

A1458
no. 90-6

GOVERNMENT POLICIES AND HIGHER EDUCATION:
BRITAIN AND THE UNITED STATES
1630 TO 1860

By
Sheldon Rothblatt
and
Martin Trow
Center for Studies in Higher Education
University of California, Berkeley

Working Paper 90-6



UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT BERKELEY

GOVERNMENT POLICIES AND HIGHER EDUCATION: A COMPARISON OF
BRITAIN AND THE UNITED STATES 1630 TO 1860

by Sheldon Rothblatt and Martin Trow
(January 1990)

Forthcoming in Colin Crouch and Anthony Heath, eds., The
Sociology of Social Reform, Oxford University Press
(Festschrift in honor of Professor A.H. Halsey)

Working Papers published by the Institute of Governmental Studies provide quick dissemination of draft reports and papers, preliminary analyses, and papers with a limited audience. The objective is to assist authors in refining their ideas by circulating research results and to stimulate discussion about public policy. Working Papers are reproduced unedited directly from the author's pages.

1. Introduction

Over the past three hundred and fifty years, American and British colleges and universities have been created and have operated in the context of policies set forth by their respective central governments, policies which have had decisive effects on the way these institutions have developed. In this essay we will explore some of the policies which shaped the diverging character of the two systems, looking for ways in which those governmental policies have interacted with other non-governmental forces to give the systems and their component institutions the sharply contrasting characteristics that have long distinguished them.

In a short essay it is only possible to open some questions and point in the direction in which answers might be found. Our approach depends heavily upon a close comparison of British and American experience at roughly the same time in the history of the two societies and their institutions of higher education. We will be looking at several key development in the early history of the two countries in order to illustrate their different responses to roughly similar problems in the relations of State and college or university. Finally, we will reflect on whether these developments reveal any underlying patterns in the State-institution relations which are reflected in the basic

characteristics of the national higher education systems in the two countries.

2. The Colonial Experience in America

Despite all the changes and transformations of State, society and economy in modern times, the American higher education system has its roots in the colonial period, when it developed characteristics distinguishable from all other systems of higher education in the world, notably: its governance patterns, marked by a strong president and lay governing board; its extraordinary diversity of forms and functions; and its marked responsiveness to forces in society as well as in State and church. In one other respect the colonial colleges are familiar to us, and that is in the importance attached to them by the societies and governments of the colonies. At a time when most or many European universities were not really central to the vitality of their societies, or were more or less preoccupied with the preparation of theologians and divines serving an established church, or with defining the virtues and polishing the accomplishments of a ruling elite, seventeenth- and eighteenth-century colonial colleges in America, especially those in New England, were regarded by their founders and supporters as forces for survival in a hostile environment. They were perceived as crucial, indeed indispensable instruments for staving off the threat of

reversion to barbarism, the threatened decline into the savagery of the surrounding forest and Indian.¹ The colleges also played a familiar role for these early Calvinists of maintaining a learned ministry and a literate laity.

Moreover, in the young colonies as on the later frontier, civilization and its institutions could never be assumed to be inherited. They had always to be created and re-created; and for this purpose, learning and learned persons and the institutions that engendered them were needed.

The colonial colleges were founded as public bodies. They were established and then chartered by a public authority and were supported in part by public funds, in part by private gifts and endowments, in part by student fees. The mixing of public and private support, functions and authority has persisted as a central characteristic of American higher education to this day, blurring the distinction between public and private colleges and universities. Americans have tended to regard all their higher education institutions as having a public dimension, and they have also allowed for a private dimension in their public institutions. As Jurgen Herbst argues, one cannot see the colonial colleges as either "public" or "private" institutions but as "provincial," stressing their function of service to their sponsoring and chartering colony, rather than to their source of support or authority.² While the distinction between "public" and "private" emerged with a certain clarity in the nineteenth century, and especially

after the Civil War, it is still more appropriate to see the broad spectrum of American colleges and universities as lying along a continuum from fully public to nearly purely private. Every "private" institution in the United States is today in receipt of public support, both through the favorable tax treatment for gifts and endowments made to higher education, as well as through publicly-provided student aid. Conversely, public colleges and universities raise private funds from student fees, gifts and endowments, business and industry; and their lay governing boards give a degree of autonomy to their institutions similar to that of the private institutions.

The geography of the Eastern Seaboard, and the accidents of settlement, created a series of distinct and largely self-governing colonies, each tied to metropolitan London through a charter and governor, yet separate from one another in character, social structure, and forms of governance. That, in turn, meant that when colonial colleges were established, they differed from one another in their origins, links to colonial government and denominational ties.³ There was no central government on the American continent with broad jurisdiction over them all, and thus no governmental body that would accept responsibility for ordering and governing an emerging class of institutions in similar ways, in response to a common law or governmental policy. Indeed, even after a Federal government emerged, it explicitly renounced its authority

over education, including higher education, delegating that power to the constituent states. That self-denying ordinance was reinforced during the early years of the Republic when an attempt to create a national university in the capital was defeated, thus preventing what might well have introduced formal and informal constraints on the promiscuous creation of new colleges and universities after the Revolution.⁴ So the colonies had the experience, before the Revolution, of a multiplicity of colleges or "university colleges," similar in certain respects but differing in others. They had also the experience of having created these institutions of higher education at the initiative or with the encouragement of public authorities and powerful private constituencies. This stands in marked contrast to the conspicuous lack of such encouragement, and indeed the stubborn resistance, or deeply divided responses, by political and ecclesiastical authorities in England to the creation of new institutions of higher education, especially and particularly those originating outside the Establishment, in the decades before about 1830. The many dissenting academies created in the second half of the eighteenth century never had the encouragement of central or local government, and their failure to be fully acknowledged or gain a charter and the right to grant degrees were among the factors leading them to short lives and a dead end. It does not appear that this early and at one time promising precedent and experience in college building was of real use

or inspiration to those who created the new English colleges and universities that arose first in London and Durham and then in the provincial towns and cities of Victorian England. One might therefore say that for Americans the colonial experience was a training in the arts of establishing institutions of higher education. And the skills and attitudes necessary for the creation of new colleges that were gained in the colonial period, along with the models of governance provided by the older institutions, led directly to the proliferation of colleges and universities after the Revolution: 16 more between 1776 and 1800⁵, and literally hundreds over the next half century.

