking to me the other night said, 'This business of every staff member doing research is all poppycock. As if all of them were really capable of research! Put your ordinary teachers at Universities on a really good teaching programme. Let them do, perhaps, twenty-seven hours a week teaching as they do in the schools. That would bring a proper

balance in the University. Then let your specially gifted research men have plenty of time for special work but don't mix them. Do not balance the individual as between research and teaching, but balance the institution by giving the research man the proper time and the teaching man the proper time for their work.' In answering that I would say that I defy any administrator to select the natural teachers from the natural researchers, and I would hate the problem of doing it myself. Usually I believe the research workers are also the most effective teachers, for teaching is more than the mere transmission of words.

Another particular problem which we have in Australia—and I think I will finish on this—is that moneys for research from the centre, the Commonwealth Government, are so heavily devoted, for instance, to the Council of Scientific Research, a magnificent organization headed by men who understand University work and support it, and now also to the National University. The position might arise in which the grant to the special Government research institution is so great that the Universities will require to put forth a greater and greater effort to get their meed of funds from a central purse to permit them to do their research. The Commonwealth might take the attitude: 'You Universities are the teaching institutions. We have our own institutes for research and we will concentrate research moneys on them.' That would be a very dangerous thing. The Universities might also be able to get moneys for defence research, but that brings up the whole problem of freedom to do the kind of research one likes and to publish the results of it. The new National University is to be wholly devoted to postgraduate studies and research, and, judging from the attitude of the men who are being approached to join it and from the men who have already been appointed, we are confident that they will not only get money for research themselves, but will try to spread the Commonwealth money throughout the State Universities, so that they in their turn can be given more opportunity for research.

The thesis I present then for discussion is this: that the whole staff of the University should be research-minded, and continually given opportunity for, and encouragement to do, research. This will give the best chance for the imaginative pursuit of learning to be the keynote of the University. Teaching and research should not be separated in the University. On the whole the best teachers are those who themselves are active in research as defined earlier. University administrative policy must be to compete energetically for funds to encourage the greatest possible amount of fundamental research work within the University. These things I present to you to open the general discussion.

PROFESSOR S. R. RANGANATHAN (*Delhi*): The Vice-Chancellor of Western Australia referred to the Preamble of his University Act in which there was no reference to research, although research was actually going on and was not affected by the absence of reference to it. That recalled to my mind a University Act in India, drafted in the days when there was precious little research done in our Universities, and it was all teaching. The Preamble said: 'Whereas it is expedient to provide for advanced work and the promotion of research. . . .'

This mention of research in the Preamble came to our rescue at a very critical time when India began to be research-minded. There was a great mathematical genius, Ramanujan, who was discovered in the second decade of the present century, and I am glad to find one of his discoverers sitting here. When it was proposed that he should be made a research fellow of the University, the legal pundits in the University said that because he was not a graduate, he could not be made a research fellow. At that time a Judge of the High Court who was on the Executive came to the rescue by reading out this Preamble and said that they could not restrict the provision in the Preamble. So Ramanujan became a research fellow, and we are very thankful for that provision in the Act, although it was not intended in that way.

It appears to me that this antithesis between teaching and research arises out of an illusion because we approach the subject from the wrong angle. We are, as it were, looking through the telescope from the wrong end. We raise the issue: is the field of knowledge more important, or the young man to be taught? In our own tradition we have another way of looking at it. This work ought to be looked at from the angle of the teacher, not from the divided angles of the field of knowledge or the people to be taught. According to the Vedic tradition there are four stages in the education of anybody. In the first stage he learns from his teacher, from his books, and from his environment. In the second stage he has to live what he has learnt. Then only education progresses. Then comes the third stage—the third necessary element in the education of a person. He must meditate upon what he has learnt. He must try to expand the field of knowledge in which he works. Even then the education of the individual does not end. These are all necessary, but these three by themselves are not sufficient. The fourth stage necessary for the completion of one's education is teaching others. That is the tradition which has been handed down to us from the days of the great seers. I hope everybody will agree that all the four elements should be there.

In the Indian Universities we have a great variety. I know of one or two Universities where it is all teaching and no research—thirty

hours of actual teaching periods, as they call it, down to twenty-two hours. I have found in these Universities that the work of the teacher and the taught alike was progressively going down. On the other hand, as a reaction to this I know of a University where the research staff had no obligation whatever to teach. There also we found the work was going down steadily.

We want both. On the qualitative side I think everybody will agree that both teaching and research are necessary. But then we come to the quantity—to the quantitative proportion of these two elements. There we find a difficulty. There are certain persons in whom the research element is dominant, who are already mature. That was illustrated in the case of Ramanujan, the mathematician, but he himself asked for teaching. As a matter of fact, the University of Cambridge and the University of Madras agreed to maintain him as a professor, to provide him with the opportunity to teach so that he could grow more. On the other hand, there are people who are rather slow to mature. They have to spend some years in teaching before they can find out the field of knowledge in which they can do creative work. Such people, who mature slowly, ought to be given an opportunity to go and do full-time research for two or three years, so that they may get themselves well-established in the mood to do research. Once they are so established, I think it is for their benefit if they do both research and teaching. In fact, the limiting form of the concept of a really mature person who is bubbling with creative energy and who cannot but teach others because he is creative has been given in a splendid verse, which I shall translate as best I can. The verse is:

‘Look at this wonder—a young teacher, sitting under the banyan tree, radiating wisdom, extending the sphere of knowledge, and so many old students looking to him and getting all their doubts cleared.’

That is the ideal—the research man should radiate energy and the energy ought to go to stimulate the mental energy of all his disciples. Unless that stimulation takes place, he does not get the necessary incentive to go forward with his research.

To what extent one should teach and to what extent one should devote one’s time to research is very difficult to decide. It must vary with the person. I do not think we can fix it statistically and administratively. I do not think, even, that it should be based on regulations. It must be left to the ‘individuating particularities’, as William Blake put it, of those who are brought together in the University.

PROFESSOR E. D. MOUNTAIN (*Rhodes University College*): My name is Mountain, and I mention it because some of you may come to the

conclusion that I am a geologist, which, in fact, I am. And I may add that my personal experience of University research has practically been limited to South Africa, which I can describe, I think, as my particular limb.

We may have very different opinions as to the objects of University work. In fact, I do not know whether any of us has the right to say what any particular institution ought to do, but the fact remains that most of our University work—the work of members of staff—does consist of two types of work—research, which may mean a wide variety of things, and teaching. In practice, it is often extremely difficult to distinguish between these two branches of activity.

What I want to suggest now is that in any regulations regarding research work we should try to avoid any form of regimentation. That is, I think, more or less what the last speaker was saying, and I was rather surprised that Dr. Currie dismissed that particular suggestion—which had incidentally been made by somebody else—in very few words. He said only that he would not like to be the controlling body which should say how much research work should be done by an individual. Well, there may be difficulties, but I think it could be done. My experience of my colleagues is that they do in fact belong to different categories not always clearly defined. There is the man who has a flair for research work; and there is the man who is an excellent teacher and perhaps has not done anything of what we may put into the narrow category of research work. Thirdly, there is the very small category, to my mind, of men who are both extremely good teachers and first-class research workers. There is, of course, a fourth category, where a man is neither a good teacher nor a good research worker.

The question has been raised by the author of *Redbrick University* as to why it is that a man in his early years will be an enthusiastic and good research worker and yet as soon as he is appointed to a Chair tends to become lazy and do no further research work. Our experience, I think, in South Africa is that we are in fact unable to get the best people, the people we want, and very often we have had to take a chance. We often have to appoint people who have done little previous research work. I am speaking now about both science and arts. The result is that a man may develop into a good research worker, or he may not. But we do our best, in any case, to get a good teacher. That is, perhaps, simple, because we have not got the funds to get the type of man who is properly developed.

The second point, with regard to the research work done by departments, is the question of opportunity. The conditions in South Africa may not be peculiar: they may be paralleled by other countries in the Commonwealth. But I do think that the problems in South

Africa are quite different from the problems of the home country. There are certain subjects on which literature is difficult to obtain in South Africa, and if Oxford's library can be criticized, as we have heard already, I do not think that our library in Grahamstown would bear investigation. There are very serious difficulties, although this is one of the things we are trying to improve, in this question of library and other facilities. Certain subjects in a new country like South Africa do lend themselves to research work, perhaps of a factual nature, but nevertheless to research work, very much more than others. For example, in the arts subjects, such as social anthropology, and in the science subjects such as most of the field sciences, there is any amount of work to be done, perhaps of rather a low level of research, but there is plenty of work, and I think in those fields we can attract good men. But in other branches of science and arts the difficulties, I think, are often enough to discourage any good research worker.

One other small point, about research work done by students. There is a peculiar feature: I think in a young country, generally, students tend to leave us at an early stage. It takes a lot to induce a good student to stay beyond the bachelor stage, and for that reason it is difficult to build up good research schools. I suppose that sort of difficulty is shared by all new countries.

Then there are points which have already been mentioned: the question of the work which normally devolves on our staffs. I think a lot of the criticism by 'Bruce Truscot' is inapplicable to the conditions in the Dominions. There is no doubt that the amount of routine teaching is extremely high, as was stated by a Government Commission in South Africa recently. The figures, I think, were quoted, and we have listened to Dr. Currie, earlier on, giving statistics showing what a heavy burden of routine teaching rests on the shoulders of staffs in Australia. The same applies to South Africa.

One other type of work which should be mentioned here, I think, which has not been mentioned yet, is the enormous amount of time which has, I believe, in institutions in all countries, to be devoted to administrative work. I think the conditions in the Dominions are such that Universities are not so stabilized, and as a result of these conditions—I think they are geographical—a specially large percentage of our time is spent on committee work and things of that sort.

All I would ask is that in view of the circumstances which obtain in a country like South Africa we do attempt not to confine or restrict research workers to certain conditions. If we have a good man on our staff, then I think he should be encouraged to do all the research work that he is able to do. On the other hand, there are quite definitely members of our staffs in South Africa who are not particularly well

qualified for research work, and I think we can expect them instead to undertake a higher percentage of routine teaching.

MR. M. RUTHNASWAMI (*Annamalai*): This claim for research in Universities, this over-emphasis on the need for research in Universities, is, I think, rather exaggerated. It seems to be inconsistent with the idea of a University. I need not remind you that a University was originally *universitas*, a corporation of teachers and students where learning had to be organized in and through social life. Speaking at Oxford, I need not remind you of the teaching of Newman on the idea of a University. You remember that famous passage in which he said that if he had the alternative between abolishing all lecturing or teaching and having only student and teacher living together in a common social life, influencing each other, mind playing upon mind, he would prefer the latter system of a University, the latter kind of University; because it seems to me that if you want research altogether in the main, you ought to go to other places. You ought to go to special academies. There is the Royal Institution; there is the Royal Society; there are all kinds of Royal Societies which are organized purely and mainly for research.

I do not want to ban all research from Universities, but research ought, to my mind, to be subordinated to learning. Research ought to be valued among teachers as a means of stimulating their teaching, but although it ought to act as a stimulus to improve teaching, if a teacher is not able to do research he must not be debarred from teaching. In the conditions of most of our Universities in India, on account of the small number of teachers, on account of the paucity of financial resources, it is not possible to have as many teachers as we wish. In these circumstances the emphasis has to be laid upon teaching, because as I have said the central idea of a University is teaching and not research. Research should be subordinated to teaching. It should be resorted to and required, only as a means of improving the quality of the teaching which we impart to the students. As I said, the fundamental idea of a University is a common society of teachers and students, each influencing the other. Research is no doubt required, but I do not think the main purpose of a University is research. I think this caveat is necessary in view of the modern—I was almost going to say vulgar—emphasis upon research as being the main concern of a University.

PROFESSOR H. A. INNIS (*Toronto*): Having listened to this discussion, I should like to raise one or two questions. First, I should like to ask whether any study has been made of the efficiency of administrators. A great deal of attention has been paid to the efficiency of

members of staffs and the part played by teachers, and it seems to me members of staffs should take some counsel as to the efficiency of administrators.

In any such study, I would suggest something like the following questions. What are the particular circumstances in which an administrator begins to get busy and make an analysis of various qualifications, and so on, of members of staffs? Do administrators tend to settle down when they become Vice-Chancellors? There are other questions: for example, when does a staff member go sour and become interested in administration, and start spying on his colleagues? I would suggest that members of staffs cannot be too careful in the sort of administrators they choose as heads. I would respectfully beg to argue that there is need for greater attention and some study of administrators on the part of members of staffs.

PROFESSOR F. L. WARREN (*Natal*): The mood for doing research was suggested by one of the Indian speakers. It is a very important pointer, because I feel that many members of the staff of the University would like to do research and find themselves bogged, not because of teaching difficulties but because of other factors. One is that as young men they go to the greater centres of learning and concentrate solely on subjects in which they cannot continue when they return to their home country. It takes them some little time to settle down to a research problem. That interim period is very important in the life of a research worker. He should keep going on some little subject, from which he will build his life's researches. And once the research bug has bitten him, he cannot help but do research, whatever the teaching duties.

The second pointer is that it is impossible to make an analysis of the number of teaching hours carried out by members of staff. I have tried to do this in my own department and for the Faculty of Science. It is far better to pay greater attention to the arrangement of time-tables so that members of staff can have whole days free or better still three or four months free without class-work. With this free time it gives opportunity for continuity of thought.

The administrative work referred to by Professor Mountain is a factor which makes serious inroads into research time, and it is an important factor in smaller institutions in some of the Dominions where expansion is constantly being planned. The difficulties could be overcome by what the Americans call 'servicing' of technical staff. It must be remembered, however, that in spite of certain lack of facilities in outlying institutions there is frequently more scope for research in many fields of learning and the right man will do research.

PROFESSOR P. E. DUSTOOR (*Allahabad*): I have, I think, in my own way done a little research, and therefore I am not prejudiced against research as such. But the question is: Am I, just because I have done some research, a better teacher, better qualified to be in a University? Perhaps I am, in so far as the discipline of research has value, but I do not think that by and large the qualities required in research work are the same as those required of a good teacher. As one of my Indian colleagues has pointed out, a teacher needs certain human qualities. A researcher may very often be as dry as dust.

I do not see why, provided a teacher keeps abreast of things, reads widely, works, is industrious, is alive in every sense, both as an academic gentleman and a common or garden gentleman, he should not be a very successful teacher. I think our over-insistence on the need for research amongst professors and lecturers is born of two or three concepts which are prevalent these days. We make a distinction between a College and a University. We say a College is a place where instruction is imparted, where learning is disseminated, knowledge promulgated. A University is a place where knowledge is created. It is a 'knowledge factory'. There may be something in that when you think of the junior Colleges and senior institutions, but I think we can carry the distinction too far. A University is not a glorified 'All Souls', or should not be.

