at all, it would be toward liberalization by the various agencies rather than in the other direction." But, he continued, "Paperwork requirements related to federal support of course represent the most troublesome aspect of recent years. . . . The requirements for time and effort reporting on behalf of the faculty are so removed from the reality of academic organization and operation as to make this requirement more than just a burden. In fact, it becomes, at least for many of our faculty members, a question of conflict with normal traditions of academic freedom and commitment to educational and research objectives."

Elburt F. Obsorn, vice president for research at Pennsylvania State University, noted that "Paperwork requirements accompanying federal support are tremendous and constantly on the increase. . . . Administrative manuals and directives are constantly expanding and being revised. It is a herculean job just to be aware of these constantly changing requirements not to mention the paperwork involved."

H. F. Robinson, administrative dean for research at North Carolina State University, Raleigh, told of NSF recently seeking an explanation of a $36 expenditure from a grant totaling some $30,000. "This inquiry took almost half a day to satisfy and involved several people on the campus."

The research administrator at a major Catholic university stated, "NSF is almost a model of efficient administration except for a 10-foot long quarterly fiscal report that no one in NSF can tell us why they need it. I suspect it is another case of computeritis."

The associate director of a large university-operated laboratory on the West Coast offered the view that "an inordinate amount of time is being spent by principal investigators and senior research personnel in negotiations, in detailed accounting, in complying with the myriad reporting requirements, etc. Each agency seems to come up with its own unique set of practices, ranging, for example, from the color of report covers and size and position of report numbers printed thereon, to increasingly disturbing attempts to control and limit the appropriate distribution and dissemination of research results. . . . The combined result of these influences," he added, "discounting inflation, fully supports the contention that it is costing more dollars today to do less research."

In the federal agencies that preside over the programs and policies that generate the comments and complaints cited above, there are ready-made, and often quite sound, explanations for the present state of affairs. It is said, for example, that if the universities did a better job of managing federal funds, government bookkeepers would not be so intrusive. It is also noted that when federal agencies try to cut down the administrative burden by giving block or institutional grants to universities, old-time beneficiaries of the project grant system angrily rebel. Furthermore, it is noted that in many instances Congress attaches restrictions to certain appropriations, and the agencies handling these funds have no choice but to carry them out, regardless of what other agencies are doing in the same area. The statistics-gathering boom that plagues the universities is a direct outgrowth of Congress's desire to know whether the wealth is being spread in accordance with its demands. Finally, though the system creaks and groans, and overwhelms the vice presidents for research, that's what they are there for—to handle the problems of getting and using federal money, while faculty members go about the business of researching and teaching.

There is truth in all of this, especially in the observation that the officials to whom *Science* directed its inquiries would have the darkest possible view of doing business with the federal government.

Nevertheless, after allowance is made for the fact that government has an instinct for tidiness and accountability while universities are untidy and often unaccountable, it appears that the administrative system between government and academe is en route to chaos. It is difficult to find broad agreement on remedies, but remedies are badly needed. They are not likely to take effect if they emanate from any of the lower-level committees that toy with these matters in the federal executive hierarchy. The incredible confusion and ill-will generated by the cost-sharing regulations are a monument to the efficacy of these committees. Perhaps it is time for the White House or Congress to decree that coherent, rational, and predictable government-wide regulations on the use of federal funds for academic research and higher education are necessary and attainable. And then let the quest for administrative sanity start from that point.—D. S. GREENBERG

Oxford: A Vote for Latin on the Way to Reform

Oxford. As the guide books say, Oxford breathes the last enchantment of the Middle Ages. This spring Oxford's critics said the university showed how enthralled it was with its own past by voting to keep what in effect is a requirement that candidates for admission pass an examination in Latin.

It was not as straightforward as that. Things at Oxford seldom are. What the governing academic assembly did was to defeat a move to reduce from two to one the number of foreign languages required for matriculation.

As things still stand at Oxford, candidates must pass O (for ordinary)-level secondary school examinations in two languages, one of which must be Latin or Greek. Candidates who qualify in mathematics or science in advanced-level examinations may offer a second modern language instead of a classical language. But, because of the actual language teaching situation in most British schools, private and state, Latin, for all practical purposes, is the sole second choice.

Cambridge, which in most things marches with Oxford, dropped the classics requirement 6 years ago and last winter went on to reduce the number of languages required to one. The breach in the Oxbridge united front is, therefore, wider now.

Oxford's language requirement has been attacked on the ground that it

raises a barrier to graduates of state schools, where classics are not widely taught, and particularly to science students, whose study schedules leave no time for Latin.