The eight colonial colleges differed widely among themselves. In a sense, these early and most prestigious American colleges, the nurseries of so many of the Revolutionary leaders, legitimated diversity. But similarities also existed. The colonial colleges had to be created in the absence of a body of learned men. In the new world no guild of scholars existed, no body of learned men who could take the government of a college into its own hands. The very survival of the new institutions in the absence of buildings, an assured income, or a guild of scholars required a higher and more continuing level of governmental interest and involvement for institutions that had become too important for the colonies to be allowed to wither or die. Moreover, a concern for doctrinal orthodoxy, especially in the seventeenth century, provided further

grounds for public authorities to create governance machinery in which its own representatives were visible, or held a final veto and continuing "visitorial" and supervisory powers (an inheritance from Britain, where bishops frequently performed the function of safeguarding the wishes of founders and benefactors). The medieval idea of a university as an autonomous corporation composed of masters and scholars was certainly present in the minds of the founders of colonial colleges, but the actual circumstances of colonial life forced a drastic modification in the application of this inheritance. At Harvard, for example, the charter of 1650

exemplified a carefully wrought compromise between a medieval tradition of corporate autonomy and a modern concern for territorial authorities over all matters of state and religion. The former was preserved, even though weakly, in the Corporation; the latter was institutionalized in the Board of Overseers.⁶

Other colonies as well, for reasons similar to those of Massachusetts, carefully circumscribed the powers of the corporate universities, each making sure that its governors and legislatures retained ultimate power over the college through the composition of its external Board or through the reserve powers of the colonial government as 'visitor.' Even in Connecticut, where Yale's trustees were all Congregational ministers, the charter that incorporated the trustees as the President and Fellows of Yale College preserved to the colonial Court the right "'as often as required' to inspect the college's laws, rules and

ordinances, and to repeal or disallow them 'when they shall think proper.'"⁷ The charter, Herbst notes, "thus upheld the ultimate authority of the Court over the college, but also guaranteed the school's autonomy within specific limits."⁸

Indeed, only Harvard and William and Mary, in Massachusetts and Virginia, the only two seventeenth-century foundations, were established with a two-board government, one representing the institution or corporation, the other the external trustees. And in both of these "the governmental practice...soon lost its distinctiveness and came to resemble that of the one-board colleges. American colleges were to be ruled by powerful and respected citizens, who would govern them for their own and their children's benefit."⁹ Ironically, the nearest American colleges and universities ever came to recreating the first, or corporate board, was when they finally were able to gather together a guild of learned men who could command respect and gain a measure of professional authority. It was not until after the turn of the twentieth century that academic senates became significant parts of the governance machinery of American colleges and universities, and then only in the most prestigious institutions employing scholars who were able to use the academic marketplace to compel respect and attention from presidents and boards concerned with the status and distinction of their institutions. The relative weakness of the academic profession in the United States, as compared with its strength in the United Kingdom,

especially in Oxbridge, has had large consequences for the diverging development of the two systems.¹⁰

With the exception of New Jersey which, because of religious diversity occurring at the end of the colonial period, chartered two colleges, each colony granted a monopoly position to its college. In this respect, each colony behaved towards its college as England behaved towards Oxford and Cambridge and Scotland towards its universities, granting their colleges the power to award degrees within their respective "province." American colonial governments were attempting to prevent or inhibit the appearance of rival and competitive institutions, in much the same way that the government in England had prevented the dissenting academies from widening the educational market in the eighteenth century. Consequently (and other factors were doubtless involved) the dissenting academies never emerged as serious competitive degree-granting institutions and were destined to failure and (with the special exception of the institution that became Manchester College, Oxford) to eventual extinction.^{10a} But their existence - and relevance - was noted in the colonies and reference was made to them as better models than the ancient universities during a dispute at Yale in the 1750s over sectarian issues.¹¹ As models they were even more relevant to the proliferation of American colleges on the frontier between the Revolution and the Civil War, with the significant difference that the American colleges were

encouraged and sometimes even modestly supported by public authorities.

Charters expressly reserved for colonial governments a continuing role in the governance of colleges, placing colonial officers directly on boards of trustees, or assigning to the Courts and legislatures the power of review. For example, the 1766 charter of Queen's College (later to become Rutgers) included among its lay trustees the governor, council president, chief justice and attorney general of the province of New Jersey.¹² By its charter of 1748, the College of New Jersey (later Princeton) placed the governor of the colony on the board as its presiding officer.¹³ And in the turbulent sectarian climate of eighteenth-century America, those reserve powers were in fact employed from time to time.

All the colonial colleges were provided with public funds of various kinds, though in varying amounts and degree of consistency. Some received a flat sum or subsidy to make up an annual shortfall in operating expenses or salaries, others assistance in the construction and maintenance of buildings. The Assembly of Virginia provided the College of William and Mary with a percentage of the duties collected on furs, skins and imported liquor.¹⁴ These subventions reflected an organic connection between the colony and "its" college, and the colonies were not reluctant to use the power of the purse as a constraint on colleges when they were supposed to have carried their autonomy too far. The

Connecticut legislature in 1755 refused its annual grant of L100 to Yale because of a sectarian dispute with the College's president.¹⁵

The power of colonial governments over their colleges, then, derived from three fundamental sources: the power to give or withhold a charter; the continuing powers reserved for government within the charter; and the power of the public purse, Or as Bernard Bailyn has stated the situation, "The autonomy that comes from an independent, reliable, self-perpetuating income was everywhere lacking. The economic basis of self-direction in education failed to develop."^{15a}

3. The American Revolution

Before 1776 the colonies displayed a stronger or at least as strong a connection between State and college as was apparent in the mother country, but the relationship changed drastically after the Declaration of Independence. In a formal sense, the Revolution transformed colonial governments into state governments and superimposed a national confederacy and then a Federal government on top of them. However, at the same time the Revolution weakened all agencies of government, by stressing the roots of the new nation in popular sovereignty, the subordination of the government to "the people," and the primacy of individual and group freedom and initiative. "The individual replaced the state as the unit of politics," writes one historian, and the Constitution and Bill of Rights confirmed this

Copernican revolution in authority." And "unlike the 18th-century venture in building a society from the top down," American society after the Revolution "originated in a multitude of everyday needs that responded to the long lines of settlement and enterprise, not the imperatives of union."¹⁶

But at least as important as the new conception of the relation of the citizen to State that emerged from independence was the opening of the frontier beyond the Alleghenies, which gave many Americans a chance to walk away from the settled and "European" states that succeeded the old colonies, requiring them to create, indeed invent, new forms of self-government on the frontier.¹⁷ Among the institutions of the frontier were new colleges, resembling the colonial colleges in some ways but differing in others and linking the recently-opened territories to the original culture of the Atlantic. In the 25 years after the Declaration of Independence, 16 colleges were established (and have survived), thus tripling the total number in existence.¹⁸ Of these, no less than 14 were created on the frontier. After 1800 the floodgates of education opened, and hundreds of institutions were established in both old states and new territories. Most of them were small and malnourished, and many collapsed within a few years of their founding. The reason for this explosion of educational activity was a change in the three conditions that had hitherto characterized government-college relations in the

colonial period, the three conditions of restrictive chartering, direct interest by government in the administration of colleges, and public support of higher education.