Another reason why, I think, research is made so much of by those who run Universities is that it provides a quantitative yardstick for the work of the teacher. You want to know whether the teacher really is academically proficient, academically alive, and you want to see if he works. But I ask you, why is it necessary for me, as a teacher, to write a paper every quarter in order that I may teach better from the platform? If I read widely, if I know my stuff, if I am human and have the qualities that make me interesting and instructive, is not that enough? Only, of course, you cannot find out unless you attend my lectures; whereas if I produce work then, of course, even if you do not read it you see it. It sounds terrific, very often. I say this because recently I was talking to a young teacher in one of the American Colleges. He was formerly a Fellow of Magdalen in this University, and he was talking to me of the woes of a teacher in the States. Amongst other things he quoted that famous academic slogan in the States, 'Publish or perish'. And he went further and spoke of the distinction there made between 'soft paper' publications and 'hard paper' publications. If you wrote only in the research journals, you were a pulpy gentleman academically. It is soft paper. If you brought out a book, then you were a hard paper professor and you were invited by other Universities. This young man told me that recently, just before he spoke to me, he

had been asked by some people to join a larger institution, but later it transpired that he could not really join that immense University because all his work had been 'soft paper'. He was told, 'Bring out a book, and then you can walk straight in.' He was also told that the professors in that University—which I shall not name: it is one of the largest sausage machines—do not care whether they teach or not. In fact, they regard their students as so many nuisances since they have to go to classes and lecture when they want to do research.

Now, surely when you come to that pass there is something wrong in academic life. Why not, straight off, as was suggested, divide all your institutions of learning into places where you teach and places where some people who are eminently qualified for the thing do research? Institutions of advanced learning, research institutions, have their place, and some people, as we all know, are very good all by themselves in the library or in the study. They produce terrific work. But put them on a platform. Surround them with a few pupils. You immediately find they are no good. They do not inspire anyone. You can read their work, but you cannot benefit when you meet them. We know that, and I think we should make allowances for it and not demand of every University teacher that he be a researcher any more than we should insist that every researcher should be a teacher.

PROFESSOR T. G. H. JONES (*Queensland*): I have listened to the remarks of my Australian colleague with considerable interest. There are one or two observations I should like to make. One is that in so far as appointment to a Chair cuts down the amount of time available for research it is, in the Australian Universities, not so much on account of the teaching as of the administrative load that is placed upon the head of a large department. The more successful an administrator is in his department the more demands are made upon his time for administrative work in other fields of the University.

I have listened, too, with considerable interest to the speeches with respect to research, but my own personal view is that while a teacher need not be a researcher, a research worker is essentially a teacher. If you define teaching as the giving of formal lectures then the research worker may not be a successful teacher. But if there is any research worker in a scientific department of a University who is spending a good deal of his time on research, who is not also teaching at a high level, then I am at a loss to know what is meant by teaching.

I think there is room in a scientific department, especially in imparting instruction in the earlier years, for the pure teacher, because work in the earlier years does not necessitate any research on the part of the students, and there is, therefore, a limited scope for a

teacher who does not devote his time to research. But it would be fatal to the well-being of any University were the number of such men inordinately large.

Now, I submit that if you attempt to carry on a scientific department in the later years of the course without having men who are enthusiastic researchers then they are not a success and the department must stagnate. It is essential that every teacher in the advanced years should be carrying on research, because it is only by carrying on research, himself, working with a group of students and thereby teaching them, that he will engender the necessary enthusiasm for the subject, without which it cannot flourish. It is generally agreed that research is the life-blood of science and without it the scientific tree will wilt and if we cannot get such an infusion of research and teaching at high levels in the University then I think that the Universities will fail in their actual function.

The necessity to my mind, then, of research is clear and distinct. I do not define teaching as merely giving formal lectures. And I have been informed since coming to Oxford that in many cases a distinguished professor will give but one or two lectures a week, while the rest of his time is devoted to research at a high level. I am sure that he is fulfilling the best functions of teaching.

I should like to make this final point. Professor Warren has said that it is impossible actually to define the number of hours or regulate the number of hours that should be devoted to teaching and to research. I suggest that it is the duty of every institution to limit, at least, the number of hours of formal teaching, so that there is a balance of time available for research for all the members of its staff. It is failing in its duty if it so loads the teaching week that there is little time for scientific inquiry. It can and should make an upper limit to the amount of time which should be spent on purely formal teaching.

DR. T. B. DAVIE (*Cape Town*): I feel that first of all—as one recently appointed to a Vice-Chancellorship—I ought to make it quite clear I am not sure of the method of my selection. But whatever that method of selection was, I hope that our gloomy Dean will not feel too depressed if one more speaker expounds the point of view of the administrative officers.

The point I want to make is a very important one from the point of view of the younger Universities. We have heard from Professor Mountain some of the difficulties which, as one of those working in one of these Universities, he experiences. I should, however, like to point out, for those who may be contemplating translation to the Dominions, that the conditions as I found them six months ago when

I first went to South Africa are, in fact, very similar in the South African Universities to what they are in Great Britain. I think there is very little real difference. Administrative charges on one's time—I am talking now from the professorial level—are just as high as they are in this country, or possibly a little higher because of the greater need for expansion in the younger countries as compared with the Universities in this country. But on the whole the conditions are very similar indeed, and what is more, the type of distribution we find there between research and other duties, teaching and administrative, is also similar. But then here, I expect, once again our difficulty in finding adequate staffs has meant a slightly greater load on the teaching side, so that Professor Mountain was correct to that extent in stressing the difficulties experienced out there.

The position that I want to stress is that in the discussions this afternoon we have somewhat got away from the actual point—and I am particularly grateful to the last speaker for bringing us back sharply to the point—at which we started the discussion. That is to say, we are to consider whether we can throw any further light upon what is the right proportion between research and teaching. I would suggest that we have partially arrived at that by pointing out that in no University should there be any attempt to define exactly, in terms of a percentage of time or hours, what shall be this relationship, but that there should be in each department, perhaps, rather than for each individual, adequate time for research. Surely if we appoint a head of a department we can consider that we have found someone who can administer that department, and whose duty it will be to see that in his department there is adequate time for research work, as there must be adequate time for teaching. And it is the duty of the head of that department to see that he brings to the higher authorities such things as the staff-student relationship and the staffing relationship as between one department and another. We have all had experience of departments in which research is so active, by reason of the stimulus either of the head or of one or other of the members of the staff, that inevitably everybody feels, in that University, that the giving of additional staff in order to undertake certain teaching duties to liberate another man is not only justified but actually welcomed, even by members of other departments working in competition, as it were, for the purse of the University.

My feeling is that we should certainly not make a fetish of research, but no more should we, as some suggest, make a fetish of teaching. I think that would be the greatest danger of all—if we came to regard our Universities as primarily teaching bodies. In particular, I would repeat what was said by the speaker who stressed that formal teaching is only one aspect of the real work of a University. And the

real work, the essential job, if I understand a University aright, is to stimulate and encourage those who would widen the field of knowledge. Unless we keep that in mind teaching becomes little more than that of a man—though I am not belittling his value—teaching in a Technical College. In a University it is our duty to see that there is an adequate proportion of time per department—which may vary from time to time: I would not care to assess it—for research. We should see, as a minimum, that in each department one-third of the overall time of its staff is free for research. That, I believe, is some sort of figure to work for. I should like it to be higher, but under the present conditions of staffing and financing difficulties I see no prospect of that.

SIR LEON SIMON (*Hebrew University of Jerusalem*): I should like to say a personal word about my being here at all. My University is no longer in the Commonwealth, but it was when the arrangements for this Congress were being made, and so it was finally allowed to be represented not fully, but by an observer. That observer should have been Professor Brodetsky, who has just retired from the Professorship of Mathematics in the University of Leeds; but he was prevented from coming at the last moment and has passed on the pleasant duty to me. I am not an academic person, but merely a retired Civil Servant who has become Chairman of the Executive Council of the Hebrew University; and I am afraid that my gain is the Congress's loss. Professor Brodetsky, who has asked me to apologize for his absence, has had great experience of University life both on the professional side and in connexion with administrative questions and had he been able to be present he could have contributed more to the discussions of the Congress than I can hope to do. I do, however, want to say a word on this question of research and teaching, because it so happens that the Hebrew University actually started twenty-three years ago as a group of research institutes with no undergraduate teaching at all. The feeling then was—and I think it was justified—that in a remote place like Jerusalem you must get together a group of scholars and scientists and build up a tradition of learning and research before you can attempt to set up a fully fledged University with students. We started with three small research institutes—one on the side of the humanities and two on the science side. There were, however, a great number of students clamouring to be admitted to courses leading to degrees, largely because of restrictions on the admission of Jews to Universities in some European countries, and so within about five years the Hebrew University became a teaching and degree-giving University. But we have maintained, and I am glad we have maintained, the tradition of research. We take the

view that teaching and research are essentially complementary, that they fructify one another and that the good University teacher has to do research at the same time. I think it is hardly too much to say that a University which devoted itself solely to teaching and attached no importance to research would be little more than a high school.

Of course, there is always the difficulty about the proportion of time to be given to teaching and research respectively; and that largely boils down to a question of funds. If you are an impecunious University—as mine is in a very high degree—you will be forced to make teaching demands on your professors and lecturers which will probably not leave them what they regard as sufficient time for research. There is a constant struggle, but on the whole I think we manage to strike a fair balance.

I have been cut off from Jerusalem for some time, but I was able to spend a week there recently during the ‘cease fire’ period and each of four professors I saw was writing a book. Three of them were just seeing their books through the proof stage. They had been through a terrible ordeal, had been reduced almost to starvation, were still inadequately supplied with food and water; but through it all, though teaching had to be temporarily suspended, they did not for a moment neglect the research side of their work. That, I think, indicates the right sort of attitude. No doubt in a teaching University the needs of the students must have first claim, but it should never be forgotten that research is of the very essence of a University worth the name.

THE VERY REV. PROFESSOR S. M. ZARB (*Malta*): I do not think I have anything new to say in the debate about teaching and research in University studies. But I should like to try to reconcile the different views, because I think that in all branches of academic studies teaching and research are of the same importance.

Of course, we all know the great distinction between science and arts, and I do not believe there is as much room in arts as there is in science for research. No science and no arts could do without research, but the element may prevail in one and be less prevalent in the other. My own subject, which is perhaps very different from the experimental sciences—Theology—lends itself to considerable research as to what has been taught on a given doctrine, by the Fathers, in philosophy, in the Bible, and so on. But we cannot pretend to make this an experimental science. Nor can we do this with ethics and metaphysics. I think, therefore, if we keep the distinction between science and arts clear we shall give the right place to teaching and the right place to research. You undoubtedly have a lot of teaching and less research in my own subject, but I realize that in a school of

medicine there is room for more research than teaching. Perhaps, then, these divergent views can easily be reconciled if one keeps the nature of the subject one professes in sight.

PROFESSOR A. R. HUMPHREYS (*Leicester*): As Professor Zarb has just indicated, there are clearly very many different kinds of approach to this problem—as many as the different institutions which are represented in the Commonwealth, and there will undoubtedly be even more than that.

It is very difficult to see how far one can generalize with accuracy. I feel very strongly the point of Dr. Davie's remark that to strike any right balance as between teaching and research in different subjects and different faculties is exceedingly difficult.

I feel very strongly also the point of Dr. Dustoor's remark that there are University institutions which lay so much stress upon research as to drive their unfortunate teaching staffs to distraction and occasionally resignation. I have known instances of that kind. At other places it is quite clear that too little research is leading to impoverishment of the teaching done.

My feeling as a student of literature is that, of course, the literary subjects and many of the arts subjects are in a very different category from that of the sciences. Dr. Dustoor argued that providing a subject were taught in a sufficiently wide context of reading and general knowledge, the fructification of the subject was going on adequately, and I do feel that is a very sound approach to the subject. I should therefore find the unification of many of these difficulties myself, as Dr. Currie did, in quoting Whitehead that it is the *imaginative pursuit of learning* which should prevail in a University. Provided the stress is laid in that fashion on the imaginative pursuit of learning the degree of emphasis on research and on teaching may be left to the University. It is the beauty of University life that many individual variations are permissible provided that the pressure of time for sheer administration and routine work is not exorbitant. And I was glad to hear the suggestion that one-third of a man's time might very well be allowed him for research. I find it difficult to say anything about practical fractions and hours. But I should just like to underline what is for me the fundamental thing in all this, and that is that it is the imagination which is the key to the whole thing.

If you are imaginative as a researcher, even if you are not a very good teacher, you will produce work which is free from the fault of a good deal of research work: that it is dusty and uninteresting. If you are imaginative as a teacher, you will surround your subject with all these extra things. You will take your teaching in the much wider

context which I think it is the purpose of research to supply. You may not yourself be doing research, though I personally feel it is important that you should.

I do dissent from the argument that research is the job of some other institute or something outside the University or distinct from the teaching faculty. I am quite sure that it is necessary to provide that wider context and also wider audiences. You do not simply have to address your own students but a much wider audience and you have to observe the standards of that audience. But to me the factor which unifies the whole thing is the imaginative approach to learning. I should say imagination inquiring after knowledge, and knowledge controlling imagination. That is a very general statement of the case. It is not coming down to practical fractions and hours and so on. But it is to me the formula which unifies the two sides of the thing, and I was very glad indeed that Dr. Currie should have taken the imaginative approach to learning as being the central issue in the whole question.

PROFESSOR A. BOYCE GIBSON (*Melbourne*): The last speaker has, I think, most beneficially reinterpreted and brought out again the point made by Dr. Currie about the quality of research done. If research is done imaginatively, then it will be an aid to a teacher, but if it is not, it will not be.

The trouble about research, especially in the arts subjects, is that a great deal of it—I say this quite deliberately—is not worth doing. That applies particularly to the minute projects set out for Ph.D.s. If this peddling conception of research is put out of our minds I think we shall see its integration with teaching more closely. I cannot see any better way of achieving that than by appealing to the imaginative quality, as the last speaker did. I should, however, like to go a little further and ask what is meant by teaching, because I think some of the threat of a conflict between research and teaching is due to a really bad idea of what teaching consists of, an idea which I am afraid I have found not to be wholly absent this afternoon.

What do we want to teach people to do? We do not want to teach people subjects. There are no such things. We want to teach people to think for themselves about certain material. We just cannot teach people to think for themselves unless we are thinking for *ourselves* already; that is to say, unless we are having the right ideas and testing them out, which is exactly what research consists of doing. It is really research and not the peddling sort of stuff that I have alluded to.