Since half of Oxford's undergraduates still come from independent (private) schools and the university has shown some sensitivity about charges that it remains a bastion of privilege, rejection of revision of language requirements came as something of a surprise. Oxford's holding the line on Latin is attributed by some to the traditional belief that the classics train the mind, and to a more specific feeling that scientists start specializing too early and are likely never to look beyond the boundaries of their specialty.

The debate on compulsory Latin has been simmering for several years, but this year's round was conducted in the context of broad university reform recommended by the Franks commission last autumn. The report of the commission, headed by Lord Franks, a former British ambassador to the United States and now head of an Oxford college, was an Oxford product, since all the members of the commission held university posts. A major aim, however, was to define ways in which Oxford can function more effectively as part of the British university system.

More Oxford Students

An accepted objective, based on the recommendation of an earlier government-sponsored report on university policy, is to increase the number of Oxford students from the present 10,000 to about 13,000, the largest proportional increases being in the numbers of women and postgraduate students. Expansion has been checked for the immediate future, however, by a tightening of the reins on funds by the government. As for implementing the Franks recommendations, progress has been made, particularly as regards university administration, but the university has taken a far from impetuous approach to reform.

It would be unfair, however, to say that Oxford has been unresponsive to the demand for change in postwar Britain. It has expanded greatly in numbers, and graduate education has grown into much more than a casual afterthought. Science and engineering have acquired new importance and an impressive physical plant, and because this plant is under the control of the university the old domination of the colleges has been modified. Perhaps most important, the fact that admission to a university in effect now qualifies a student for a public grant has made the university a much more socially mixed if not yet a democratic institution.

What has been happening at Oxford in many ways parallels what happened there in the 19th century when several decades of reformist ferment culminated, in the 1850's and again in the 1870's, in legislation that gave the university the shape and character it was to retain through the two world wars.

Oxford, of course, was a very different place a century ago, but a series of recent lectures published in book form suggests that the issues underlying university reform don't change radically. The book is *Mark Pattison and the Idea of a University*, by John Sparrow,* warden of All Souls College, Oxford.

All Souls College

All Souls is one of the curiosities of Oxford, a college without students. It is perhaps the least touched by the 20th century of any Oxford college and has been on the verge of reforming itself for something like 40 years. In choosing Pattison as a subject, however, Sparrow was picking no apostle of reaction. Pattison was head of one of the smaller and poorer colleges and, for much of the half century he spent at Oxford, was identified in his own very personal style with the forces of reform. His reputation as a scholar was international, and on the question of university reform he ranked as a commentator, if not as an influence, with Arnold, Newman, and Jowett.

In the first half of the 19th century Oxford was emerging from the doldrums which Gibbon described. Slow progress had been made in raising academic standards by tightening examinations and developing the tutorial system. But when Pattison went to Oxford in the 1830's the best hope for those interested in learning lay, as it had for Gibbon, in self-education. The university was still essentially a clerical institution, a preserve of the Church of England. Fellowships were open only to those ordained in the established church, and undergraduates had to satisfy religious tests to matriculate. Much of the income of the colleges went to support country parsons and sinecure fellowships.

A long campaign finally produced the Great Reform of 1854, an act of Parliament which worked a semirevolution. Most important, the restrictions, geographical and otherwise, on fellowships were removed, so that fellowships went to the ablest on the basis of competition. A new breed of don was thus developed. For undergraduates the religious test for matriculation was removed. The moves to laicize the university were carried further in 1871, when all religious tests were abolished except for theological degrees and professorships in theology.

Pattison, who won a fellowship at Lincoln College in 1839, had strongly urged the reform of fellowships. He had reservations, however, about the strengthening of professorships which was then occurring. He had firm views on vocational education and how it should be conducted, and felt that the lecture was suitable for imparting technical information but not higher learning. A strong professoriat, he felt, threatened the close relationship between the teacher and the taught which he held to be essential in the university.

Pattison's place in the reform movement, like his career in general, was affected by his personality. Luckless in human relationships and restless in religion, Pattison was remembered as morose and caustic. In 1851 he failed to win the rectorship of Lincoln in a campaign that might have provided the plot of a C. P. Snow novel. He reacted bitterly to the reversal, virtually withdrawing from the life of the university. In 1861 he was elected rector and promptly married, as only heads of colleges were then allowed to do in still-celibate Oxford. Both the rectorship and the marriage went sour, and Pattison became the model for unkind portraits in at least two Victorian novels, the best-known of which is *Middlemarch* by George Eliot.

Dons Defrocked

In the 1870's the cycle of 19th-century reform moved to completion. University funds were increased, the richer colleges supported professorships, and celibacy for dons was finally abolished. What had happened in the era of reform was that the domination of the church had been removed as a result of government intervention. Pattison, aging and disaffected, however, was far from delighted with what had occurred. During the 1850's Pattison, while avoiding Oxford, had spent much time at the German universities and had been deeply impressed with the

* Cambridge University Press, $5.50.