The new states, both those which succeeded the old colonies and those carved out of the new lands to the West, did not give a monopoly to any single state college or university, relecting the quite different relationship of State and societal institutions that emerged from the Revolution. The states granted charters much more readily than had colonies before the Revolution, and on decidedly different terms. Herbst tells of efforts in 1762 by Congregationalists dissatisfied with the liberal Unitarian tendencies of Harvard to create a Queen's College in western Massachusetts. The nation's oldest college and its Overseers opposed the proposal and prevailed, using the argument that Harvard "was a provincial monopoly, funded and supported by the General Court for reasons of state" and "properly the College of the Government."¹⁹ The principle that preserved a monopoly to the "College of the Government," with its attendant rights and privileges, had to be overthrown for American higher education to break out of the restrictive pattern of higher education that had been historical practice. What is astonishing is not that it was subsequently overthrown, but that it was done with such ease as to scarcely occasion comment. Harvard lost its monopoly in Massachusetts when Williams was founded in 1793, although

Yale managed to preserve its special privilege in Connecticut to 1823.

The founding in 1815 of Allegheny College in western Pennsylvania near the Ohio border illustrates the changes that took place after the Revolution in yet another way.²⁰ A group of the leading men in a village of some 400 people came together to establish a college, as others were doing all over the western frontier. The initial group who met in the village of Meadville constituted themselves a board of trustees empowered to create an institution that would bring light and learning to their community. The education was to embody what was then a fairly standard curriculum centering upon the study of Latin, Greek, Hebrew and classical authorities. Since there were few secondary schools in the region to prepare pupils for higher education, the new board decided to admit a class of "probationers," boys and young men who, without being fully matriculated for the degree, would undergo instruction for a year or so. Having successfully completed their probationary period, they would be admitted to the College's first class.²¹

The self-appointed trustees of the newly-created college applied to the state government of Pennsylvania for a charter. However, without waiting for one to be granted, they immediately appointed a president, who was a Congregational minister, a graduate of Harvard, a headmaster of an eastern secondary school, and a cousin of one of the founders of the college. The founders appear to have had no

doubt about the charter, nor much doubt about the possibility that money would be granted by the state legislature, where local representatives would press their case. They appointed a second professor - a local clergyman - and subscribed to the endowment. On the very day of his appointment, the new president of the college was authorized to solicit gifts 'in such parts of the United States as may be deemed proper."²² A fund-raising tour took him immediately eastward to New England and New York, where he raised some \$2000 in cash and books to add to the \$4000 subscribed by the founders and their friends. As expected, the state of Pennsylvania contributed an additional \$2000 on the occasion of the grant of a charter.

Nevertheless, Allegheny remained in perennial financial difficulty for decades, and its history is marked by constant and almost always unsuccessful appeals to the legislature for support, despite the fact that the charter placed the governor, the chief justice and the attorney general of Pennsylvania on the board of trustees ex officio. The continuing poverty of almost all American colleges after the Revolution, and the lack of firm guarantees to their survival by public authorities, were crucial to their self-conception and to their relations with the surrounding society. The absence of assured support shaped their responsiveness to the interests of their internal and external constituencies, the numbers and social origins of their students, and the numbers and character of the faculty

recruited to teach.²³ The president of Allegheny, in an effort to provide for endowed chairs, approached a local society of Masons, which he had helped found in 1817, and there was talk of establishing an Architectonic Mathematical Professorship. An attempt was made to induce the Germans of Pennsylvania and other parts of the United States to raise a fund "for a learned professor, whose duty it shall be, not only to teach the comprehensive and energetic German language, but to exercise his talents in disseminating the light of German literature and science." A gracious letter in German and English was circulated, and the president's plan was laid before the Lutheran and Reformed Synods, but the College was too distant from the German centers of population, and the plan failed.²⁴ The college did not gain financial security until it accepted the patronage and authority of the Methodist Church in 1833.

It is perhaps worth noting that the founders of Allegheny College, though frontiersmen, were what the eighteenth century would have considered "gentlemen," well-educated and not poor farmers. A leading figure had been an officer in the Continental Army. It is also worth noting that the new College president, his cousin on the board, and probably other board members as well, all had interests in a large tract of nearby land being sold by a land development company in parcels to new immigrants to the Northwest Territories. The president had earlier visited that area, and on his return to the East had written fliers

and advertisements for the company. Land speculation was and remained a central element in American life, and was so not only in the foundation of Allegheny College, but also in the development of higher education throughout American history. Land speculators all through the western movement assumed that the creation of a college in a region would make property more attractive to immigrants, and thus more valuable. That attitude speaks to the commercial spirit of the society at large, the unembarrassed way in which that spirit could be linked to the establishment of cultural institutions, and the way in which both culture and commerce could be seen to be defences against the barbarism which threatened to overwhelm Americans as they moved yet farther away from the secure and hallowed centers of civilization in the East Coast and Europe.

The founders of Allegheny received their charter two years after the founding of the College, though by that time it was already in operation. And they received it, along with a small subvention from the legislature, with no questions asked about the institution's academic standards. It was enough that the first president was a Harvard man.

The ease with which new colleges were granted charters after the Revolution, and especially after the turn of the century, was itself both symbol and instrument in the triumph of society over the State after the Revolution. Despite the efforts of the Federalists, central government itself over time came to be not the dominant institution in

society (alongside the churches), but merely one player in social life, and not a very important one at that. By the fifth decade of the nineteenth century, the national government was scarcely visible in American life: no national bank, no military worth mentioning, no taxes that a growing majority of citizens could remember paying its officials.²⁵ And even state governments, closer to the people and with constitutional responsibility for education, confined their role to serving as the instruments of groups and interests in the society at large, including those who wanted to create colleges for a whole variety of motives: cultural, religious and mercenary.

4. Two Notable Failures

But that did not occur without two significant efforts by government, one by the Federal government and the other by a state, to play a more traditionally authoritative role in the world of higher education. The first of these, the proposal to create a national university at the seat of government in Washington, was an effort to give to the federal government an institution for nation-building which would discipline and coordinate all the other institutions of higher education in the country, a capstone university whose recognition (we would now say "accreditation") would give direction and standards to the whole of American secondary and post-secondary education. The second was the effort by the state of New Hampshire to reorganize and reconstitute Dartmouth College as a state institution,

something closer to a provincial college than Allegheny College or the many other "private" foundations being created at about the same time. The first effort was defeated by the Congress, the second by the Supreme Court.