It would seem, then, that if teaching is real teaching—that is, getting people on their toes and getting them to use their minds and not simply to suck something in—we can only do it if we are doing

the same thing ourselves. If we are doing that, we are already on the way to doing research. All we need is just a little more testing and the time to write things down. And there the various proposals for time off come in.

DR. G. A. CURRIE (*Western Australia*): It is with great pleasure that I have listened to the discussion, and I do not propose to take up your time in making lengthy remarks on it. We had the whole matter wrapped up very nicely for us by the last two speakers, my colleagues from Melbourne and from Leicester, who did rather better than I did, in coming back to what I found as the essence of my study of this subject in the beginning that it is the *imaginative pursuit of learning* as between the teacher and the taught which really matters.

To take those who spoke in turn, the first gave us a delightful integration of the parts to be played by a University teacher and his students and teaching and research. To his mind—put over to us so very pleasantly—the statistical possibilities were doubtful. With him I, too, doubt the possibility of having perfect statistics, but a University administrator must know the principles which guide him in this matter, and statistics, however imperfect, are a help in framing these.

Is research a proper function of the University? If it is we must find the material means for its expression. That is the administrator's job.

The next speaker, Professor Mountain, had a question on library facilities. There again we see the material need to have library facilities and laboratory facilities. That means money and it is the administrator's job to see if money for these things can be provided.

I think a nice brick was dropped by Professor Innis about the efficiency of administrators and their selection. I cannot tell him about their selection in various countries, but Australian staffs have—though at long range—a definite part to play in the selection of their Vice-Chancellors. I do not say they are successful, any more than others might be, in that selection, but it is so. And I would say to him that any administrator who would try to impose rigid conditions upon his staff would be a very poor administrator. In Australia, anyhow, his attempt at imposition would have no effect.

I would also say that the job of an administrator—and I am sorry to preach—is to enable his institution to produce in the largest quantity and in the best quality that which it is supposed to be producing, namely learning. He enters into the picture only as an *enabler*; that is his job. Anybody who tries to impose a rigid structure on the institution he is administrating or to make a machine of it is not a good administrator. He must be watching all the time for his opportunity to assist the students, research workers and teachers, in

fact the people who do the real work, to get the means to do their jobs as they would wish to. That is all he is there for—to enable his institution and all the people in it to produce learning.

Dr. Dustoor made a very able and brilliant speech about University teachers being required to publish in order to keep their jobs, hard paper and soft paper being amusingly introduced. Again I would say that no University I have heard of in this country, or in any country of the British Commonwealth, has pressure put upon it to make men do unessential things such as publishing even soft paper they do not want to. It is again a matter of stimulus, the inspirational atmosphere, that is the thing rather than compulsion and there can be no forcing of research on unwilling teachers.

Professor Jones, my colleague from Queensland, made one very good point amongst others about the researcher being naturally a teacher, even if he may not have the best technique for it.

The balance put by Vice-Chancellor Davie, Cape Town, I think, fitted into the general picture which we have already painted, and so did that of the head of the Hebrew University. Reference was also made to the distinction between science and the arts. This was knit together by Professor Humphreys of Leicester when he so ably emphasized the imaginative approach to learning. It is true that in the arts research is of a different character from science, but it fits quite well into the general principle.

Finally, I just want to thank those who supported me but more particularly those who put another point of view, because it is only by that general discussion that we can get stimulus for new ideas and better material to shape our own. A University is big enough to work as a free experimental democracy. I think it is an ideal democracy in unstable equilibrium, so that influences from all sides are continually acting upon it and continually working for a philosophy that is never fixed nor can be. The administrator must be looking at all times for the opportunity to provide the material means, the time and the money to let the students and staff do the things they want to do for the University's best well-being.

To do that he also must continually strive for the best philosophy, which will interpret the true duties and spirit of the University so that he also can serve it best.

**THE CHAIRMAN:** I am sure you would wish to thank Dr. Currie, and I do so on your behalf.



*Friday, 23 July*



## DISCUSSION

### 1. GENERAL PLANS FOR COLONIAL HIGHER EDUCATION

### 2. THE EXTENSION OF THE UNIVERSITY SECONDMENT SCHEME

*Chairman:* PROFESSOR D. HUGHES PARRY, Vice-Chancellor of the University of London and Chairman of the Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals

#### 1. GENERAL PLANS FOR COLONIAL HIGHER EDUCATION

THE CHAIRMAN: Both at Bristol and at Oxford we have noticed with much regret the absence of a distinguished veteran Vice-Chancellor, Sir James Irvine. As Chairman of the Inter-University Council for Higher Education in the Colonies he would have been the natural person to open the discussion today. He had been invited to do so and he had accepted the invitation, but unfortunately he is prevented by indisposition from being with us. In this circumstance, the Vice-Chairman of the Inter-University Council, Sir Alexander Carr-Saunders, has been invited to open the discussion.

Sir Alexander's contributions to the furtherance of Higher Education in the Colonies have been many and important. The University of London has developed certain special relations with some of the University Colleges in the Colonies. Sir Alexander is the Chairman of the Special Committee that is charged with the practical implications of the implementation of the special relationships; and in that capacity we value greatly the work that he has done in the University. But I am quite certain you would agree with me that his greatest contribution must be the part he has played in preparing the report of the Commission on University Education in Malaya, and I am quite certain that you would wish me, on your behalf, to congratulate him on that work and on the favourable reception that the report has already received, both in Malaya and in this country.

After calling on Sir Alexander to open the discussion, I intend then to call upon two Principals of Colonial University Colleges to take part in the discussion, and I propose to ask Professor Lillian Penson if she will conclude the discussion.

I now call on Sir Alexander Carr-Saunders to open the discussion.

SIR ALEXANDER CARR-SAUNDERS (*Vice-Chairman of the Inter-University Council for Higher Education in the Colonies*): Mr. Chairman, in the circumstances which you have described, it falls to me this morning

to do what Sir James Irvine could have done so much better. It falls to me to open this discussion on the plans for higher education in the Colonies.

I think that in this context higher education can be taken to mean education at University level. I propose to follow the example of Sir Hector Hetherington who, when two days ago he was introducing the discussion on inter-University relations, said he would take the desirability of those relations for granted and would confine himself to a discussion of how to implement them. Equally I propose to take the desirability of education at University level in the Colonies for granted—I think I can do so before this audience, though I do not think one could do so everywhere—and to confine myself to a brief exposition of the plans now laid and in operation.

There are in the colonial territories at the present moment two Universities—the Royal University of Malta and the University of Hong Kong. Between them they provide University facilities for some two million people. If the recommendations of the report on Malaya are implemented, there will soon be a third University in colonial territories serving another six million. That will leave many more millions in colonial territories without these facilities—twenty-three or twenty-four millions in Nigeria alone. When I say ‘without these facilities’, I do not forget the gallant but small-scale efforts that have been made by those responsible for the Colleges at Fourah Bay, Sierra Leone, and at Codrington in the West Indies.

There are to be five University Colleges in the Colonies under these plans: one in the West Indies in Jamaica, one in the Gold Coast, and one in Nigeria; these three colleges are to be new foundations. The fourth, to be at Kampala in Uganda, serving the territories of Uganda, Kenya, Tanganyika, and Zanzibar, is not a new foundation. Makerere College has existed at Kampala for some time. It is part of the plan to raise it to the status of a University College. The fifth centre is at Khartoum, where Gordon College has existed also for many years. But here there is a slight anomaly. Strictly speaking, I am going beyond my terms of reference in referring to anything in the Sudan, because the Sudan is not a Colony. On the other hand, this plan extends to the Sudan in the same measure as to the colonial territories. There is one difference which I will refer to later between the position of the University College in the Sudan and the University Colleges elsewhere. That difference relates to the matter of finance.

These Colleges are to be independent corporations set up by Royal Charter or by legislation. Whichever method is adopted makes no difference. Their Constitutions are to be those now normal in a University in this country of modern type, and I would refer to two

features in these constitutions. The first is that there is to be a Council or final ultimate governing authority so composed that no one interest is predominant. On the Council there will be representatives of the academic staff, making a quarter to one-third of the membership, representatives drawn from local professional life, and representatives of the legislatures concerned. As to the latter—the representatives of the legislatures—they are not there to control these Colleges on behalf of the Governments. They are there in their private capacities, and it is hoped that things will work out as described by Sir Ivor Jennings two mornings ago in Ceylon. There can be, by the nature of things, no University Grants Committee in the Colonies. The Colleges must look to the Governments for their funds, and it is hoped that the representatives of the Governments, by their presence on the Council, will learn how the Colleges are working, will come to understand their needs and sympathize with their aspirations, and that when the time arrives for asking the Governments for help these representatives will put the case to the Governments for financial assistance of that kind. The other notable feature in these constitutions is the existence of an Academic Board, composed wholly of the members of the staff, which will have final power to determine all academic questions, questions such as those relating to syllabuses and the granting of degrees. There will be other bodies normal to Universities or University Colleges—faculties, boards of studies, and so on—but I need not refer to them.

You will see that these Colleges, with one important exception, will be very like a University. Given relatively small changes, such as the institution of the office of Chancellor, the transformation of the Principal into a Vice-Chancellor and of the Academic Board into a Senate, and you have a University, except that there is no degree-giving power. It is intended that they shall have such a power later on and that they shall become Universities in the full sense of the word. No one can say how long it must take for that step to be justifiable, but it is clearly in view.

Meanwhile, there is a gap to be filled, because teaching will be at University level. The students will need to work for degrees, and therefore something must be done to enable them to gain degrees. It is proposed to fill the gap in this way. The University of London has powers to grant external degrees: that is, degrees to persons who have not studied at London Colleges. Where they have studied—or, indeed, if they have studied at any place of formal education at all—is irrelevant; they sit for London University examinations and get their degrees if they pass. London makes wide use of these powers. It conducts external examinations in many countries of the world, including the colonies. At the present moment the syllabuses are,

with slight variations, everywhere the same. But there is no reason why these syllabuses should be everywhere the same, and London proposes to take advantage of that fact in the following way. London is prepared to receive applications from the Colonial Colleges to enter into 'special relations'. Before any College is accepted into 'special relations', London will need to know that certain conditions are fulfilled as, for example, that the Colleges have constitutions appropriate to a body of University status, that the teaching is adequate in range and quality, and that in general the status of the body is that of a University institution. Satisfied as to that, London will accept a College into 'special relations' and will then hold discussions with the College with the object of devising syllabuses and degree arrangements appropriate to the needs of the territories and of the students. Special degree courses will in this way be instituted.

When it comes to the matter of examinations, the staffs of the Colleges will be invited to participate in the setting of papers and in the marking of scripts, though the University of London must retain entirely in its own hands the giving of degrees, since no University could depute that power to any other body. Two points I might perhaps just add to that description. First, only the registered students of these Colleges will be able to sit for this form of external examination. The second point is that the ordinary London external system is not superseded. It remains as it was. All that will happen will be the creation of an extra facility within the London external system.

Such, in very bare outline, is the plan for the constitution of the Colleges and for the manner in which the students will be able to work for degrees. Now a brief word on the finances of these Colleges. They will have to look to their Governments for all recurrent expenditure, but in respect of capital a sum of six million pounds has been set aside from the Colonial Development and Welfare Fund to assist these Colleges in the matter of capital expenditure. The Colonial University Grants Committee has been set up, of which Sir Hector Hetherington is Chairman, and that committee advises the Secretary of State on the allocation of the six millions as between the Colleges. The Colleges will need more than that sum of money for their capital requirements, no doubt, but the six millions is a substantial help. Here comes the difference between Gordon College in the Sudan and the others, because the Sudan, being a condominium with Egypt and not a colonial territory, is not eligible for assistance under the Colonial Development and Welfare Fund.

The Colleges need advice and help in many matters, and to give them this help the Inter-University Council for Higher Education in the Colonies was set up two years ago. It consists of representatives of all the Universities in the United Kingdom, together with some

co-opted members. This committee is in close and active relations with the Colleges. It nominates members to the councils of the Colleges—two members to each council. It sends out visiting delegations to advise the College on the spot and report to the Council at home. One very important function of this Council is that it offers to assist in the finding of staff; it is ready to advertise posts, to interview candidates and to make recommendations. It advises on salaries and grading if asked to do so. It has a special officer to deal with library problems at these Colleges. That was made possible by the generous assistance of the Carnegie Corporation of America. It is ready to assist with problems of lay-out and buildings, the problem of superannuation, and, indeed, with anything on which the Colleges might need advice.

The Principals of several of the Colleges are present here this morning, and they will, I hope, tell you how these plans are operating in regard to the Colleges of which they have charge and what their problems are. I propose to say very little more, but I would add a word on two subjects. First of all, these plans are not just plans on paper. They were only made a very short time ago, but they are being actively put into operation. Where no College existed the land has already been acquired. I believe in the case of Ibadan in Nigeria and again in the Gold Coast the land extends in each case to five square miles which at least in this crowded country is something that makes one envious. Where there are no buildings architects have been engaged and are at work while teaching is going on at temporary quarters. Where there are buildings they are being enlarged.

But there is the subject—and this is the point on which I want to say a word more—of staff. In regard to staff we, of course, touch the point which is critical for the whole future of these Colleges, because the success of this enterprise will depend on finding staff for them adequate in number and in quality. Now, it is here that the Universities of the Commonwealth can assist. As time goes on, the Colleges will be increasingly staffed from local candidates. Eventually, they will be mostly so staffed. But for many years to come, they must look elsewhere for most of their teachers, and especially for those who are going to occupy the higher posts.

This being so, and in the hope of soliciting the interest of the Universities, I might say something about the conditions of work and the opportunities offered. To begin with, as I have said, those who go there will find Colleges organized as Universities with full academic freedom, the teachers determining all academic issues. The grading of the staff will be as is normal here. Salaries will be fully equivalent to those in our Universities for corresponding grades, and they will carry superannuation rights. Arrangements for home leave will be

generous. It is laid down that teaching must not take the time that should be given to research. In short, salaries and conditions will be as good as elsewhere in the University world. But those thinking of seeking a post in one of these Colleges will need to be satisfied not merely about terms of service but also about opportunities.

The opportunities for research are abundant. It is, of course, the case that the tools for research have yet to be put in their place and provided in adequate amount; I am thinking of laboratory accommodation and of libraries. But steps are being actively taken to ensure that the tools of research will be there. Of course, it is true that in the natural sciences the opportunities for fundamental research will not be very good, at least for some time. But in many—indeed most—other aspects of research in the natural sciences the opportunities are most attractive. I think that is also true for the social sciences, certainly it is true for linguistics. In the arts subjects in the more conventional sense of the word the opportunities differ a good deal from place to place in fields such as history, archaeology, and so on. But in general the opportunities for research are most inviting.