German system and its results. He revised his opinion on professors and admired the German students' eagerness for learning and the atmosphere of academic freedom.

Reformed Oxford he viewed as a "cram shop" filled with students seeking honors and tickets to success. University facilities, such as laboratories and libraries, were expanding. But students from the public schools, which had undergone their own reforms, were bringing to Oxford their games and societies and a life generally organized on the competitive principle. The foundations were laid for making the British a nation of examination-takers. Pattison thought the university had been degraded into a school.

As for the faculty, Sparrow quotes this from Pattison's bleak but revealing memoirs:

> Young M.A.'s of talent abound but they are all taken up with the conduct of some wheel in the complex machinery of cram, which grinds down all specific tendencies and tastes into one uniform mediocrity. The men of middle age seem, after they reach thirty-five or forty, to be stuck with an intellectual palsy, and betake themselves, no longer to port, but to the frippery work of attending boards and negotiating some phantom of legislation with all the importance of a cabinet council—*belli simulacra cientes*. Then they give each other dinners, where they assemble again with the comfortable assurance that they have earned their evening relaxation by the fatigues of the morning's committee. These are the leading men of our university, and who give the tone to it—a tone as of a lively municipal borough; all the objects of science and learning, for which a university exists, being put out of sight by the consideration of the material means of endowing them.

What Pattison wanted is not easy to state neatly, in part because he changed his mind. He altered his views, however, on means—not ends. He felt that the objective of a university was production of "a professional class of learned and scientific men"—that the university's primary function was learning and research, not teaching. Pattison came to believe in the abolition of colleges and fellowships and the transfer of college endowments to university control. On these drastic reforms in organization and finance Pattison was a radical even by the standards of today. Although he was trained in the classics and theology and his interests were largely in the field we would now call intellectual history, he was a strong partisan of the natural sciences and mathematics, both as a part of a liberal education and as subjects of research. He seems to have envisioned Oxford as the site of an Institute for Advanced Study. Also he anticipated the democratization of the university, which was to come through the government scholarship, by demanding that more students and more poor students be admitted, to make Oxford a truly national university—that is, one representative of the nation.

Above all, Pattison argued that the function of higher education was not to inculcate dogma or to impart specialized training. He recognized the necessity of vocational training, but insisted that the university was not the place for it. At the same time he would have had little sympathy with the modern research game in which the score is kept by simply counting publications. If Pattison's idea of scholarship can be summed up in one of his phrases it is that the fruit of learning "is not a book but a man."

Pattison lived through an era at Oxford in which the influence of the church was greatly diminished through the intervention of Parliament. Since World War II the reliance of the university on the government has deepened. Not only does the university, like all British universities, rely on the government for funds to operate central facilities, but more than 90 percent of students receive, and a large majority depend on, grants from local and national authorities.

The great increase of government spending on higher education in Britain has been justified mainly by the argument that a larger cadre of highly trained people is needed if Britain is to remain a successful modern industrial society. Emphasis has also been placed on insuring that opportunities to acquire higher education are gained through merit rather than through wealth or social class. The welfare of the nation, in a direct way verifiable by manpower statistics, is the university's objective. It is symptomatic that pressure is being applied to British universities to show results in applied science and technology as well as in "pure" research.

There is no doubt how Pattison would feel about putting utilitarian and equalitarian ends first. He would have said that the university's main business is the development of the individual. Pattison's sentiments are still respectable, however difficult they are to implement. The two historic tendencies still influence Oxford as they do other universities. Most academics see them as complementary rather than antagonistic. What can upset the balance is the strength of the demand for results, and the financial power of the government. Under the circumstances it is perhaps not too much to see in the vote on Latin at Oxford a stroke for Pattisonian independence.

—JOHN WALSH

Council of Social Advisers: New Approach to Welfare Priorities?

Every year the federal government spends billions to make society "better." Once the war in Vietnam is over, Washington's contribution to social welfare programs—antipoverty, public and private education, health and medicine—will probably increase even more. The government will spend, but will it spend wisely? There is growing conviction, among officials and Congressmen, that it may not.

At least one Senator, Walter F. Mondale (D–Minn.), has put the question in specific terms. There is "fragmentation on a massive scale," he insists, in collecting and using relevant research information to formulate program priorities. "Our intentions are good, but we lack a systematic and integrated approach to social programs."

To provide more and better information, Mondale has introduced a three-part proposal, which he calls "The Full Opportunity and Social Accounting Act of 1967." The bill, if passed, would:

1) Create a three-member Council of Social Advisers (modeled after the Council of Economic Advisers), which would try to sort out the significant findings from reams of government studies, fill apparent gaps with investigations of its own, in-