The idea of a national or "Federal" university was apparently born around the campfires of the Continental Army, but first given expression by Dr. Benjamin Rush, a prominent physician and patriot of Philadelphia.²⁶ The idea gained its strongest supporter in George Washington, who urged it on the Congress in his first and last messages, and made a contribution towards it in his will. He argued that it would promote national unity, save young Americans the expense and bother of going abroad for their higher education, and provide the basis for one really first-class university in a country already possessing a goodly number of institutions, all too small and poor to be competitive with the leading European institutions. As he noted in his final message to Congress,

Our Country, much to its honor, contains many Seminaries of learning highly respectable and useful; but the funds upon which they rest, are too narrow, to command the ablest Professors, in the different departments of liberal knowledge, for the Institution contemplated, though they would be excellent auxiliaries.²⁷

Correct in his diagnosis, Washington underestimated the hostility in Congress to any attempt to strengthen the power

of Federal institutions, especially one which would have such clear implications for the creation and development of local, state and regional colleges and universities. And despite efforts to bring the issue back to the Congress by his successors, a national university was never created. For while suggestions to create a University of the United States were not accompanied by proposals to give it a monopoly over higher degrees, it would surely have been, in colonial terms, "the Government's university," and as such would have had profound effects on all of American higher education. Its standards of entry, curricula, educational philosophies and forms of instruction would have provided models for every college or "seminary" which aspired to send some of its graduates to the university in the Capitol. A University of the United States might well have established national academic standards for the bachelor's degree, for the qualifications of faculty, even conceivably for entry to colleges, and in these ways have greatly influenced the character and curriculum of secondary feeder schools. We might speculate that eventually a national university would have shaped and constrained the growth of graduate education and research universities. It would surely have been the central instrument of Federal government policy regarding higher education in the Union. Therefore the defeat of the idea of a University of the United States was arguably the most important policy decision affecting the role of central government in American higher education, determining or at

least conditioning the character of all future Federal government interventions.

The spectacular defeat of the idea of a central university needs to be discussed in the same breath with a second event of momentous consequence, the decision by the Supreme Court in 1819 in the case of *The Trustees of Dartmouth College versus Woodward* (for the State of New Hampshire), for this too had a profound effect on the place of public authority in the development of an American higher education system.²⁸ The New Hampshire state government seized the occasion of a dispute between the President of Dartmouth and its Trustees to attempt to change the College charter in order to bring public representatives directly onto the board. Other changes affecting the governance of the College, its curriculum and sectarian linkages were also in train. New Hampshire maintained that although Dartmouth may have been established in colonial times as a "private" corporation, it was founded to benefit the people of the state. Consequently, the public, through the state's legislature, deserved and required a voice in the operation of the College. The State of New Hampshire intended to "improve" Dartmouth as a place of learning by modernizing its administration and curriculum, creating the framework for a university, and encouraging a freer, nonsectarian atmosphere.

The Trustees, claiming that the State of New Hampshire was illegally modifying Dartmouth's original charter, took

its defense to the U.S. Supreme Court, where their position was upheld in a landmark decision written by Chief Justice John Marshall. He wrote that the College was a "private" rather than a "civil" corporation, and affirmed the sanctity of the contract (as embodied in its charter) between the state and Dartmouth. In attempting to change the charter, the legislature, he continued, was substituting its own intentions for those of the donors; and the consequence, in his opinion, was that the College would be turned into "a machine entirely subservient to the will of government."²⁹ Marshall expressly affirmed the rights of private property over the implicit links of a colonial establishment with its charter-granting government. In this judgment, Dartmouth was not the "Government's College," as the original colonial colleges had so long been. On the contrary, it was the exclusive possession of its Trustees.

Historians have been debating the significance of the Dartmouth College decision. It has even been argued that the public-private distinction did not occasion much comment at the time and does not seem to have been as central an issue as the secular-sectarian dispute.³⁰ Bailyn, however, has noted that the character and limit of State authority, the definitions of a private right or privilege, were hot issues in the 1780s at the time the Constitution was being framed,^{31a} and it is difficult to think that Enlightenment ideas about individual or corporate autonomy in the exercise of power were totally absent from the minds of parties to

the Dartmouth question. However that may be, the long-run implications seem beyond dispute. The Supreme Court decision, preventing the State of New Hampshire from taking over the institution, or altering its charter, had the practical effect of safeguarding the founding of "independent" colleges. Henceforth the founders and promoters of private educational ventures knew that once a state charter was obtained, they and their successors were secure in the future control of their investment. The legal basis for the extraordinary proliferation of privately founded and governed higher education institutions in the United States was now in place.

5. Higher Education Policy in Britain at the end of the Eighteenth Century

At the time of the American Revolution, the interest of the British State in the structure and functioning of higher education was primarily limited to maintaining the religious and political orthodoxy of the nation's universities. Those members who criticized existing arrangements or challenged them in any fundamental way were ejected or neutralized. At Oxford or Cambridge, religious tests were required of undergraduates for admission or graduation; and while no such subscription was necessary in Scotland, a test, albeit unevenly enforced, was imposed on university faculty there. In England, therefore, non-Anglicans could attend the two senior universities only if they were willing to perjure

themselves (and submit to obloquy), but in Scotland, where the Presbyterian Church was Established, students of Dissenting and Nonconformist backgrounds were welcome. At Edinburgh and Glasgow, non-Presbyterians held professorships.^{30b} In Ireland, before the Act of Union in the early nineteenth century, an independent Irish Parliament had dispensed with religious tests for conferring degrees at Trinity College Dublin; but while open to Roman Catholic undergraduates, the offices and emoluments of the College were nevertheless closed to them until the 1870s.^{30c}

Where they existed, the requirements for orthodoxy were consistent with a constitution of Church and State and therefore resembled, in certain respects, the higher education practices in effect in American colonies. In England, as in America, no specific government policies existed with respect to those issues now deemed indispensable to the operation of an effective higher education system: admissions and access, curriculum, cost effectiveness and accountability. To be sure, in Scotland the State (to be precise, the Crown) had long taken a major role in higher education, supplying universities and colleges with a small annual grant. Nevertheless, in both kingdoms the financing of higher education was largely a mixture of market forces and charitable endowments.

Statutes and ordinances, approved over the centuries by the Crown in Council or Parliament, provided in some half a hundred versions the framework of governance in which the

ancient collegiate societies of Oxford and Cambridge functioned. The numbers of fellowships and scholarships were specified, as was the internal distribution of appointments according to schools and colleges of origin. Otherwise, in varying degree, the collegiate societies functioned in an astonishingly unrestricted environment, free not only from direct government interference but from what would later be understood and referred to as the force of public opinion. Interference, when it occurred, usually came in the "acceptable" statutory form of an official "visit," customarily by a bishop, invited by the fellowship to adjudicate conflicting claims and disputes. Indeed, although it would be an anachronism to say so, the ancient colleges (though not the universities) behaved as if they were "private" institutions; and perhaps it is not surprising to learn that when, in the 1830s, debates about the public and private roles of higher education institutions occurred, colleges were even legally referred to as "private"³¹ despite a long history of royal interference right into the earlier decades of the eighteenth century.