Then as to teaching. It will be, as I explained, at degree level. There can be no doubt whatever about the great keenness and enthusiasm of colonial students for University work. There is no reason whatever to think that there is less latent ability among them than elsewhere. There are difficulties—difficulties which are present now but which will pass—such as the inadequate teaching in the schools, leading to inadequate preparation for University life. There is the difficulty which is in itself rather a challenge—the problem created by the difference between the home background of the students and the atmosphere of a modern University. But the chief difficulty, and this is what I am going to conclude with, is that of the isolation of these Colleges.

They are far away from other institutions of higher learning. The people who share the interests of members of the staff in the general population are few and far between. Isolation is certainly a serious drawback, and it does deter a good many suitable candidates, I think, from applying. Some of these difficulties will diminish, especially with the granting of generous leave and the modern facilities for travel. But there is one point about isolation to which I particularly want to refer. The man ambitious to have an academic career may hesitate to take a post in a Colonial College because it seems to imply, if not leaving the academic world, at least going to live on the fringe of it. He may fear that he will not have chances of promotion elsewhere, partly because being far away he will not be personally known and may not be interviewed, and partly because he may think he is joining an inferior sort of institution. What is important, in my

judgement, is that these Colleges should be, so to speak, incorporated within the University society of the Commonwealth. If the Commonwealth Universities here represented could come to know about these Colleges, to learn about them, to be interested in them, and to follow their fortunes, it would do more than anything else, I believe, to solve the staffing problem. I have spoken of the staffing problem as though it was a matter of what one might call the permanent staff, but the Universities of this country have agreed to facilitate the secondment of their members for a period of two or three years at a time to teaching posts in these Colleges. To the extent to which that can be done it will be very beneficial to both sides. I only hope that the Universities of the Dominions may be willing to do the same.

I have indicated very briefly the plans. I have stressed what seems to me to be the most important point—that of staffing. There are difficulties and disadvantages in an academic life of this kind, and I have not attempted to disguise them. But there are very great opportunities—first in the realm of research, secondly in the building up of these colonial communities to a point where they can stand on their own feet and enter into the society of nations as equals. I do suggest that these difficulties might present themselves to our potential University teachers as challenges. We need to have promising graduates from the Universities in sufficient numbers who would like to take a hand in this enterprise. But if they are to do so, they must hear about the Colleges, and perhaps one result of this Congress may be to spread the knowledge of the existence of these Colleges and their needs, and so stimulate men and women of the right type to come forward and assist in their work.

MR. L. C. WILCHER (*Gordon Memorial College, Khartoum*): I welcome this opportunity to testify on behalf of those who are engaged in this work in a full-time professional—by which I mean executive—capacity. Perhaps it may emphasize the all-Commonwealth nature of the task if I tell you that until a very short time ago I was, *pace* the House of Lords, an Australian national.

It would be churlish of me if I were to start in any other way than by paying a heartfelt tribute to the work of the Inter-University Council. That Council is an outstanding example, if I may say so, of that noble British tradition of voluntary service, a tradition whereby it is obligatory for men and women of standing not only to work without pay *pro bono publico* but to do it to the best of their ability. I am aware that University people are apt to be so glutted with committee work as to be incapable of refusing another helping, but I do not think this explains, or can even begin to explain, the enthusiasm of the members of the Inter-University Council. I feel that their

devotion can only be explained by a recognition of the fascination and importance of the problems with which they are concerned. But even then I find it almost incredible for people like Sir Alexander, Sir James Irvine, Dr. Priestley, Professor Penson, Miss Perham, and all their colleagues to devote not only so much time but so much creative attention to the work of the Council. And with that behind us those who are struggling in the field feel confident indeed.

Sir Alexander said that he felt it was unnecessary to say anything about the desirability of this work. But I must confess that when, by an accident which I still do not wholly understand, I was called to take part in the venture, I had very considerable doubts indeed. At that stage many of those doubts, of course—or most of those doubts—were personal. But behind the personal doubts lay the basic question: Was this work likely to be genuinely rewarding, not in the financial sense, but in the real sense? At that stage, you see, I did not know the Sudanese. I had no feelings about or towards them, and I could only think of the question in the abstract. And I rather imagine that most of you can only see it in the abstract this morning—that you can only ask yourselves, is it really serving a good purpose to be taking the somewhat dubious gift of higher education to an undeveloped and therefore relatively happy people? I am not one of the people who peers into the future and professes to be able to answer a question like that, but what I can say, after eighteen months' work in the Sudan, is that the actual performance of the task is as warming and sustaining as anything could possibly be. There are many reasons for that. But perhaps to me at all events the most important reason is to be found in the character and outlook of the Sudanese people themselves. They are a grand people, polite, humorous, manly, and self-respecting, as only the inheritors of a great cultural tradition can be. It is impossible to work among them without sharing their conviction that higher education is going to provide their country with a new and happier destiny. They may, as some people are inclined to say, value higher education for the wrong, that is to say, political and material, reasons, but as an Australian I must confess that I find it difficult to condemn people who look forward to the social and cultural development of their country for that kind of reason.

Gordon College, as Sir Alexander has indicated, is the descendant of a secondary school, a secondary school which was established almost while the mopping-up operations after the Battle of Omdurman were going on. The first thing Kitchener did when the battle was done was to open a subscription list for a school, and the school took shape thanks to the response of the people in this country to this appeal at the very dawn of this century, and it was given a name

which I think was entirely appropriate, the name of General Gordon—not because Gordon was a great although somewhat wayward genius, but because he was the first westerner who had genuinely worked for the welfare of the Sudanese people. And that name, I think, does suggest a kind of obligation which the west owes to the colonial peoples who have been engulfed in its own expansion. The presence of so many Indians and others today makes it clear that this is not the first time that the west recognized obligations in that way, but in Africa the west came later, and this was the first development in that direction.

The College has inherited the name, the grounds, and the building of that secondary school. It has also inherited the work of a small group of higher schools which were established approximately ten years ago, and it is now an actively functioning organization at the University level. We are already in special relationship with the University of London. In the schools of arts and science a number of students are already studying for London degrees, and on that point I should like to say how fortunate it is for these colonial institutions that there exists in this country a great Federal University capable of fathering and mothering and wet-nursing the small struggling institutions.

I had certain doubts about the University of London to begin with. I was not 'redbrick', at least, in my education in this country, and I had certain doubts. Those doubts have completely gone. The University of London is indeed doing us proud. It is not only extremely efficient in all its dealings with us, but it listens sympathetically to every suggestion we make about syllabuses and examinations and so on. It has admitted us to full participation in the examinations which are being conducted under the special relationship system. Our own teachers are taking part in these examinations, and they are not, therefore, external examinations in the worst sense of the word.

Despite the good service that London is giving us, however, we do aim at becoming a full University as soon as is humanly possible. We feel that to make the College a truly national institution we must make it capable of standing squarely on its own feet as quickly as we can—say in ten or fifteen years, or even in less than ten years if that can be done.

This is unquestionably going to cost a great deal of money. Already this College, which has fewer, though not many fewer, than 300 students, costs annually over £150,000 to run. We have planned further buildings which will cost something like £600,000 in the next ten years. A very small proportion of the money can come from outside. In point of fact, we have an endowment of one million which came from His Majesty's Government, and that yields about one-fifth of our annual expenditure. The rest comes from the taxpayer of

one of the poorest and least developed countries in the world, from peasant cultivators and nomadic tribesmen; and they too must yield the £600,000 which our building scheme will cost.

I am not looking towards anyone in particular in mentioning these facts, but I do suggest that here is a legitimate field of enterprise for the great foundations which exist to further the cause of higher education.

The problem undoubtedly, as Sir Alexander has said, which must be solved if these colleges are to do their job properly and if, in particular, the Gordon College is to achieve its own ambition of becoming a University quickly, the major problem, is the problem of staff. I am not a pessimist on that problem: it is clear already from our own experience that people in this country are prepared to respond to the challenge which this work does present. But there is undoubtedly in the minds of many who perhaps see the advertisements some measure of doubt, particularly on the score of research but also on the score that if they come to this place and work there they may not get back. I do sincerely hope in that connexion that the colonial institutions will be able to share in the arrangements which will doubtless follow this conference as between the full Universities of the British Commonwealth—arrangements for the exchange and interchange of staff and young teachers and so on. I do hope, too, that it will be borne in mind in this matter of secondment. I do not think secondment can meet more than a proportion of our teaching needs, but it can meet a very important proportion. If those of you who are executive heads of Universities throughout the British Commonwealth do receive appeals from not only Gordon College but all the other institutions for assistance in this regard, I hope you will not be stony-hearted. I think that is enough, and may I say once again I have indeed welcomed this opportunity of trying to put this small, struggling but extremely worthwhile College on the map.

DR. K. MELLANBY (*Ibadan*): I should like to say first how grateful I am to the organizers of this conference for giving me and my colleagues from the six embryonic University institutions an opportunity of attending this and the previous conference at Bristol, so that we have been able to bring to the notice of the developed Universities of the Commonwealth the existence of our institutions. As Mr. Wilcher said, we shall be dependent very much on the help and co-operation of the other Universities, and it is very important, therefore, that we should make ourselves fully known.

I have to be brief, but I think I might first of all just remind you a little of the geography of Nigeria. Nigeria is the largest colony—it is just north of the Equator—in Africa, and it contains a population

which has not been properly estimated but is sometimes assessed as being as much as 30 million. Therefore it probably contains at least two-fifths of the population of the whole of the Colonial Empire. For that reason, it is a very great responsibility that we have there in developing higher education.

The people of Nigeria are not simply being forced into higher education. There is a great deal of interest in the country in the development of a University institution. That interest sometimes takes rather embarrassing and rather uninformed directions, but I think we can say that our local press gives proportionately more space to questions about the University than any other press in the world. Those of you who are familiar with the newspapers of Nigeria may not take that as a compliment. But at any rate the interest is there, and it is our duty, I think, to educate that interest as well as educating the people of the country.

Our Constitution, which has much in common with that of other places, has been outlined to you by Sir Alexander Carr-Saunders. I would just mention that, due to the various commissions which have studied the problems of higher education in the Colonies, the work of the Inter-University Council and of the Special Relations Committee of the London University, we ought to be starting with the best possible conditions. Various speeches at this Congress have shown the necessity for vigilance regarding independence, for the conditions of service, for the possibility of transferring staff from one place to another, and all of these things have been borne in mind in the Ordinance setting up the College in Nigeria and in the arrangements for conditions of service. So if anything is imperfect, the fault should lie upon those of us who are trying to make the arrangements.

On the question of finance, as you have been told, we are hoping to get a very large slice of the Colonial Welfare and Development money earmarked for higher education. Of course, people in Nigeria always feel we are not getting as much as we ought to do when we consider the enormous population of the country. We feel that it is obviously our due to get at least half of any fund going to the whole of the Colonial Empire. Then there is no doubt that the country is doing its best to meet its own share of the expense. The Legislative Council of Nigeria has made a quinquennial grant for the first five years of £500,000 at the rate of £100,000 per annum to get things going, and the whole question will be reconsidered at the end of five years. In addition to that they have produced a sort of nest egg, or endowment, of a quarter of a million pounds and suggest that should be increased to one million pounds from local funds in the next few years in the hope that it would be considerably expanded from other sources. One reason why they were keen on the endowment

fund was to enable us to have as much independence as possible. Others have discussed the question of whether it is possible for a University to remain properly independent if all its funds are coming from local revenue, and it appears that in most cases it is possible. But I think everyone agreed that there was a danger, and that has been felt by the Government of Nigeria, and in order that we should be really independent they have started this endowment fund from which they hope that a substantial part of our revenue will come, and which will be completely under our own control. The fees which can come from a country like Nigeria are not likely to be a particularly substantial part of the running costs of the University College—though they are not nowadays a very substantial part of the running costs of any college. But we are proposing to start by charging fees which will be met either by the students or by various other funds which are being set up. It is very gratifying to see the great local interest which is typified by the way in which various bodies throughout Nigeria are producing money and putting it at the disposal of the College to pay for scholarships. The Academic Board of the College will award the scholarships and then the Board will be reimbursed by the local organizations.

There is a great deal I could say about the College, but there is not a great deal of time. We are already engaged in degree-teaching in certain subjects in arts and science. We are proceeding with our medical school. In October we think we will have a body of rather over two hundred undergraduates, and we expect an annual intake of about a hundred in the next few years. We are at present working in temporary buildings which have certain advantages over permanent buildings in that if we suddenly have the need for another laboratory we can at least put up a wooden or a mud building in the next few days, without having to wait the time one does for a permanent one. But we do not want somebody to write about us as 'mudbrick' University, and plans are going ahead to get on with the proper permanent buildings at the earliest possible date. Our architects, as Sir Alexander told you, are getting ahead with the plans.

As I said at an earlier meeting, we hope that when arrangements are being made for visits of young postgraduate workers and University teachers we will not be forgotten, and that where we have facilities for them, people will send them to us. We do depend very much on the help and co-operation of Commonwealth Universities, and I am sure that we can rely on that in our development.

THE CHAIRMAN: The discussion is now open.

MR. H. R. RAIKES (*Witwatersrand*): I want very rapidly to make

just three points. In the first place, I very much hope that these young medical schools in Central Africa will make sure that their students make the widest possible use of local clinical experience in their training. I feel sure that their first degree should be taken in Central Africa.

The second point I want to make is that you should bear in mind that dentistry must be developed side by side with medicine. It is very unfortunate that in most Universities dentistry has only been brought under the cloak of the University at a much later date than medicine and as a result the dentists tend to feel that they are considered to be an inferior type of being to doctors. It would be the very greatest pity if that feeling spread to Central Africa. The dentist must be considered at all times the equal of the medical man and if medical training is necessary in Central Africa, as I am sure it is, dentistry is quite equally important.

My University has already established fairly close relations with Makerere. We have already provided two members of the staff and we have established close connexions which must be developed if we in Johannesburg are to bring our nutritional research to a satisfactory conclusion.

Finally, during the late war we in Johannesburg established the practice of bringing down from the Middle East distinguished surgeons and physicians who were there as consultants to the British and Allied armies to act as external examiners in our final examinations in Johannesburg. Those visits have proved to be of very great importance, and we hope to bring people out from England in the future from time to time. It would be perfectly possible, provided the examiner is willing to spend the additional time, for him to stop off between two flying boats at Khartoum and at Kampala and to visit the medical schools there. I do not see any necessity for him, at this stage, to attend the final examinations. It would be quite sufficient for him to gain a proper appreciation of the position by meeting the staff and the students, so that there would not be any need for them to time the final examinations in connexion with ours in Johannesburg. I would, however, point out that our examinations come in November, so that these visits would have to be paid either in November, or at the beginning of December, when the examiner is on his return journey.

