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-

form the President of program shortcomings, and advise him on social priorities.

2) Have the President deliver an annual report to the Congress on the state of the nation's "social health."

3) Establish a joint congressional committee to review the report and make soundings of its own.

The spirit of cost-benefit analysis pervades Mondale's plan. He wants to cut across departmental lines to find out, for example, how all programs for the prevention of crime are doing together. And he wants to know which projects in the spectrum of agency efforts are most effective. He also thinks that the government, with all its studies, often lacks vital information. He notes, for instance, that former Consumer Counsel Esther Peterson says there is no reliable information on the costs of living for the elderly, and he wonders how well a government without such data can aid the aged.

On paper, the proposal looks attractive, but there are problems. The germ for the bill came from an appreciation of the role that the Council of Economic Advisers is now playing in the making of economic policy. But social problems and social statistics are by their very nature much broader in scope and far more ambiguous in nature than economic problems and statistics.

Not only that, but statistical reports alone often serve only to keep the government printers busy. The Council of Economic Advisers, born in 1946, did not emerge as a truly powerful force until it won the confidence of President Kennedy. A new Council of Social Advisers might court Presidential favor, but then again it might not. After all, the Bureau of the Budget has been doing much (though not all) of the practical job Mondale suggests for the new council—that is, sorting out different program approaches and recommending the best alternative.

Moreover, the mere placing of the new council in the Executive, even if it had the President's support, presents problems. As Mondale put it, "We can't create an institution that will directly embarrass the President." Nor, presumably, would the President, who appoints the members of the council, allow it to embarrass him.

Daniel P. Moynihan, former Assistant Secretary of Labor and now head of the Harvard–M.I.T. Joint Center for Urban Studies, has focused on many of the problems raised by Mondale but has proposed a slightly different solution. What troubles Moynihan, among other things, is that, "up until now, the executive branch of the federal government, and the executive branch in American government in general, has had a virtual monopoly on evaluative research."

Senator Walter T. Mondale

Moynihan wants the market opened up. "Too often, the executive is exposed to the temptation to release only those findings that suit its purposes; there is no one to keep them honest," he told a congressional subcommittee last fall. Subsequently, Senator Abraham Ribicoff (D–Conn.), the subcommittee's chairman, sponsored legislation embodying Moynihan's proposal for an Office of Legislative Evaluation. Staffed by social scientists, the office would review program and "PPBS" (Programming-Planning-Budgeting System) decisions by the Executive. (PPBS is one of the techniques introduced by Defense Secretary McNamara and now spreading to other parts of government.) The object, in Moynihan's words, is "to 'evaluate the evaluators' and in this way maintain and improve the quality of regular ongoing work of the executive departments. . . ."

Though the Moynihan and Mondale proposals are not identical and not necessarily mutually exclusive, in practice they would face similar obstacles. The first is that of any "overview" approach to government programs: the executive agencies and, to a lesser extent, Congress both have what Mondale terms "channel vision"; that is, committees and agencies naturally concentrate on their own projects and responsibilities for oversight. This decentralization guarantees specialization, but also assures that the committees and agencies will take, more often than not, a "narrow" view of their own efforts and defend themselves against "comprehensive" evaluators from the outside.

The second problem concerns the limits of research findings. As Moynihan told Ribicoff's subcommittee, the government's "commitment to evaluation research is fundamentally ambivalent. This is so, not only because research can blow up in an administrator's face when it turns out that his programs show little or none of the effects they are supposed to achieve, but more important because, in areas of social policy, facts are simply not neutral—they are inescapably political."

It may be some time before the theory underlying these two proposals is put to the test. Hearings on Mondale's bill, for example, will open in late July, but the Senator concedes that passage next session would be "lucky." In the interim, other questions—the real need for new evaluators, a possible confusion of roles between councils of economic and of social advisers—will arise. But, if a council is ever created, its ultimate importance may lie not so much in the statistics it produces as in the men it brings to government and the weight given their advice.

—ROBERT J. SAMUELSON

RECENT DEATHS

Gilbert W. Heublein, 58; a member of the senior radiological staff at Hartford Hospital, Canton, Conn., and visiting clinical professor of radiology at Jefferson Medical College and Medicine Center; 27 May.

Richard Kudo, 81; professor emeritus of zoology, University of Illinois, and visiting professor of zoology, Southern Illinois University; 1 June.

Leo Loewe, 70; clinical assistant professor emeritus of medicine, State University College of Medicine, New York, and former editor of the journal *Angiology*; 30 May.

Preston Lowrance, 51; former associate professor of internal medicine, University of Virginia Medical School; 30 May.