The Crown (and Parliament) had long demonstrated their authority to revise college statutes. Consequently it was not from such legal safeguards as college constitutions and the habit of self-government allowed that Oxbridge foundations were independent. The colleges of Oxford and Cambridge derived their liberties from an incontestable social fact, namely that their membership shared the values

and beliefs of those who sat in Parliament or advised the Crown. Despite low enrollments (a feature of most eighteenth-century European universities), Oxford and Cambridge colleges educated all of the Georgian prime ministers (with two exceptions) and about one-half of all members of parliament between 1734 and 1812, giving the English governing elite an educational cohesion comparatively unique in Europe.³² Such an historical situation did not require an elaboration of the differences between private and public, for the two realms were intertwined. In this the colleges of England were not so dissimilar from their American colonial counterparts, which were also intimately connected to elite society and were responsible for educating the clerical and political leaders of that society, whose patronage and association brought them prestige and for some, a reasonably comfortable income.

Non-Anglicans, which also means Roman Catholics and Jews, were not closely identified with aristocratic society, although it would be an error to suggest that significant political and economic ties were absent, at least to certain aristocratic segments. Nevertheless, it is correct to say that in general non-Anglicans were excluded from direct participation in government and administration by the operation of a code of electoral laws. Being effectively excluded from Oxford and Cambridge by the requirement of an oath of religious loyalty, and in general ignored by the State, Dissenters had created over the course of the "long

eighteenth century" an alternate educational system for themselves, one that was weakly-financed and can be anachronistically but also usefully described as "private." The curriculum of the dissenting academies reflected many of the modernizing education tendencies of the time, being stronger in science, social science and vernacular languages than English schools and colleges, and similar in this respect to some if not all of the Scottish universities.

Whether the academies can be described as a "higher education system" is problematical. They attracted pupils of high school age (as did Scottish and American institutions), and many of their pedagogical concerns were the consequence of typical adolescent problems such as pupil discipline. Nor did the academies educate candidates for the learned professions, apart from the chapels from which they drew support. While Oxford and Cambridge were also by this point relatively disconnected from the education of potential lawyers and physicians, their undergraduates at least were older, in a range similar to what we might expect today.

6. Drifting towards a Higher Education Policy: London and Durham

Of course no Revolution occurred in Britain to change or alter the existing relationships between the State and its universities and colleges. No Dartmouth decision was needed to separate the sphere of private from public educational activity, and no central government scheme for a

national university was considered necessary when in the eyes of many the hoary colleges of Oxford and Cambridge already fulfilled that purpose. The Crown in Parliament was sovereign, not an abstraction called "the people," and no constitutional institution outside the Crown in Parliament (such as a Supreme Court) existed as a counterweight to the exercise of public authority. Alterations in the relations of the higher education sector to the central government, therefore, were not dependent upon the definition of such abstractions as "people" or "society" but on the more concrete details of possible shifts in the attitudes or the social composition of the kingdom's governing institutions, a possible reflection if not always a clear one of larger changes in the nation as a whole.

It is therefore appropriate to speak about changes in State-university relations as more the result of a drift towards public policy than as a sudden and dramatic reversal or alteration, ad hoc solutions rather than carefully-meditated ministerial decisions. Such drifts in Britain are familiar from other areas of the kingdom's history, and as such reinforce the long-standing opinion of historians that change was essentially piecemeal and improvised, practical responses to specific social problems and rarely a complete overhaul of existing institutions. Compared to adjustments and changes in the system of higher education in the United States, those in nineteenth-century Britain were less haphazard and unpredictable, more consistent in the

application of slowly-evolving principles, and much less dependent upon a seemingly feckless market economy. Probably the distinctions should not be overdrawn. Both Victorian Britain and Victorian America were liberal cultures. Resemblances existed, especially in the area of private initiative and philanthropy and in the importance of urban localism and local institutions. Yet even so, underneath surface similarities were institutional, legal and cultural solutions to common problems that indicated profoundly divergent or diverging views on the organization of higher education systems and their primary curricula.

The first signs of the development of a government policy towards higher education in England appeared in the 1820s and 1830s in the controversies surrounding the foundation of the University of London. These led to an independent decision, taken from below, to expand and diversify the provision for higher education in England, and to improve access by opening university education to those groups effectively barred from attending the ancient universities because of cost or religious stigma or both and prevented from entering the Scottish universities because of distance in the days before railways.

The basic facts concerning the formation of what is now called University College London but was initially known as the University of London are familiar enough not to require repetition here, yet several aspects of the historical situation deserve special emphasis and elaboration.

The creation of a new university took place at a time of major political change leading to the extension of the franchise, the removal of civil disabilities from Dissenters and Roman Catholics (but not Jews) and the growth of a liberal philosophy of private endeavor. Recent research has pretty well established that a surprising amount of educational initiative took place in the final decades of the eighteenth century and early decades of the new century in an active market economy, heavily weighted towards consumer choice and discipline and even involving brand-name recognition.³³ The University of London was founded hard on the heels of this expansion of consumer interest. It was also created at a time when the numbers of non-Anglicans had greatly increased, so that any notion of an Anglican Establishment based on the majority, as, for example, advanced by Bishop Warburton in the mid-eighteenth century, was coming under fire. The formation of the University of London can be seen in two ways, either as a departure from the older pattern of college-building or as the final installment in the system of educational institutions created by Dissenters over a century earlier, except that the founders also included moderate Anglicans, Roman Catholics, Jews and secular-minded urban intellectuals essentially of non-aristocratic origins.^{33a}

The title "university" was chosen in preference to "academy" or "college" for both symbolic and practical considerations, as the association of the word with Oxford

and Cambridge, the Scottish universities, and the new institutions being founded in Germany and the United States carried overtones of prestige.³⁴ Actually, before the degree battles of the 1830s, no legal or commonly-agreed upon definition of a "university" existed, either in Britain (or the United States). The issue had simply not arisen before, and nothing could be more apparent than the confusion of contemporaries arguing the case for uncertain precedents and groping for historical antecedents. The differences between "college" or "university" appeared to be clearest in the case of Oxford and Cambridge because of the division of functions that had arisen since the middle ages; but several Scottish universities, notably Glasgow and St. Andrews, also possessed colleges, and there the distinctions were unclear since the colleges were less boarding establishments for the wealthy than a device for supplementing the incomes of the teaching staff. North of the Tweed the words "college" and "university" were virtually synonymous,³⁵ a lexical habit that decisively influenced American usage.

The new university did not seek nor did it receive a royal charter of incorporation. At law, the university was established as a business corporation or joint stock company, financed from the sale of shares, but the potential return on investments was limited as an answer to public criticism that the new university was not an educational undertaking but a profit-oriented enterprise. This strategem - for such it appears to have been - was doubtless adopted

in order to maintain the institution's independence and status as a private venture, for otherwise, as a chartered or endowed or charitable institution, it would have fallen by law under the jurisdiction of Church and State and their legal and administrative instruments, such as the newly-founded body of charity commissioners.