Probably some of those concerned with the Central African medical schools know that in Johannesburg we have been training non-European doctors for the last eight years. They have been trained in the same classes as Europeans except for the clinical work, which must of necessity be done on non-European patients, and we are now graduating about eleven or twelve non-Europeans every year. It is,

however, now proposed by the Government to establish a new medical school at Durban. In all probability in order that there may be sufficient student material for Durban we shall stop training non-Europeans so as to support the Durban school. That is as far as undergraduate work is concerned.

I am most confident that we shall be able to provide very good postgraduate instruction at our two new non-European hospitals which between them in the very near future will have over two thousand beds entirely devoted to non-European patients and staff on a full-time basis. We shall hope to develop postgraduate teaching at these two hospitals and we shall welcome postgraduate students from Central Africa if they should wish to come to us.

DR. E. G. MALHERBE (*Natal*): A large proportion of the students in the University of Natal are non-Europeans (Africans, Indians, and coloured). In fact, I think I am in my institution responsible for dealing with the largest single group of non-European University students in Africa. I should, therefore, also like to support the general idea that has been put before us here this morning, viz. the advancement of University training in the Colonies, and particularly in Africa.

You probably know that at the last U.N.E.S.C.O. Conference great stress was laid on the importance of increasing mass literacy all over the world. This, of course, is a very big problem for Africa. We have, however, a responsibility at the other end of the scale (i.e. in higher education) which is, I think, equally important. To make these people merely literate is a somewhat dangerous process if you do not at the same time provide for the leadership, *the enlightened leadership*, of these people. It is not the same problem as it was in England when people pleaded for elementary education a hundred or more years ago. The problem is fraught with greater dangers today than those which caused many of our forebears to object to education of the masses. Today, with the modern means of reaching the masses through the press and through the radio, they are exposed to propaganda in a way that they were not exposed a hundred or two hundred years ago when the fight for elementary education was fought in this country. Consequently, our task is to see to it that when we develop literates they are also made propaganda-proof, so to speak.

We are all aware of the regrettable fact that the growing child very readily picks up swear words first from his elders. Similarly, when a primitive people comes into contact with another civilization, with the Western civilization particularly, as they do, often through the products from Hollywood, they tend to pick up the least essential

elements and somewhat undesirable elements of our Western civilization. For example, they think that to go about at night in evening dress and have entertainments with wine, women, and so on is the essence of Western civilization, instead of merely the frills. The essentials of civilization which are based on hard, honest work, they fail to grasp. Thus they do not appreciate the importance of those human activities which underlie the maintenance of health, sound agriculture, engineering achievements such as the building of roads and bridges, and an effective form of social organization and government.

Unless literacy enables these peoples to gain an appreciation of the foundations and underlying values of Western civilization, it may do more harm than good. It will merely plough the virgin fields and prepare them for others, e.g. Communists, to come along and sow their seeds therein.

Above all we must see to it that they have the right leaders, men trained from amongst their own people, and who enjoy the confidence of their people. An essential part of their training must be in the fundamentals of Western civilization. An appreciation of the ideological issues at stake can best be given at Universities. Therefore it is in the Universities in the colonies that we must build up our security and surest defence against ideologies which signify the death knell of those ideals which we hold most precious.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think it might be better to adjourn after the next contribution, and perhaps it may be possible to join the two discussions after the opening addresses on secondment.

DR. J. W. DAVIDSON (*Victoria University College, Wellington, New Zealand [University Lecturer in History, Cambridge]*): I represent New Zealand, but what I wish to say arises rather from the fact that I teach and live in this country. It is mainly one point that I want to try to bring home to those who have not come into very close contact with the problems of colonial Universities.

All of us who are interested in the subject have been stimulated and encouraged by the imagination which has been shown in the last few years by those in this country who have been planning the establishment of the new Colonial Colleges. But there is one point, which continually needs emphasizing; how little the Inter-University Council or any of us can, in the long run, direct the future of Colonial Universities.

It seems to me that the two conclusions which we can draw from the discussions of the last two days are relatively simple ones. We saw from our discussion of the relations between the University and the

State that there was no easy solution other than the creation in the community, and particularly among its leaders, of sympathy for and understanding of, the role that a University has to play. Similarly, in regard to the problems of teaching and research and to those of the relation of arts and science we saw there was no solution other than by creating in each University a community of live minds in which the teachers were also learners and in which every individual approached his subject with a due sense of its place in relation to a larger whole.

We have seen, too, how in practice the relations of State and University have been controlled. Dr. Currie has told us of the necessity in his University for keeping on good terms with the Government of Western Australia, and Sir Ivor Jennings has told us how he obtains money for the University of Ceylon. Those were not the records of mere expediency but statements of things that are good in themselves in that, on the one hand, they offer political leaders an opportunity to become more fully aware of the University's needs and functions and, on the other, they keep the University more closely in touch with the actual changes in the material interests and preoccupations of the community.

In regard to the new Colonial Colleges the position for the moment is inevitably somewhat different. Because of the backwardness of the colonial communities, Universities must remain for the present partly in the hands of outsiders. Superficially, therefore, the position is different, but fundamentally it remains the same. The Europeans, as outsiders, can be effective only in so far as they realize that the dominating factors still remain the needs and interests of the colonial communities themselves and that all it is in their power to do is to canalize these interests and preoccupations and deflect them a little. Thus we see that, if effective institutions are to be created, there must be no attempt in the colonies to found 'ideal' Universities, based on the conceptions of Europeans brought up in a very different cultural situation. But the temptation is constant and almost irresistible to a European who has power in his hands for the time being, to go beyond this situation: to cease to be the sympathetic interpreter of local points of view and to assume a sort of godlike initiative: to establish institutions that seem to him satisfactory and that place all the emphasis on such matters as the maintenance of standards equivalent to those of European Universities. Such matters seem to him necessary, but they may make far less appeal to the people of the colonies themselves.

To illustrate this last point might I just for a moment refer to the history of the Universities of the Dominions, with which so many of us are connected? Their standards were not equal in earlier days—not

equal or anything like it—to those of English Universities; but, as the people of the Dominions, and specially those of them directly interested in University affairs, realized the necessity of raising standards, standards were raised. And this is the proper basis of progress: for the University's own attainments, and the demands made upon the University by society, to advance together, stimulating and controlling one another.

So far in regard to the colonies it does not seem that the danger of the University Colleges being separated from the local people has been very evident, but there have been one or two signs that it has not been wholly avoided. It was originally proposed, for example, to found one University for the whole of West Africa although the loyalty, even of Africans educated in Europe, is first of all to their own territory. Possibly the decision not to canalize the enthusiasm attaching to Fourah Bay College in Sierra Leone is another. But in all aspects of colonial policy this is a danger, which is always present: that Europeans—whether politicians or administrative officers or educationalists—will lose that imaginative identification with the interests of the community they are serving, which is indispensable to healthy advance.

A few of the members of the Congress may recollect a remark of Robert Lowe, the Victorian statesman: 'You must choose', he said, 'between the Colonial Office and the Colonial Empire. You cannot keep them both.' To apply that remark now would be, I think, to caricature the situation. But there is still an unhappy if small element of truth in it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Before we adjourn I should like to suggest that, if thought fit and proper, we pass a comprehensive resolution of sincere and warm appreciation of the magnificent work of all who have contributed in such full measure to the undoubted success of the Congress. I should like to be allowed a very few minutes to elaborate this text.

First on the list come the organizers of the Congress itself, the Universities Bureau, particularly the Organizing Committee of that Bureau. If I may specially mention Sir Harold Claughton, who was for a time in the Chair, and Dr. Priestley who followed him, and, of course, there is Mr. John Foster himself and the staff, and particularly Mrs. Mahoney, who was seconded for this work. They could not have guaranteed success had they not been helped very considerably by the generosity of, in particular, two great Trusts, namely, the Imperial Relations Trust and the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Both gave princely donations to the travel fund of the Bureau, and we wish to acknowledge with gratitude their contributions. We have

also received contributions from some British companies, such as the Imperial Chemical Industries and Lever Brothers, and we are expecting more.

Next on my list come the University of Oxford and the Colleges, and I must make special mention at this stage of Dr. Veale. I should like to assure representatives of the University of Oxford who are present here that we all agree most cordially with everything that was said last night by those who spoke in praise of our reception here.

I must also acknowledge our indebtedness to His Majesty's Government for their hospitality—and must make special mention of the Lord President of the Council and say how much we appreciated his presence here with us.

I should also like to thank the Mayor and Mayoress of Oxford for their generous hospitality to members of the Congress.

The British Council deserve particularly warm thanks of us for much work done for the success of the Congress at Oxford and for their reception to members of the Congress in London, and also for arranging visits, particularly for our overseas members, to different parts of the country. Finally, I should like to thank the English Speaking Union for their hospitality and assistance at all times, and the Nuffield Foundation for their ready and generous support.

In conclusion I would say, on behalf of my British colleagues, that we have valued very greatly the assistance and co-operation and encouragement of our colleagues from overseas.

DR. D. VEALE (*Registrar, University of Oxford*): May I, on behalf of the Members and the officials at Oxford who have had to take part in arranging this Congress, thank you very much indeed for the kindness with which you have spoken of their contribution to it. Everybody knows that on occasions of this kind the real bulk of the work is done not by the principals who receive the thanks, but by their assistants who at this stage of the proceedings have generally reached what would, nowadays, be diagnosed as a state of near nervous prostration. But speaking for myself, I should like to say that anybody who has had the pleasure of sharing a task with Mr. Foster knows what it is to come under the spell of the enchanter, and I know, speaking for my own personal assistant, Miss Shearer, and her staff, that they have taken no less pleasure in working with Mrs. Mahoney and hers.

In regard to Oxford generally, might I say that it has been a very great delight and honour to us to have this Congress here, and we have never known a Congress which has passed from start to finish in an atmosphere of such friendliness and cheerfulness.

Finally, as I have to go by an early train up to London, may I take

this opportunity for myself of saying a collective adieu to many new friends whom I am prevented from seeing individually.

## 2. THE EXTENSION OF THE UNIVERSITY SECONDMENT SCHEME

**THE CHAIRMAN:** Now it is my very pleasant duty to call on Sir Ronald Adam to open the discussion on our second item this morning. I am not going to take up any of his time except to say we are extremely happy to welcome him here and to recognize the work of the British Council generally and its work in particular in connexion with this Congress.

**GENERAL SIR RONALD FORBES ADAM** (*Chairman of the British Council*): I am very grateful to be given this opportunity by the Congress to mention this subject of the secondment of professors to Universities and Colleges, and I think I am probably the first non-academic speaker to address you from the rostrum.

I should like to start by saying something of the work of the British Council.

It was started in 1934 in a very small way, and chiefly by private subscribers. The real pressure which got it started at that time was the Nazi and Fascist propaganda. The first Chairman was Lord Tyrrell who was followed by Lord Eustace Percy who in turn was followed by Lord Lloyd. It began work mainly in the eastern Mediterranean, the Middle East, the Balkans, and Italy, in the theatre where we wanted to get as many friends as we could. It never had a very large amount of money before the war, and it was during the war years, when a great deal of our work was with the Allied armies, and after the war that the Government subsidies rose to a considerable amount.

The Council's Royal Charter, which was granted in 1940, gives as the objects of the British Council: 'for the purpose of promoting a wider knowledge of Our United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the English language abroad and developing closer cultural relations between Our United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and other countries for the purpose of benefiting the British Commonwealth of Nations.'

Although the Government provides practically all the money and any questions about the Council in Parliament have to be answered by one of three Secretaries of State, depending on where our grant comes from, we have great freedom of control in what we do. An Executive Committee, on which eight members only are official representatives of Government Departments and twenty-two are representatives of Parliament, of Universities, of adult education,

music, art, and science, &c., decides the policy, although we keep close touch with the Government Departments.

Our work falls into three fields. In the Colonial field it is a question of doing the jobs that Government and officials cannot do. For instance, in the West Indies our main task is libraries—parish libraries or island libraries—and connected with the libraries community centres for the Arts.

In the Dominions we are working at present in Australia, India, New Zealand and Pakistan, though in India and Pakistan the work is only just started. We do not go to a Dominion unless we get a direct invitation from the Prime Minister. We try and do what the Dominion asks us to do and our work is mainly in the field of drama, fine arts, or music.

In foreign countries besides the work of the theatre, music, and the arts, one of our main objects is to help in the teaching of the English language. The spreading of the English language in Europe since the war has been astonishing. In Poland, for instance, recently 65 per cent. of the secondary school children were learning it. Sweden, Austria, Portugal now have English as the first foreign language.

Then there are the demands from all over Europe for people who want to come here to study, whether it is town-planning, medicine, surgery, and so on. We have a continuous stream of visitors not only from this side of the Iron Curtain but from behind the Iron Curtain.

In all our work we are dependent on the advice of strong advisory committees. In the University field, we are much helped by Dr. Priestley's Committee, representing all the Universities, which Dr. Morgan spoke about yesterday, and we depend on this Committee to advise us on studentships and professorships, and so on. We have at the present moment—from all over the world—about 400 post-graduate scholars in this country. We are beginning to get a return now for these scholarships. We have offers of about fifty return post-graduate scholarships from the various countries. This process is increasing since the British Government have signed cultural conventions with France, Norway, Czechoslovakia, Belgium, and the Netherlands. As these conventions are signed, matters become more closely tied up, in particular scholarships. The British Government has made us the body that plays the main part in carrying out a cultural convention on behalf of the United Kingdom.

I come now to the subject that is the main object of this discussion and that is the placing of British professors and lecturers in foreign Universities. We feel, of course, that the Universities are the most important field in international ideas, and that in some countries it is the one place where there is still freedom. I have just been to Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary, and I visited nine Univer-

sities. It struck me that there is still great freedom of thought in all those Universities I visited, though this may change any moment. The influence that a good representative of Great Britain with personality can have is very great with professors and particularly with the students.

We now have some fifty-two professors and lecturers in overseas Universities and 75 per cent. are dealing with British life and literature with varying degrees of subsidy. We should like to expand into other fields, such as the law, which is particularly British, medicine, which is of wide interest, and in certain cases we can do a great deal of good for commerce by having professors of engineering as we have in Turkey. But I should put personality first as the most important requirement in any country that I know of. We make it quite clear to lecturers and professors that their first loyalty is to their University.

