



THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 1921.

Editorial and Publishing Offices:

MACMILLAN & CO., LTD.,

ST. MARTIN'S STREET, LONDON, W.C.2.

Advertisements and business letters should be
addressed to the Publishers.

Editorial communications to the Editor.

Telegraphic Address: PHUSIS, LONDON.

Telephone Number: GERRARD 8830.

University Grants.

THE governing bodies and teaching staffs of the universities will view with dismay the proposal of the Lords Commissioners of H.M. Treasury to reduce the annual grant-in-aid of university education from 1,500,000*l.*, at which it stands in the current year, to 1,200,000*l.* for the coming financial year 1922-23.

It will be recalled that in the Estimates for 1921-22 a sum of 500,000*l.* was added to the annual grant, which at that time stood at one million. Of this 500,000*l.* it appears that 200,000*l.* has already been allocated in the form of *annual* grants to the various institutions participating in Parliamentary grant, while it is presumed that the remaining 300,000*l.* has been, or will be, available for non-recurrent allocation. On some such assumption it is explainable how the sum of 1,200,000*l.* has been arrived at. If the reduction of 300,000*l.* is agreed to by Parliament there will be in consequence no addition in the coming financial year to the annual grants now paid to these institutions, and obviously no non-recurrent allocation.

In the light of these statements it is important to review the question of university grants. Two facts are clear: (1) When Parliament voted the additional annual grant of half a million last session it did so on the ground of necessary and essential expenditure—this was made perfectly clear by Sir Philip Magnus and others in the debate on the Estimates; and (2) the governing bodies and teaching staffs of the universities assumed, and with perfect justification, that the grant voted as an *annual* grant, would be dis-

bursed as such. That only 200,000*l.* was allocated as annual grant and the rest as a non-recurrent allocation—a principle which, whatever its good points, is open to serious criticism—does not make the assumption less justifiable. Accordingly it was perfectly legitimate for the universities to make their plans in the belief that the 300,000*l.* would be available in succeeding years. The withdrawal will mean that these institutions will be let down and let down badly. One can readily understand why, at the recent opening of a bazaar to raise funds for Manchester University, "this grave fact was a subject of pained comment" by the vice-chancellor. "Comment" characterised by quite a different word from "pained" would not have surprised us. Sir H. A. Miers must have exercised great restraint on that occasion.

If the additional grant of 500,000*l.* is necessary and essential for the current year, what is the reason for the proposed withdrawal of three-fifths of it for next year? Is it less necessary or essential then, or is there some other reason? The plea of national economy cannot be justified. Very little consideration will show that to curtail the range of university education or to limit its possibilities is to curtail and limit the progress of civilisation, whether in things of the spirit or in the organisation and development of science as applied to commerce and industry. It is a short-sighted policy and one fraught with sinister import if the highest institutions of learning in the country are allowed to flounder in a morass of financial difficulties. It is certainly economy, but economy of a peculiar kind; it is the economy which leads to spiritual and material bankruptcy.

Let us examine the question a little more closely. Last February the University Grants Committee reported in no doubtful terms upon the clamant needs of the universities, and in particular upon the emoluments of university teachers. The report stated that the salaries were still below the minimum necessitated by economic conditions, and that the committee was satisfied that unless further substantial improvement was made the efficiency of university education would be seriously endangered. It went on to say that "the best men and women would neither enter nor continue in the profession at the rate of salaries then within the competence of the authorities to offer, nor could a teacher under the perpetual shadow of financial anxieties give his best to the work of instruction and research." This statement, strong as it is, has been amply confirmed by the difficulties which various departments in the universi-

ties are experiencing at the present time in recruiting their staffs.

Upon the strength of this report, together with representations made to Parliament by various interested bodies, the additional annual grant referred to above was made by Parliament. Now it is proposed to ask Parliament to cut down this grant. Such a proposal, in our opinion, can be justified only if it is shown that the grant is neither necessary nor essential in the coming year. Without considering the question of the further development of the universities, all-important as it is, let us examine one of the factors in the situation—university stipends.

Last July a conference of the heads of university institutions, the non-academic members of university governing bodies, and the council of the Association of University Teachers approved of a scale of minimum salaries for university teachers. This scale is extremely moderate, and, as a *minimum* scale, seems likely to meet with general approval. On the basis of these very reasonable proposals it was estimated that it would require an additional sum of about 400,000*l.* to raise the full-time teachers in university institutions in England and Wales to the minimum salary of the scale. Assuming that since the date when the Estimate was made an aggregate sum of 100,000*l.* has been added to the emoluments of the university teachers referred to, there still remains a sum of 300,000*l.* required to raise these teachers to their minimum on the scale. In this figure no allowance is made for an increase in the number of teachers or in the stipends of those who have reached their minimum.

Thus at the very time when an annual sum of 300,000*l.* is required in England and Wales to put university teachers on a minimum scale, which has been drawn up with due and proper consideration of the necessity of national economy, the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury propose to reduce the annual grant by 300,000*l.*, precisely the sum which, if distributed as an annual grant for salary purposes, would have enabled the university authorities to establish a reasonable and just scale of remuneration. Is it any wonder that the governing bodies and teaching staffs of the universities are dismayed at the proposal? We trust, however, that Parliament will not deal with our universities in this fashion, but, recognising that their necessities will be no less in the coming year than they are at the present moment, decline to be a party to a proposal which, in our opinion, from whatever side it is examined, cannot be justified.

NO. 2716, VOL. 108]

Psychological Medicine.

The Basis of Psychiatry. By Dr. Albert C. Buckley. Pp. xii+447. (Philadelphia and London: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1920.) 30s. net.

AT the present time, when great interest is being taken by both public and Press in the questions of body in relation to mind, psycho-analysis in the treatment of the psychoneuroses and psychoses, and the necessity of lunacy reform, a book which deals comprehensively with the subject of psychological medicine is especially welcome. Moreover, now that the conjoint board of the Royal Colleges of Physicians and Surgeons and many of the universities, notably Cambridge and London, have instituted a diploma of psychological medicine, a book such as "The Basis of Psychiatry" is notably opportune, and we have no hesitation in recommending this book strongly to students and practitioners, for it satisfies a long-felt want.

The author first discusses biologic phenomena, including the laws of heredity and their application to mental and nervous diseases. Then follows a brief but useful chapter on cerebral development and receptive organs, with a description of the autonomic system and its functions. We are rather surprised to find that no mention is made of Hughlings Jackson's levels. The author shows how sensitivity and differential sensitivity constitute fundamental biological phenomena, but Head's theory of protopathic and epicritic sensibility is not alluded to. This may be an omission on account of space rather than disbelief in its validity.

Chap. 5 is devoted to psychological processes, and should prove very useful to students and practitioners, for it enables the reader to grasp principles and become familiar with psychological terms sufficiently to enable him to understand and express in suitable language disorders of the mind.

Since psycho-analysis is at the present time attracting so much attention of the profession, the public mind, and the Press, it will be interesting to consider a little fully the views of Prof. Buckley. The doctrine of the unconscious mind is discussed, and the author points out that it was an outgrowth of abnormal psychology led by Charcot and continued by his pupils Janet and Freud. He describes briefly Janet's pioneer work on dissociation of consciousness upon the basis of which the symptoms commonly met in hysteria were explained by the eminent French psychiatrist. The further development of the unconscious by Freud, according to whom psychoneuroses are due to a complex carrying with it a