The University of London had not insisted on the right to grant degrees. The strategy of the founders, we have suggested, was to avoid additional controversies (the University was non-denominational and secular) that might imperil its existence as a corporate body. A royal charter of incorporation carried certain risks: the threat of State interference, the opposition of the High Church Oxbridge lobby. The power to award degrees likewise offended Church and State, but would also provoke the hostility and promote the rivalry of the hospital-based medical profession, since the new University also included a medical "department". In the next decade, however, the University reversed itself, doubtless encouraged by the reform movements that allowed both Dissenters and Roman Catholics to take seats in the House of Commons, the vigorous attack on Anglican privileges, and controversies over passage of the Reform Bill. Yet it is appropriate to assume that the right to grant degrees had been more or less entertained from the start, for the suggestion had even once been made that some sort of degree-granting authority might be obtained from an increasingly reform-minded House of Commons if the royal

assent was out of the question. In 1830 the degree hardly possessed the career value now attached to it, but it was of some use in medicine and also represented the final stage in the long-standing efforts by the marginalized groups of English society to obtain something like educational parity. Or, as stated by the newly-appointed Professor of Greek: academic degrees,

impart to those who bear them a literary rank, not only in their own country, but wherever learning is cultivated. It is this identity and universal acceptation...which has sustained their value,

despite, he added, with a nod to the controversies of the 1830s, "the undue facility with which they are granted in some instances."³⁶

The godless institution in Gower Street was organized on the plan of a Scottish unitary institution rather than an English collegiate university, but for all practical purposes it appeared to be only a university college. Could a college award degrees? Historically (or so it appears to us) the authority to award degrees was not essential to the definition of a university.³⁷ The sixteenth-century foundation, Trinity College Dublin, was empowered to grant degrees - given the distance of Dublin from the imperial capital and other institutions with which it might affiliate, a separate degree-granting authority made sense. Yet Trinity College, a university college in size, had been founded as the nucleus of a collegiate university but had

never grown into one. The Irish case both conformed to and departed from English precedent. It conformed because it was collegiate, at least in theory or principle, and it departed because Ireland was self-governing before the nineteenth century.

The original University of London lost the battle to obtain a royal charter which authorized the institution to grant degrees. It is simple enough to identify the parties to the dispute but difficult to explain the outcome. The Church Party in Lords opposed - the bishops especially were in an anti-reform mood - but not Commons. The Privy Council was divided but perhaps inclined to approve, and probably the Cabinet too (their membership overlapped), but in the event what emerged from the deliberations and controversies was an odd compromise. A new and fundamentally different institution with no teaching responsibilities was chartered, receiving the right to grant degrees and to charge and collect examination and degree fees. Another charter without degree-giving authority was granted to the original University of London - a rival Anglican institution, King's College, already possessing a similar one - and both institutions were officially designated university colleges. The new University itself was a "public" or State-supported institution, administered by a miniscule staff that was virtually a committee of the Treasury. A Senate was composed of academics (none of them drawn from the London colleges) and professional men who were nominees of the Privy Council.

The government's Office of Works maintained the premises. Its exclusive function was the setting and administering of degree examinations. The two university colleges were "private," possessing their own governing councils. They enjoyed the option of preparing students for the degree examinations; and until the next major reform at mid-century when examinations were thrown open to all who had passed a London matriculation examination irrespective of their prior education, it was very nearly an exclusive enjoyment.

This peculiar settlement, giving the State the special right to set examinations for a university system, has been so little studied in detail that its origins remain relatively obscure. It was the outcome of a protracted and bitter fight in which all the authorities of Church and State partook. The result was the exact opposite of the Dartmouth decision. At the end of it, the involvement of the State in higher education affairs was in principle greater. A more directive role from the center was now possible under the terms of a liberal parliamentary constitution, and new mechanisms for regulating expansion, curricular change, access and diversity were being gradually created. Most of the implications of the solution of 1836 lay in the future, but the shift was discernible. And behind this shift lay another one, also gradual but unmistakable, namely, the loss of parliamentary supremacy by a class of landed gentlemen whose identification with the ancient universities was on the whole so complete that

interference in the running of the colleges was thought unnecessary. As Oxford and Cambridge "separated" themselves from landed society, their relationship with the State assumed a new formality and structure. The University of London of 1836 foreshadowed this change.

The new University of London also established a far-reaching precedent for the formation of new higher education institutions in Britain and the Empire. Henceforth, any new English foundation was required to begin its corporate life as a university college if degrees were sought, and in Ireland, Wales, Canada and elsewhere, federations on the London model were formed. Even in Scotland, with its own traditions, a new university college scheduled to open at Dundee in 1883 entered its students for the London examinations.³⁸

Merely stating the bare facts leading to the birth of the examining University of London is in itself a significant illustration of many of the differences in university-building between Britain and the United States. In the new nation, established and competing governmental structures were relatively ineffective. State monopolies were being abandoned or were becoming weak, and entrenched educational interests were unable to resist market challenges. There was no movement comparable to the one in England to create precise legal and institutional definitions or establish a widely-accepted degree standard of achievement.

The case of the foundation of Durham University is especially interesting, for its history also helps us understand the higher education issues of the critical decade of the 1830s. Various schools and colleges had at one time or another existed in Durham for centuries, and Cromwell and his Privy Council had actually founded a college in 1657, probably on the model of "schools" like Eton or Winchester. But no plan really ever succeeded, and the establishment of Durham University in 1832 was a genuine innovation. Durham began as an endowed institution drawing its income from the ample revenues of the Dean and Chapter of Durham Cathedral with the assistance of the Bishop (who was also Dean). While supporters of a higher education foundation in the diocesan city spoke often of an emerging demand for general education in the north, it is more certain that their actions were "a sort of panic,"³⁹ a response to bitter attacks on the Church's politics and extraordinary wealth, derived increasingly from the lucrative coalfields of the diocese. In the 1820s and 1830s the hammer of Durham was the radical party of Dissenters, supporters of popular education and parliamentary reformers who used every opportunity in a tempestuous period of political change to threaten the Church with disappropriation or withdraw its tithes. Durham's response was to attempt to disarm the "incendiaries" (as one member of the Church phrased it) by using "surplus" income to establish a university. Besides, rivals loomed on the

horizon. The Dissenters talked of establishing a university in the industrial communities of Newcastle or Liverpool,⁴⁰ and Anglican rivals had their eye on York.

The earliest Durham documents refer to the desire to establish either a college or a university, the two words appearing interchangeably, some supporters actually favoring a theological seminary, for which the word "college" would have sufficed, as a number of theological training colleges already existed. The more influential backers, however, promoted the idea of a degree-granting institution, for which the word "university" seemed to them more appropriate, having always in mind the organization and model of Oxbridge. They argued that the gentry of the North would settle for nothing less (especially as bishops would refuse to ordain any but graduates). Nevertheless, Durham really began, as did King's and London, as a university college. The statutes of 1834 identified the "Warden of the College" as also the Vice-Chancellor of the University.^{40a} At this point the founders may have been using the college idea to emphasize the private nature of their undertaking. Their specific educational model was actually Christ Church, Oxford University, where a cathedral organization and higher education were intertwined, the Dean and members of the Chapter also occupying academic posts in the House.