The suggestion that we should ask the Commonwealth Universities to help in this scheme at the present time is not a new idea, because we have actually at the present moment a lecturer in Holland provided by Eire. India provided us with a lecturer in China. But I should like to say a word about the value to the Commonwealth of these Chairs. The Universities will get a great deal out of some of them. The opportunities for research are good. For instance, Charles University is probably the only place where you can really study the Slav languages at the present moment, and the opportunities of learning the life and thought of a European country are great.

We know the difficulty of the present time in all Universities, but the numbers will not be very many at one time. We should very warmly welcome any assistance we can get in finding either lecturers or professors from the Commonwealth to hold these posts anywhere in the world. Our greatest number is now in Europe—twenty-six. We have, however, some in China, some in the Middle East, some in South America—so the demand is world-wide.

I do not think the numbers will increase appreciably though there may be a further demand from German Universities.

PROFESSOR A. R. HUMPHREYS (*Leicester*): This is a point which does not directly concern secondment as such, but I think it may very well affect recruitment for the British Council and possibly for the Colonial Universities too. In the case of secondment it may be that with the larger Universities it is comparatively easy for members of staff to serve the British Council or Colonial Universities for a short period of years and their return is guaranteed. They know exactly where they are. I am thinking rather of another category: the man who would like to do work for the British Council or a Colonial University

but who may perhaps be under the necessity of leaving his own University post to do so. I am not going into autobiography, but that was my own case. I was willing at one stage to do some University work for the British Council abroad, and I was under the necessity, since my own University could not second me, of leaving it. The main difficulty, of course, with which anybody in that position is faced is that he may very possibly find it difficult to return, and I think that this is a very considerable natural deterrent in the case of a man who would otherwise be only too happy to work for a Colonial University or the British Council.

Along with that there goes the consideration that Universities here, when appointing to their own staffs, are finding it increasingly necessary to cast their nets wider and wider. At Leicester we have fairly recently angled for a member of the British Council staff and also for a teacher in an American University.

My suggestion is simply that when effect is given to the discussions in the first meeting on Inter-University relationships and when in line with those discussions information about posts at home is circulated, as was suggested in the discussion, from a central office in Great Britain and a central office in the Dominions, something should also be done to enable staffs of Colonial Universities to hear about such posts here as they may validly be candidates for, and also members of the teaching staff of the British Council whose tenure may perhaps be coming to an end. They may have worked for four or five years for the British Council. I am suggesting this not as a means, though it might sound like that, of depleting the British Council staff or the staffs of Colonial Universities. I do not think that would be the effect at all. It would simply mean that one of the deterrents in applying for such posts would be removed if a man appointed to them knew that he would receive full information in good time of vacancies at home for which he might be qualified. I think to that extent it would remove one difficulty in recruitment.

SIR LEON SIMON (*Hebrew University of Jerusalem*): When a lecturer or professor is appointed to a foreign University is he expected to lecture in the language of the country to which he goes?

SIR RONALD ADAM (*British Council*): No, that is certainly not necessary. Some of our lecturers do, but in most countries you find students who understand English very well indeed. It is not essential for a lecturer to know the language.

THE REV. PROFESSOR C. E. RAVEN (*Cambridge*): I wonder if I might put two questions because I have come across what may be misunder-

standing—at any rate a certain measure of criticism—in regard to them.

The first is the suggestion made very strongly by some of my colleagues who know the conditions overseas, that in most cases the work which representatives of the British Council are doing is teaching commercial English. How far is the sort of work for which posts are being offered really of academic standing at all? I do not want to criticize specific posts, but that is an objection which I have heard raised a good many times—that men are sent overseas for this work and then they find that there is really no opportunity for doing anything on their own level at all.

The second is more general—the criticism raised in meetings of Vice-Chancellors and elsewhere, that such work is in itself not strictly academic but propagandist; that what is really wanted in the British Council is to ‘sell Britain’. So long as that suspicion continues it is difficult, I think, to persuade most of our keen younger men that this is a legitimate exercise of academic freedom. May I just ask that an answer should be given on these two points?

SIR RONALD ADAM (*British Council*): I think, on the first point, that that has been true in the past. The difficulty in Europe, when we first went back there after the war—with the European Universities in the state they were in and the little knowledge we had—made it inevitable that a number of posts were really not more than for teaching English. But we are rapidly finding out now and are specializing in posts which are of higher academic standard.

We had exactly the same difficulty with our postgraduate scholars immediately after the war—to choose the right ones and get really satisfactory ones to come to this country. The point is now solved. As I said, our policy is to help Ministers of Education to improve English teaching and to teach elementary English.

As to the second point: we are finding out more and more what countries want from us, and if we can provide it. I will give an example of our recent work in Italy which has been canalized into two lines. One is to provide proper anaesthesia in Italy and the other is to start social welfare work. We have been extremely successful and have just got going the beginnings of providing information on social work. In this way we do get credit for what is going on in Britain, but our main object is to help Italy to improve in these two particular lines. It may surprise you to know the new town plan of Warsaw is based on the new plan for Manchester. This is due to Polish town-planners inspecting the town plans of Great Britain. You will find that in certain countries, particularly behind the Iron Curtain, what they are wanting specially is medicine, town-planning, social science. It

may be called propaganda, but we regard it as the contribution we can make to helping them in their difficulties, and completely outside the political field.

SIR DAVID S. SMITH (*New Zealand*): I think it would help some of us if we could get from Sir Ronald a statement as to how he views the work of the British Council in relation to U.N.E.S.C.O. We feel, a lot of us, that academic work is not itself national in character, and that the only body which is really purporting to do academic work upon an international basis is U.N.E.S.C.O. We cannot think that the work of the British Council should be inconsistent with that of U.N.E.S.C.O. Perhaps we could get a line on that to show us how the two are reconciled. It would be helpful.

THE CHAIRMAN: My difficulty is that the question is a little outside the subject for discussion, but I am quite prepared to let Sir Ronald have a short time for a reply.

SIR RONALD ADAM (*British Council*): I might just say two words on that. We are keen supporters of U.N.E.S.C.O. because the British Council provided the Secretariat at the original meetings that founded U.N.E.S.C.O.—the Allied Ministers of Education in London. We were therefore in at the foundation.

I have been a delegate to both U.N.E.S.C.O. Conferences. U.N.E.S.C.O.'s work in the main does not mean direct action between states, but research in the international field, encouragement of international bodies, and stimulation of international ideas. U.N.E.S.C.O. uses the British Council as its agent for the few scholars it sends to this country and the seminars it holds here.

We have found from experience that to get work done the negotiations have to be bilateral, but we do keep U.N.E.S.C.O. informed of everything we do. The British Council helped by giving a scholarship or two to U.N.E.S.C.O. when there were difficulties in the early days. But U.N.E.S.C.O. will never do much in the way of direct scholarships. The budget of U.N.E.S.C.O. is not very large in any case and they could not do much in the way of giving scholarships or subsidizing Chairs in addition to their other activities.

THE CHAIRMAN: I see that no one else desires to speak on the secondment scheme, so I now throw the meeting open for discussion on either secondment or the first subject this morning.

## GENERAL DISCUSSION

MR. H. J. PAGE (*Trinidad*): I think the picture of the position in regard to higher education in the colonies would be incomplete if some reference were not made to the College which I represent—the Imperial College of Tropical Agriculture. This College shares, with one or two other institutions represented here, the—shall I say?—distinction of being concerned with only one faculty, and it is alone in being the only one, not merely here but so far as I know in the whole of the Colonial Empire, which represents only the faculty of agriculture in the sphere of higher education. So I thought it would be right if I were just to say a few words to give you some idea about the functions of the College, particularly as I have found very little information outside those concerned with the agricultural field.

The Imperial College of Tropical Agriculture was founded (as the West Indian College of Agriculture) in 1922 and it gained its present name and its Royal Charter over twenty-five years ago; its primary function is postgraduate teaching and research. It is available for postgraduate work for graduates from any part of the Colonial Empire or, indeed, from any part of the Commonwealth or elsewhere. It may for all I know some day be decided that it would be preferable that its name should be changed to 'Commonwealth College' in line with the changes made in other 'imperial' organizations.

A very large part of our postgraduate students are Colonial Office cadets, graduates in science or agriculture, who spend first one year at Cambridge and then one year in Trinidad learning tropical agriculture and the tropical agricultural aspects of the basic sciences concerned. In the course of twenty-five years several hundred such people have passed through the College and they now represent an overwhelmingly large proportion of the staff of the Departments of Agriculture of all the British colonies. But we do also welcome postgraduate students from all sorts of other places, as well as these Colonial Office cadets who come in the first instance from the United Kingdom. We have had students from the Gold Coast, Nigeria, Kenya, Uganda, Nyasaland, Australia, Malaya, Burma, India, and a number of foreign countries, including the United States and South America.

We also have a local function which is not postgraduate teaching but undergraduate teaching, primarily for students from the West Indies, whom hitherto we have taught for our own Diploma (D.I.C.T.A.) up to an approximate degree standard. We are now entering into association with the new University Colleges of the West Indies and in association with them we hope to enter into special relations with the University of London, so that in future we shall co-operate with that College in teaching for the London degree. Probably, in

co-operation with them, we shall enter into a similar association for London higher degrees not merely in agriculture but in the basic sciences which are represented on our staff, such as Soils, Science, Botany, Economics, Entomology, and so on. At present we give our own higher Associateship of the College (A.I.C.T.A.) and a post-graduate Diploma in Tropical Agriculture (D.T.A. (Trin.)). I could say a lot more, if there were more time, about the details, but I will not detain you today to do that, and will merely content myself with giving you these particulars in order, as I say, to complete the main outline of the picture in regard to higher education in the colonies.

DR. B. W. WILLIAMS (*University College of the West Indies*): I should like to take advantage of the offer to go back to the first part of our discussion this morning and to follow the example of Mr. Wilcher of Gordon College in describing some of our conditions and difficulties in the West Indies.

We have, of course, much in common with all the embryonic University Colleges, but we have some local differences. First of all, the area which is covered by the University College of the West Indies is very large. It covers more than a thousand square miles. But it differs from some of the other areas in that it is an area of multiple foci with centres scattered throughout.

The University College happens to be centred in Jamaica. Jamaica is the largest of the colonies, but Barbados is the oldest, Trinidad is the richest, and Guiana feels it will be the most successful. In those colonies there has been a long history of resident colonists who have gone on from generation to generation. I am one myself. Some of them have kept links with this country, coming to schools and Universities here; so that one of the functions of the University College will be to provide to a larger extent than was available before the sort of education which a not inconsiderable number of the local population have enjoyed in England.

That, of course, means that it is very much more difficult, in some ways; that we have to achieve standards acceptable to a very critical population.

I myself am concerned with the starting of the medical scheme, and we have been committed to beginning with probably the most difficult faculty in the medical school. For that reason, the help that we have had in the past and hope to get in the future is of paramount importance. If we are to maintain standards acceptable to the local population, they will have to be standards comparable with those obtainable by degrees in this country. Otherwise, as soon as possible, the best men will scrape the money together to come to England, and we may be left unsupported.

That is why the question of secondment is extremely important. I cannot improve on what Mr. Wilcher said as to our gratitude for the immense help that has been given by the Inter-University Council, by London University, with whom we are in special relations, particularly with regard to the medical school. And I should also like to mention that we have had, in the West Indies, an enormous amount of help in the past from McGill, so that is part of the Dominion assistance. We hope that we shall be able to continue in close association with McGill in the future.

The problem of secondment, as has been pointed out already, concerns mostly the younger men. In medicine secondment and translation of teachers in clinical fields is a little more difficult than it is in other academic subjects. Clinicians become very much more fixed to their place of work than other academic teachers, and so I think it will only operate amongst the younger men, but in order to operate we must be able to put it in some concrete form. I hope it may be possible to crystallize this question of secondment in the actual advertisements of posts so that men will know from the very beginning that they can return to this country, if they so wish, without any prejudice to their position at their teaching hospitals, and their future as clinicians.

MR. W. E. DYER (*Singapore*): My excuse for detaining you for another few minutes is in the first place that I think I can say that I have had probably as long experience of at least one colonial college as any member of the Congress, having been on the staff of Raffles College, Singapore, since its foundation in 1927. Consequently I have had experience of the difficulties which are common to all embryonic colonial colleges.

The first one, the one we have experienced all along, is that of isolation. Unquestionably our staff throughout have felt this handicap of being isolated from their academic confrères in other countries. It is a feeling which, as it were, grows upon one, and it is one which I think can only be overcome by an increased degree of interchangeability.

Now, the great difficulty in regard to interchangeability has been the one which previous speakers, from Sir Alexander Carr-Saunders onwards, have touched upon. That is, that it is extremely difficult to get people seconded from other Universities if by so doing they feel that they will incur a loss of status and that they will not be able to return to their former University on the same basis. They will have lost ground. They will have lost in reputation. And as long as that appertains, so long will it be impossible to secure that degree of secondment which we feel is absolutely basic to the proper development of our staffs and the solution of our staffing problems.

Therefore I feel that I speak for all Principals of Colonial Colleges when I do appeal to the Universities of the United Kingdom and the Universities of the Commonwealth to make it quite clear to the members of their staffs that to accept a post temporarily in a Colonial College does not imply any loss of status, does not involve any degree of inferiority, on their return. That, I think, would be one of the greatest services which the Universities of the United Kingdom and the Commonwealth could make to their struggling Benjamins.

PROFESSOR F. L. WARREN (*Natal*): In connexion with both the subjects under discussion this morning, I should like to make two points. I saw this happening in Egypt, and I saw a large number of British officials there gradually finding posts in other places. The French officials seconded from the Sorbonne or from the University of France stayed on because in practice it worked in this way. A man working in Egypt from France counted two years' seniority for every three years in France. I feel we must have something concrete to offer men who go to these places. It is not difficult, in my experience, to get back to the Dominions or the United Kingdom if one keeps in contact.

Secondly, with regard to the development of these Colonial Universities, I would suggest humbly to the Principals that they should in some small way advertise what can be done there, and offer facilities for visiting research workers. I saw this operating in Egypt where visiting astronomers had a small bedroom and a working room at their disposal in the Observatory. At the Marine Biological Station a room was made available next to the Director's house where marine biologists could go. I am certain there would be many attractions to geologists and others to visit a country for a short period of, say, three months and study there provided they knew they were not going to incur large expenditure or have to face the difficulty of living in conditions not suitable for Europeans.

LORD CHORLEY OF KENDAL (*Association of University Teachers*): I should like just to stress an aspect of this business of secondment which has not so far received any attention, I think. We have been considering the matter from the point of view of secondment to a new Colonial University and to University Colleges, very largely. My Association about two years ago was invited by the Control Commission for Germany to advise them on the problem of the German Universities. We drew up a report which some members of the Congress may have seen. But one aspect of the matter was particularly borne home to us and I think it is one with which some of the Universities of the Commonwealth might very well help. I refer to

the secondment of British University teachers to the rebuilding of the German Universities.

Anybody who has visited any of these German Universities must have been appalled by the terrible material destruction which has taken place there, and even more so by the moral and intellectual disintegration which has taken place, and the enormous task which confronts the Universities in Germany in rebuilding their intellectual life.

Mostly, the senior professors there are very old men, and their whole attitude was to look back into the distant past beyond the first world war. We do feel that if more of the younger British University teachers could be seconded to the work of helping to build up the German Universities—to put the British way and purpose which has been outlined to us by Sir Ronald Adam this morning—it would be a very great thing. Undoubtedly there is a struggle going on for the soul of the German people, as has been said, and in that obviously the University side is of very great importance. The job of any English University teacher going to a German University is not going to be at all an easy one. The material conditions are terrible, and even beyond that the intellectual inertia from many points of view is very deadening. But it is emphatically a job for an idealist to take on. And having spent two or three days at this Congress very profitably, I have been enormously impressed by the tremendous idealism which obviously exists all over the Commonwealth. I do feel that with so many Vice-Chancellors and Principals of University Colleges and institutions all over the Commonwealth we have here the opportunity of asking them whether they cannot persuade some of their younger and most enthusiastic staff to take on a job which is evidently and obviously very well worth doing. I am quite sure the British Council and other institutions—there are several bodies which have been set up to help with this task and their names and addresses can be made known—will give you all the information you need if you are prepared to help.

PROFESSOR LILLIAN M. PENSON (*London*): I only want to make a few remarks on one or two points that have arisen, particularly in the first part of the discussion this morning.

I have listened with very great interest to the accounts given by the two Principals of the University Colleges already in being and to the further evidence that was given. But I want in particular to refer to a point raised by another speaker at the end of our first session—the speaker who dwelt on certain dangers and problems which are, indeed, of very great importance. He emphasized the need for harnessing the sympathy of the nationals of the country concerned to the

University College. That, I can assure him, is by no means absent from our minds. The plans which have been formulated as a result, in the first instance, of the Asquith Commission, and are now being carried out by the Inter-University Council for Higher Education in the Colonies envisage in every case the building up in as short a time as possible of a national University institution and the constant association of the people of the region in the College itself. I have seen that association at work in the Sudan, which is the region I have visited most frequently. I can assure Dr. Davidson that no step is taken in relation to the College without constant consultation with Sudanese opinion. They sit round the Council table, a number of them, when I go there—as I did this spring. The number who wish to discuss the College is very large, and their hospitality is as great as the hospitality of Oxford.

Secondly, there is the point which has already been referred to by Dr. Williams, that of standards. It is not a question of any attempt by the Inter-University Council or the Special Committee of the Senate of the University of London—let alone the Colonial Office—to force standards upon the peoples of these regions. They want standards, and nothing but what they regard as equal to the best University education elsewhere will satisfy them. The problem is to meet their desire for standards rather than to force standards upon them. That is a very important point to bear in mind. The idea of their being put off with a second-class University education would arouse a very great deal of opposition.

It is with that in mind that those of us who are specially concerned with the building up of these Colleges, or specially interested in them, are particularly anxious to obtain the help of the staffs of all the Universities in the Commonwealth. The question of secondment is particularly relevant there. It is perfectly true that a large proportion of the staff of any University institution ought to be something other than people seconded for two or three years. We all of us know, who have assisted in building up Universities in this country, that the man who has been there a long time is the man who has the greatest influence. But while that is true, there is a very important place, particularly in the earlier stages of development, for younger people who have had some experience in a University elsewhere to go for four or five years and take part in this great job. It is, I am sure you have all realized, after hearing Mr. Wilcher and Dr. Mellanby, an extremely good job. On those occasions when I have had the opportunity of talking to students of the two institutions that I have visited, I have been struck, in the first place, by the fact that they are very much like our own undergraduates. They are much more like our own undergraduates, in many ways, than you would expect. They

ask the same kind of questions—put, perhaps, in rather different terms—show the same kind of intellectual curiosity. No one, I think, who goes to the colonial institutions on the secondment plan need fear that he is going to lower his own standards of teaching, and that fear is, of course, a danger that might deter some people. The students will not like it if they lower their standards of teaching, so that it would be a pity from all points of view.

One last point, if I may, and that is that one of the purposes, as I conceive it, of the Inter-University Council in this country is to see that the adventurous young man or woman who goes out on one of these jobs does not get lost sight of. There is no reason at all why they should be lost sight of. I am not at all sure that sometimes some of these colonial institutions will not feel they get almost too many visits. We all enjoy it so much when we go. They are not at all isolated in that sense as they were isolated in the old days at Singapore. The opportunity occurs, certainly I hope once a year, for people from other Universities to come into contact with them, to talk with them, and thus to act as a link between them and the University world in other countries.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am now going to give an opportunity to Sir Ronald Adam to close the discussion.

SIR RONALD ADAM (*British Council*): I have very little to add to what has already been said except two minor points. One is that as regards accommodation we do provide it in the more difficult countries for our professors and lecturers and for any of the British Council staff.

Reference was made to the French work in Egypt. One thing we avoid is having rivalries with other cultural departments, and we are in the very closest touch with the French and with the Americans in our work, so that it is not rivalry but done in the U.N.E.S.C.O. spirit of working together for a common end.

As regards Germany, we have filled four University posts there. We are having difficulty in filling the others. But we have had a wonderful example from Sir Ernest Barker, who spent a very difficult winter at Cologne University in a Chair there.

I should like to say how much we of the British Council owe to the Universities of this country—and to the Vice-Chancellors in particular—for the amount of time they give to help us in our work. One of the greatest difficulties we have is the number of visitors—Rectors of European Universities and other University men—coming here who are continually wanting Vice-Chancellors to receive them. The Vice-Chancellors have been very patient.

I want to conclude with one word about this book.<sup>1</sup> It is a co-operative effort between the Universities Bureau and the British Council. This is a proof copy pulled off in a hurry for the Congress, and it is already, I am afraid, in the matter of fees, out of date.

May I say, lastly, that we do hope that we shall get—we know we shall get—some assistance from the Universities of the Commonwealth in this cause. We do need their fresh point of view, and in the present situation in the world I suggest that it is useful for the Universities of the Commonwealth to be in touch with what is going on in Europe, in the Far East and all over the world at the present time.

THE CHAIRMAN: I would like, on your behalf, to thank Sir Alexander Carr-Saunders and Sir Ronald Adam for opening the lively and interesting discussion this morning. I want to thank also all those who took part in the discussion. Mr. Foster has asked me also to thank in particular members of the Press who have been so helpful to him and all who have been responsible for the organizing of the Congress; and I would like to mention in particular Mr. Alington, the Press Liaison Officer.

I am going to ask Mr. Foster to come up here to acknowledge the expressions of thanks that have been made to him more than once for his work in connexion with the organization of the Congress. I think it would be only right that the chief organizer of the Congress should close it with a word or two of acknowledgement.

MR. J. F. FOSTER (*Secretary of Congress*): If I am to close the Congress I am at a loss to know what is the appropriate benediction to bestow on you. You have been good enough to say some kind things about the organizing work. I think that those of us who have been associated with it feel a sense of satisfaction because this Congress has really been valuable, but that is not a matter for which the organizers alone can receive credit, since every member of the Congress has played his part. We have met in the most happy circumstances at Oxford and I would think that the result is a reasonably good job. By that I mean we have laid the foundations for a good basis of co-operation among the Universities of the Commonwealth in the next decade.

May this Congress be repeated at frequent intervals. I hope we shall not have to wait five years for the next one, although in saying that I am not unaware of the responsibility if the organization falls

<sup>1</sup> Higher Education in Great Britain and Ireland: A Handbook for Students from Overseas. Published for the British Council and the Universities Bureau of the British Empire. Longmans, Green & Co., London, New York, and Toronto. 1948.

to me and my staff. I would like to say that I have been very loyally, and I think very courageously, supported by the members of the staff of the Universities Bureau in making the arrangements for this meeting. A lot of the work has had to be done under extreme difficulty and under office conditions that I think people from overseas would regard as quite makeshift, but the loyal help of the lady members of my staff has contributed a great deal to the success of this gathering.

## APPENDIX ONE

### INTER-UNIVERSITY RELATIONS

*Report on a visit to Australia by DR. D. VEALE, Registrar of the University of Oxford*

1. The purpose of my visit was concisely described by Mr. Medley (now Sir John Medley). He said that the Australian Universities contained the best raw material in the world, but that they were isolated from other great centres of learning and desired to break down that isolation. I was invited to help in the task, because Oxford, with its Rhodes Scholarships and Nuffield Dominion Demonstratorships and Clinical Assistantships, was clearly committed to giving a lead.

I started with two assumptions:

(a) that a University education is a costly privilege; and the more advanced it is, the more costly it becomes, not only in money, but what is more important, in the time and energy of teachers.

(b) There is no academic reason why a student should move from one University to another except to improve his own quality; or why a University should accept a student from another University except for its own benefit.

In making these assumptions I did not ignore the importance either of providing a University education for an increasing number of young men and women, or of promoting mutual understanding between the nations of the British Commonwealth; but I regarded such considerations as outside the scope of my inquiry.

As my inquiry proceeded, it also became clear

(c) that young Australians seeking entry to most of the learned professions are practically compelled to seek it through an Australian University, because the professional bodies do not conduct separate examinations, e.g. an Australian degree in law takes the place filled by the Bar and Law Society's examinations in England. It follows that the courses in Australian Universities are more vocational than at Oxford and Cambridge.<sup>1</sup>

(d) The standard of teaching and examination in the Australian Universities is very high.

2. Among the facts which must strike a visitor from Oxford to Sydney or Melbourne are:

(a) That the concentration of learned men and women is lower than in British Universities; and in Australia generally, assemblies of learned men are difficult. The distance between Sydney and Melbourne is about 600

<sup>1</sup> For this reason, as well as because of the shortage of full-time teachers a good deal of part-time teaching is done at the University by members of the professions.

miles: Adelaide is 400 miles west of Melbourne, and Brisbane is 450 miles north of Sydney.

(b) That the contact between members of the University is less close than at Oxford. This is true both of contacts between members of the staffs, and, to an even greater degree, between students and teachers and between the students. The reasons are, of course, that the Australian Universities are not residential, and that the ratio of students to teachers is too high to admit of any real tutorial work. There are tutorial classes, but they are generally too large for intimacy and most of the teaching is by formal lectures. Even in the residential colleges, which at Melbourne and Sydney accommodate less than one-tenth of all the students, it has not been found possible to develop tutorial teaching comparable to what is given at Oxford even in the present overcrowded conditions. Moreover, the Universities more or less cease functioning at 4 or 5 o'clock, the number of students who are active in Clubs and Societies during the evenings being small. This is bound to happen in any non-residential University, and particularly when the staff and students are dispersed over the enormous areas of Sydney and Melbourne.

The view expressed in this paragraph is confirmed by what has happened at Mildura. This is a branch University established by Melbourne in an old R.A.A.F. hutted training station between 300 and 400 miles from Melbourne, accessible by air daily and by train on 4 days a week. It is some miles from the small town of Mildura, which is the centre of a fairly large fruit-growing district on the banks of the Murray River. It accommodates between 400 and 500 first-year students of science, medicine, dentistry, engineering, and architecture. The equipment of the laboratories is inadequate, and the Library is as yet only rudimentary. The students live two to a 'flat', the flat consisting of two bedrooms and one sitting-room, each 9' by 10', furnished austere. This experiment has been astonishingly successful. The students have in their examinations outstripped any other set of students in Australia; and this is attributed mainly to the fact that they enjoy, in a primitive form no doubt, the advantages of residence, though allowance must also be made for the fact that the Branch has a Warden with a genius for improvisation and a staff of the quality to support him.

3. It is a commonplace that the most valuable features of life at Oxford and Cambridge are the contact of mind with mind in the intimacy of life in College Common Rooms and in big departments and institutions. It is this kind of life that the Australian Universities cannot offer, and which chiefly attracts their students to the British Universities.

4. What stage then, in his progress, is the right one for a British University to offer special inducements to a young Australian, on the assumption that the visit must be mutually advantageous, and will be so costly that, if it is to be justified, benefits ought to result to society as well to the individual? What a University aims at subsequently to the teaching for the first degree is the advancement of knowledge, and the training of

persons suitable for academic life, as teachers and researchers in Universities, or for research or other comparable posts in industry. It would seem, therefore, reasonable that the costly training in Great Britain at the advanced stage should be given mainly to persons who are to pursue academic careers. If they are resident in England, this can without inconvenience begin immediately after the first degree. But the Australian must travel 12,000 miles each way; and it would be no light matter if either he were to be found to be unsuitable or he changed his mind.

It seems probable, then, that the proper stage for a visit to England is when the Australian is committed to an academic career. The practice in the Australian Universities is for a young graduate who wishes to undertake research to seek some sort of probationary teaching post in his University; and after some two or three years' experience it is generally possible for everyone concerned to decide whether he is fit for an academic career. Some provision should be made also for those who intend to seek posts in industry, especially posts from which they will influence the Universities either as part-time teachers (see the footnote to para. 1), or as promoters of research.

5. The following proposal is, then, related to Australian graduates who have already had two or three years' teaching experience in an Australian University and who have been selected by their Universities as suitable for appointment to permanent academic posts as lecturers.

6. Any scheme for bringing young Australian graduates to Great Britain should be as free as possible of administrative hoops. It must also be of such obvious mutual advantage that it will run under its own impetus and not depend upon the energy of some enthusiastic individual or body, whose enthusiasm may not be reflected in the participating Universities.

7. Conditions exist for the time being in Oxford (and I will confine my remarks to the University where conditions are known to me) which are favourable for an experiment in free trade with the Australian Universities. With nearly 3,000 students above the pre-war number, and a teaching staff not yet recruited to fill the gaps caused by the war, the burden of teaching in Oxford is hampering original work, and, in some subjects, tending to lower the standard of teaching. It would, therefore, be an advantage to Oxford to reinforce its teaching strength temporarily while the post-war pressure continues.

8. I have been assured by Professors at Sydney and Melbourne who have themselves been through Final Honour Schools in Oxford, and of whom some have had actual teaching experience here, that the young Australian lecturer of the kind described in para. 5 would be fully capable of undertaking some tutorial work and of lecturing in Oxford. (The conversation of young lecturers whom I met confirmed this.) The Professors think also that the Australian lecturer's quality as a teacher would be improved if he could have experience of teaching in Oxford. Such teaching could be combined with work for a research degree; and a

further advantage from the Australian point of view would be that contact would be promoted between the student and the senior members of Oxford University who are interested in his subject; and this in turn would lead to more introductions to Oxford academic society than usually fall to the lot of the research student from overseas.