But if Christ Church was the model for the governance structure of Durham, the University of Cambridge provided the example of a collegiate university which appeared to

supply an answer to the thorny question of admitting Dissenters. For at Cambridge, graduation but not matriculation required subscription. The division was accordingly this: As a university, Durham was public, as the university at Cambridge was in some sense public, as the new University of London was public. As such Durham was an "open" university, its lectures available to all comers on the payment of appropriate fees. However, its degrees were only available to those who were enrolled in privately-endowed colleges, subject to collegiate discipline, willing to attend chapel and free in conscience to subscribe to the doctrine of the United Church of England and Ireland.^{4ob}

It is an ironic development that while the supporters of the first University of London in Gower Street feared - and rightly feared - the power of the Church, the founders of the University of Durham, at approximately the same time, feared the power of the State as it might be wielded by what they saw as a formidable radical alliance. The supporters of clerical London created an institution that taught religion and placed students under a conventional religious discipline. The friends of secular London fought this English conception of a university, insisting upon a type similar to those being founded abroad, such as the University of Berlin or Bonn or Virginia. They wanted a university that would admit non-Anglicans, a University of the North that had been discussed by them for about a decade, a university every bit as strong in historical

conception as the Oxbridge idea defended by the partisans of the Established Church.^{40c}

While planning the new institution, Durham's founders attempted to keep their deliberations relatively private, suspecting that Dissenters and parliamentary radicals would use every opportunity to disrupt the scheme. It was hoped that a new institution could be founded without much fanfare, but two factors made relative silence impossible. The first was the desire to grant degrees. The second was the necessity to steer a bill through Parliament - in this case, a private bill - legally authorizing the Dean and Chapter to transfer Church property to a different foundation. Since the consent of Parliament was therefore unavoidable, it was planned to originate a bill in Lords, as the House friendlier to the Church.⁴¹

In 1832, an Act of Parliament was passed enabling "the Dean and Chapter of Durham to appropriate part of the property of their Church to the establishment of a university in connection therewith."⁴² Did the Act constituting the University also empower it to grant degrees? Apparently the question was not settled to the satisfaction of the Dean and Chapter, perhaps because, whatever the specific powers granted under the Act, the Chapter itself had not yet agreed upon the exact type of institution it wanted. The matter required further clarification, and the Chapter subsequently decided to seek a royal charter. Several years of delay followed because of

the opposition of Dissenters and the entry of yet another player, a newly-created body of Ecclesiastical Commissioners appointed by the Crown to deliberate upon the redistribution of Church emoluments generally. A charter finally passed the Great Seal on 1 June 1837. Acknowledging that the University of Durham had been in existence for some time - a reference to the Act of 1832 - the charter went on to add "that the said University would be better established, and its character and design more clearly and appropriately determined, if its members were incorporated by Our Royal Charter."⁴³ The degrees now clearly authorized were conferred seven days later.⁴⁴

While in the U.S. the distinction between "school," "college" and "university" was nowhere clearly spelled out, the words retaining the ambiguities common to the English-speaking world before the nineteenth century, in Britain the degree issue of the 1830s produced a legal meaning with important ramifications for the future organization of higher education: universities conferred degrees, colleges did not. Furthermore, higher education institutions could now be divided into Church-related and secular institutions, each for the time being responding to a different aspect of State authority. The Church, because it was Established and thus part of the State, was allowed to retain its historical role in higher education for all institutions on the Oxbridge model. The new and emerging secular part of the higher education system was put under State direction in a

different way: through control over degrees. The State had declared the question of educational qualifications to be a matter of the public interest, too important to be left to the separate institutions or their teachers. It had also shown itself to be suspicious of the operation of the highly-active consumer market in education generally that had developed since the eighteenth century, since that market had produced a greatly diversified elementary and secondary school system whose standards of achievement or religious disposition could not be easily guaranteed, although there was certainly evidence to suggest that whatever else it might have achieved, market discipline had also encouraged positive efforts at improvement.

In the 1830s the State's new interest in higher education was as yet unclarified and certainly, in retrospect, incomplete. The financing of higher education in England was still regarded as much more of a private than a public matter. The structure of the University of London did not alarm a fiscally-conservative Treasury, since fees scheduled to meet the costs of administering and marking examinations could more or less cover expenditures. Yet what had been established in 1836 by the chartering of the second University of London was in principle far-reaching, a recognition that standards set and administered at the top of a system could reverberate throughout, creating barriers and constraints. "[I]n the ordinary course of proceeding," wrote an interested contemporary, "it is plain that the

examinations of the University will regulate the instruction of the Colleges and the studies of their pupils."⁴⁵ Degree examinations influenced teaching, the curriculum, innovation, diversity and "articulation," the name given by Americans in the early twentieth century to that process by which one type of educational institution was linked to another, primary to secondary schools, secondary schools to colleges and universities, and one kind of college or university to another. As the degree increased in value in the course of the nineteenth century, in response to the expansion of the civil service and the service economy more generally, the importance of examinations in certifying competence and regulating entry into the occupational structure likewise increased, fulfilling the hopes of those who believed in the necessity for standards to be set at the top of the educational system rather than derived from below.⁴⁶

7. Government Policy in Scotland

This sketch of the drift to a higher education policy in England, however, leaves something to be desired in explaining Scotland. In some respects, Victorian Britain had a federal constitution. While Ireland and Scotland no longer had independent parliaments, both were governed from Westminster but often as if they were indeed separate nations, which in fact in so many ways they were. In higher education the universities of Scotland, like Oxford and Cambridge, were Church and State institutions, linked to the

Crown and the Presbyterian settlement and through mythistoire to the Scottish people themselves.⁴⁷ Arrangements dating back before the Union of 1707 had put the universities in receipt of annual subsidies from the revenues of the Sovereign, principally in support of professorial chairs, but assistance in the construction and maintenance of buildings had also been available. In the 1820s at least one half of all chair appointments were therefore made by the Crown, which also enjoyed ancient powers of visitation. But not all Scottish universities were under the same funding arrangements. Edinburgh, for example, had long been considered a "town university" since the burgh controlled professorial appointments and handled the university's financial administration, and used this authority to interfere in the regular running of the institutions.⁴⁸

Like Oxford and Cambridge, the governance of the Scottish universities was based on an immense tangle of inherited ordinances and statutes which hampered their ability to respond to nineteenth-century changes in the economy, society and in the relation of cities to countryside. As in England and the United States, a further difficulty lay in the definition of what could be considered higher or lower education. That difficulty was being eased at Oxford or Cambridge by the arrival in the eighteenth century of an older student (perhaps bearing some relation to the creation of the Cambridge honors degree, the first

written examination in Britain), although the dons were slow to adjust their systems of discipline accordingly.⁴⁹

However, since in Scotland undergraduates were most often if not invariably quite young, the absence of a well-defined secondary system of education made differentiating between a university or college or high school somewhat difficult.