**First Recommendation.** That arrangements should be made for a limited amount of teaching, paid at the standard rates, to be offered to Australian University Lecturers, selected by their own Universities. Normally they would come to Oxford for two years immediately after their appointment to permanent lecturerships. I understand that leave of absence would readily be granted, generally with pay for one year and without for another. If an income from teaching of upwards of £200 a year for two years could be earned in Oxford, the main financial difficulty of the Australians would be met. Even a married man could manage on this if his wife were able and willing to work as most young wives are nowadays.

9. I was told that the number of lecturers from Australia of the standard described above, desirous of coming to British Universities, would not be likely to exceed eighty a year. Some of these would get awards of one kind or another, and others would prefer to pursue their studies uninterrupted by teaching, and could afford to do so. Some also would prefer to forego the residential advantages of Oxford and Cambridge because the needs of their specialities would be better met at other Universities. It seems probable, therefore, that an average of one acceptance a year by each of the Oxford and Cambridge Colleges (including the Women's Colleges) of Australians qualified to combine research and teaching would more than meet the demand.

10. If there is to be free trade between Universities, traffic of this kind will be expected to flow both ways, and for the same reasons. Young men or women who are good enough to be confidently recommended by their own University for a teaching post in Australia will obviously be in the running for appointments in British Universities, and they may well feel that they will prejudice their chances by going to Australia. To offset this risk, which is a real one, there must be some clear advantage which could be reaped by going to Australia. I made inquiries, therefore, about the opportunities for original work in Australia which would enable young men and women to establish their reputation for original work and thus improve their chance of academic promotion at home.

There are certain attractions which are common to all departments in Australian Universities, e.g.

- (i) the University departments in Australia are, because the staffs are smaller, less specialized than at Oxford and offer attractions to the young man or woman who prefers to keep a wide view of his subject, or to one who, at home, feels himself somewhat oppressed by the weight of learning of his seniors and would welcome more chance of being able to make his mistakes in his own way.

- (ii) Opportunities for academic people to influence the professions come much earlier in Australia than in England, e.g. a teacher of law in an Australian University soon gets invitations to serve on such bodies as Statute Law Revision Committees; and he comes to number leading members of the legal profession among his former pupils earlier than does his counterpart in Great Britain.

There are also certain fields of study which offer a much wider range of subjects for original work than are open to the scholar who stays at home. Among the most obvious are

(i) *Australian History*. Compared with any comparable period of English or European History, the history of Australia since the Colony was first established seems almost a virgin field. Those original documents which are not available except in Australia have only recently been collected; and I was told by the Librarian of the fine City Library at Melbourne that much of the material recently collected there has never been worked over at all. The Library is now starting courses in Librarianship, and is about to appoint an archivist. The original documents in the Library will, therefore, soon be fully accessible. There is also some material, though probably not a great deal, in private Libraries, and family papers. The need for this mass of material to be studied by competent historians is urgent; there are also in the Libraries at Melbourne and Sydney fine collections of works on English and European History which are kept up to date and would provide all the books of reference needed by anyone who was combining research in Australian History with general historical teaching.

(ii) *Sociology*. The changes in the structure of society which are taking place throughout the world are complicated in Australia by a rapid growth of mining and industries of all kinds comparable in some ways to the industrial revolution in England in the nineteenth century. These changes are likely to repay academic study, and such study may well lead to valuable practical results both in Australia and elsewhere.

(iii) *Agriculture*. This has always been a major industry in Australia, and with the increase of industrialization will become more important still if Australia is to make its proper contribution to world recovery. For reasons also of climate, soil structure, and other considerations, the Australian departments of Agriculture will offer increasingly valuable opportunities to English scholars to do original work. In certain aspects of soil science, e.g. trace metals, Australia has led the world.

(iv) *Anthropology*. The natives of New Guinea are said to be among the most primitive of native races in the world. Considerable developments are probable in the country if oil is found there in any quantity. In any case there must be rapid social changes and intensive anthropological studies are both urgent and likely to be rewarding. The Great Barrier Reef is a famous marine hunting-ground.

(v) *Biology*. Both in botany and zoology much original work is already in progress, especially field-work.

There are also openings in industry in Australia comparable to those in England.

11. The Australian Universities would welcome young English scholars in their teaching posts, and the younger lecturers were emphatic that they would befriend such colleagues, especially if the traffic from Australia to England were stimulated.

**Second Recommendation.** That arrangements to encourage traffic from England to Australia should be made by making the opportunities for original and interesting work that exist in Australia better known in England.

12. These two recommendations are self-supporting so far as the arrangements within the Universities are concerned. Free commerce between Universities already exists between the Universities in Great Britain. And it would be wrong by special subsidies to put Australian students in a privileged position. But the distance separating Australia from Great Britain may properly be regarded as an Act of God, and as such proper to attract the attention of philanthropists.

**Third Recommendation.** That money should be made available by the educational trusts, by the British Council, and by other bodies for payment of fares between the two continents. It seems likely that some of the money now spent on scholarships, especially one-year scholarships offered by the British Council, would be more usefully spent on the payment of fares.

13. These recommendations are not intended in any way to conflict with the Rhodes Scholarships, but rather to supplement them. The Rhodes Scholarships will remain an invaluable opportunity for the man who wishes immediately to supplement a first-degree course in Australia by a similar course at Oxford or by taking a Research Degree at Oxford. There are many reasons why men should wish to do so, e.g. the more philosophical approach to the Oxford degree and the academic polish which the Oxford man gets by his more intimate contact with his teachers. The number of Rhodes Scholars who have risen to eminence in both academic and non-academic fields offers a convincing proof of the value of the Rhodes Scholarships. But there are too few of them to meet the need with which these proposals are concerned; and they are, moreover, rightly awarded solely on the personal qualities of the scholar and without reference to the use he is going to make of his qualities.

14. These proposals are based solely on the advantages which they might bring to the participating Universities, and it is by that test that they must stand or fall. But since they involve the provision of travel funds, the political advantages must be taken into account. Any Englishman travelling in Australia must feel proud of the esteem in which he finds his country is held, and be moved by the sympathy felt by Australians for its present distresses. In one of the main streets of Sydney a valuable site is occupied by an office for the dispatch of food parcels, into which there

passes a steady stream of Australians of all classes to send their tribute. In the academic field admiration of the British Universities is intense; and they are regarded by the young men and women as a sort of El Dorado. But excitement about El Dorado itself would soon wane if nobody ever got there. Now, if ever, is the moment to cement once and for all the bonds which unite the two nations. The U.S.A. offer alluring counter-attractions out of what seems to be inexhaustible resources. The Australian continent is on the brink of enormous developments. New sources of mineral wealth are being prospected, agriculture and stock-breeding are flourishing, and new industries are being started. In what direction is this wealth to flow?

15. My proposals may be criticized as being based upon the transient conditions of the post-war period. Even if they were they might still be worth adopting. Fifty or sixty teachers with experience in Great Britain would not be a negligible addition to the strength of the Australian Universities. Moreover in such matters it is impossible to plan far ahead because conditions change rapidly. But it is reasonably certain that if results of value are achieved, in some way or other means will be found to continue the commerce between the Australian and the British Universities.

This report has not been discussed as a whole with any representatives of the Australian Universities; but all the details have been the subject of numerous conversations at Melbourne and Sydney, and I did towards the end of my visit, when certain conclusions seemed to be emerging, try to present a complete picture. While, then, I cannot claim any definite support from the Australian authorities, my premises seemed to be generally accepted and my conclusions welcomed. And, of course, I received innumerable valuable suggestions and criticisms.

## APPENDIX TWO

### THE UNIVERSITIES BUREAU OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE

#### *Member Institutions during the Inter-Congress Period 1936-48*

##### ORDINARY MEMBERS

###### *England and Wales*

Birmingham  
Bristol  
Cambridge  
Durham  
Leeds  
Liverpool  
London  
Manchester  
Oxford  
Reading  
Sheffield  
Wales

###### *Scotland*

Aberdeen  
Edinburgh  
Glasgow  
St. Andrews

###### *Ireland*

Queen's, Belfast  
Dublin, Trinity College  
National University of Ireland

###### *Canada*

Alberta  
Bishop's College, University of (1936-41)  
British Columbia  
Dalhousie  
McGill  
Mt. Allison  
Manitoba (since 1947)  
New Brunswick (since 1947)  
Queen's, Ontario  
Saskatchewan (1936-43)  
Toronto  
Western Ontario

###### *Australia*

Adelaide  
Australian National University  
Melbourne (since 1947)

Queensland  
Sydney  
Tasmania (since 1947)  
Western Australia (since 1947)

###### *New Zealand*

New Zealand

###### *South Africa*

Cape Town  
South Africa (1936-41)  
Witwatersrand

###### *India*

Annamalai  
Calcutta  
Madras  
Osmania  
Patna  
Travancore (since 1944)

###### *Pakistan*

Panjab

###### *Other Parts of the Empire*

Malta  
Hong Kong  
Rangoon (1936-47)

##### ASSOCIATE MEMBERS

University College of the South-West  
of England, Exeter  
University College, Hull (since 1945)  
University College, Nottingham  
University College, Leicester (since  
1945)  
University College, Southampton  
Natal University College (since 1943)  
Rhodes University College (since 1943)  
Auckland University College  
Canterbury University College  
Victoria University College

ASSOCIATE MEMBERS (*cont.*)

University of Otago, Dunedin (since 1937)
Hebrew University of Jerusalem (1937-47)
Canberra University College (since 1947)

## ADDITIONAL MEMBERS

Municipal College of Technology, Manchester
Royal Technical College, Glasgow
Raffles College, Singapore
King Edward VII College of Medicine, Singapore

*Members of the Executive Council during the Inter-Congress**Period 1936-48*

Alton, Dr. E. H.	{ 1942-4	Garrett, H. L. O.	1941-2
	{ 1945-7	Gates, Prof. R. Ruggles	1941-2
Aveling, Prof. F. A. P.	1936-7	Goldby, Prof. F.	1946-8
Ball, H. Standish	1939-42	Greaves, Sir Ewart	{ 1939-41
Benians, E. A.	1938-41		{ 1943-8
Bonham-Carter, Lt.-Gen. Sir Charles	1946-8	Hall, R. L.	1945-7
Cameron, Dr. A. E.	1936-9	Harlech, Rt. Hon. Lord (Chairman, 1946-8)	1946-8
Cameron, Dr. J.	1943-6	Harrop, Dr. A. J.	1936-44
Chatterjee, Sir Atul	1947-8	Heald, Sir Benjamin H.	1937-8
Claughton, Sir Harold (Vice-Chairman, 1946-7)	1941-7	Hele, Dr. T. S.	1943-5
	{ 1937-8	Hetherington, Sir Hector	{ 1938-9
Coffey, Dr. D. J.	{ 1940-2		{ 1943-8
	{ 1944-5	Holland, Sir Thomas	{ 1938-9
	{ 1936-9	Horrocks, W. A.	{ 1941-3
Cotton, Dr. T. F.	{ 1941-3		{ 1936-8
	{ 1945-8	Irvine, Sir James	{ 1936-7
Cullen, Dr. W. (Hon. Treasurer, 1938-48)	1936-48		{ 1939-41
de Brun, Very Rev. Padraig	1947-8	Jones, B. Mouat	1941-3
Deller, Sir Edwin (Hon. Treasurer, 1936)	1936-7	Keir, Sir David Lindsay	{ 1939-41
	{ 1938-9		{ 1943-5
Dingli, Dr. A.	{ 1940-1	Lal, Rt. Hon. Sir Shadi	1936-7
	{ 1943-4	Lambert, H.	1941-3
	{ 1945-6	Lindsay, Dr. A. D.	1936-42
Duff, Dr. J. F.	{ 1938-9	Littlehailes, R.	{ 1939-41
	{ 1946-7		{ 1942-8
Eason, H. L.	1938-41	Livingstone, Sir Richard	1944-7
Evans, Ifor L.	1937-9	Logan, Dr. D. W.	1948
Fisher, Prof. A. G. B.	1938-46	Loveday, Dr. T. (Chairman, 1943-6)	{ 1936-8
Flemington, Lt.-Col. W. T. Ross	1942-3	Lugard, Rt. Hon. Lord	{ 1943-8
	{ 1936-8		{ 1942-5
Fyfe, Sir William Hamilton	{ 1941-3	McEwen, B. C.	1937-9
	{ 1945-8	MacInnes, Prof. C. M.	{ 1941-3
			{ 1945-7

McNair, Sir Arnold	1942-4	Rees, Sir Frederick	{ 1936-7
Massey, Prof. H. S. W.	1947-8		{ 1944-6
Masson, Dr. J. I. O.	{ 1936-8	Ross, Sir David	1942-4
	{ 1943-5		
Mountford, Dr. J. F.	1947-8	Sibly, Sir Franklin (Hon.	{ 1937-8
Mudaliar, Diwan Bahadur	1936-9	Treasurer, 1937-8)	{ 1945-6
Ramaswami		Spens, Sir Will (Chairman,	1936-8
		1936-8)	
Ogilvie, Sir Frederick	1937-8	Stallybrass, Dr. W. T. S.	1947-8
Osborn, Prof. T. G. B.	1939-45	Stopford, Sir John	{ 1936-7
	{ 1941-2	(Chairman, 1938-43)	{ 1938-43
Owen, Prof. L. G.	{ 1944-5	Suhrawardy, Sir Hassan	1940-4
		Taylor, Dr. H. M.	1946-8
Peacock, Sir Edward	{ 1939-41	Thirkill, H.	1945-7
	{ 1947-8	Thrift, Dr. W. E.	1938-40
	{ 1936-7		
Peel, Sir William	{ 1939-40	Venn, Dr. J. A.	1941-3
	{ 1942-3		
Percy, Rt. Hon. Lord	1939-41	Vollum, Dr. R. L.	{ 1939-41
Eustace			{ 1943-5
Priestley, Dr. R. E. (Vice-	{ 1939-42	Wilson, Prof. J. T.	1936-9
Chairman, 1947-8)	{ 1945-8	Wright, C. S.	1937-9
Radhakrishnan, Prof. Sir	{ 1936-40	Yealand, Dr. L. R.	{ 1939-41
Sarvapalli	{ 1945-7		{ 1943-5
Raven, Rev. Prof. C. E.	1947-8		{ 1946-8

PRINTED IN  
GREAT BRITAIN  
AT THE  
UNIVERSITY PRESS  
OXFORD  
BY  
CHARLES BATEY  
PRINTER  
TO THE  
UNIVERSITY