(Indeed, several supporters of the original University of London contemplated having a school on the model of the High School in Edinburgh.) Professors were consequently fully engaged in a form of remedial education known as the "junior classes,"⁵⁰ wherein underprepared students were brought up to snuff. These were similar to, and probably the forebears of, the "preparatory departments" of American colleges in the nineteenth century. As Scottish society changed, virtually every feature of university life was the subject of acrimonious dispute. Great divisions of feeling existed with regard to governance, financing, the curriculum and the founding of new chairs, the proper tone or character of a university education, graduation rates, degrees and examinations, access and the social or "gentlemanly" functions of education, the latter a typically English concern and as such reflecting the Anglicization of Scotland.

The combination of archaic regulations and the log-jam of constitutional and jurisdictional disputes, the division of authority between academic Senates, town councils and religious bodies and professional associations, as well as

the growing quarrels within the Kirk that finally, in 1842, produced the Disruption and the Free Churches - in fact, the extraordinarily complicated interdependence of the universities and virtually every aspect of Scottish life - brought the Crown into the story as the only available mechanism for resolving disputes. Beginning in 1826 and meeting almost continuously through the rest of the century, a series of royal and executive ("statutory" in England) commissions discussed, mediated, and sometimes acting through Parliament but at other times using their own legal authority to do so, legislated far-reaching changes for the Scottish universities. The Treasury also played a part, especially in the second half of the century. While changes were discussed and pressed from the top, important unlegislated changes were occurring from below, most notably in the development of an effective secondary education sector which in time boosted the age of entering cohorts and made possible a greater degree of curricular specialization and variation.

For present purposes it is not necessary to review the enormous number of alterations legislated or recommended for legislation by the commissions, or the internal reforms stimulated by them and by wider social changes generally to repeat the point so well argued by Robert Anderson that by law, history and popular agreement, the power of the Crown to legislate for the Scottish universities was never really questioned until the Edwardian period. No more than in, let

us say, nineteenth-century Sweden was the State in Scotland regarded as different and separate from society. So far was this point accepted, that it did not appear shocking that few if any professors were actually members of the many Scottish commissions of inquiry that met in the Victorian era. And indeed this same point was made even more forcefully in the early twentieth century by the Secretary of the Carnegie Trust, who thought that the Scottish higher education establishment was even more tightly controlled than the German one.⁵¹

Among the welter of issues considered, the "London" problem of assuring a high level of academic achievement stands out. This question, in fact, antedated London and drew the attention of the very first royal commission on universities to be appointed in the nineteenth century, the Scottish Royal Commission of 1826, and it continued to be addressed in one form or another by all subsequent commissioners. The 1826 Commission proposed the introduction of an honors degree, compulsory essays and class prizes, drew attention to the need for a higher attendance record and a much greater devotion to the study of classical languages - all as ways of encouraging incentive, competition and academic rigor. Hitherto, the Scottish curriculum had been characterized by a concern for breadth, represented by a special emphasis on metaphysics, which observers who were influenced by the type of honors examinations developed at Oxford and Cambridge considered

too vague and general.^{51a} Other obstacles to higher standards were thought to be the system of parochial schools, which fed immature and under-age pupils into the universities, thus necessitating the system of junior classes, part-time students and low graduation rates. A major issue for the century, therefore, was shaping up in the 1820s, and can at some risk of simplification be described as a contest between those who believed in the Scottish system of relatively open admissions and were therefore willing to accept high drop-out rates as a legitimate trade-off, and those who wished, although in accordance with other Scottish traditions, to drive the system towards an elite model by tightening standards throughout, making more effective use of degree examinations to accomplish this end. By and large, American practice has been closer to the first of these positions than to the second.

More than a quarter of a century later, several highly influential academics adopted a modification of the London idea in proposing a single board of degree examiners for all of Scotland. But such a modification would have interfered with the respected professorial system of combining teaching and examining and was effectively beaten back. What ultimately emerged by the end of the nineteenth century was a compromise, with degree examinations and honors courses more broadly-based than in the kingdom to the south, but with higher entrance standards, an older entering student,

the disappearance of close ties between the parochial and largely rural schools and the universities, and the evanescence after about 1890 of the junior classes.

8. Royal Commissions of Inquiry and Higher Education

For several decades now a controversy has taken place over whether the Scottish higher education system with its strongly independent history was forced to conform with English practice in the course of the nineteenth century, transforming an essentially "democratic" curriculum and entry policy into an "aristocratic" or elite system.⁵² The Scottish higher education curriculum system today is a mixture of Scottish and English features, but in such matters as financing and access it conforms to the general English model. In relation to the State, Anderson is very persuasive: the Scottish universities and colleges have never been truly independent. Instead, therefore, of thinking about the reforms in Scottish education as travelling up the high road from England, we can also think of important changes travelling in the opposite direction, and the history of royal commissions of inquiry certainly makes this point.

As we have seen, some 25 years before the decision was taken to appoint royal commissions in England to inquire into the financing, distribution of emoluments, governance and admission policies of the ancient universities, and to create statutory commissions to assist Oxford and Cambridge colleges in revising their ancient statutes, a royal

commission was at work in Scotland. The machinery of investigation that was being developed by the nineteenth-century State to collect information, investigate practices and recommend legislation for a great many social issues, was also being used to re-draw the contours of the higher education system. Over half a century of activity, the State and its representatives, temporary or permanent, acquired great experience conducting systematic investigations, learning to ask the operative questions and pinpointing the necessary sources of information. The result was a habit of putting higher education on the national agenda. The role of higher education in society, the economy and Empire therefore became a matter of wide-ranging interest and discussion, well-covered in the newspapers and burgeoning "serious" journalism of the Victorian era.

But the creation of a State apparatus of reform was not an independent development. It was accompanied by, perhaps influenced by, and certainly related to changes in the character and composition of what we customarily denominate the "State." Historians have debated the nature and effect of such changes, attempting to assess the impact of franchise reform on the social composition of cabinets, parliaments and the bureaucracy. Apparently no sweeping changes occurred - indeed, the social composition of Parliament did not appreciably change until the second half of the nineteenth century, and the Cabinet remained heavily aristocratic until even later.⁵³ The bureaucracy did change

- at least segments of it - and in fact had been very gradually changing since the last years of the eighteenth century, the principle of employment by merit rather than patronage insinuating itself into ministries and departments, bringing into administration the "statesmen in disguise" of which George Kitson Clark once spoke. These were by and large the new, highly-educated Victorian mandarins, competent, influential, astonishingly well-connected. The new blood was largely of reformed public boarding school and Oxbridge origins, inheriting an aristocratic ethic of service and an evangelical ethic of responsibility, and represented as well the growth of the professional sector that was to play such a decisive role in the evolution of the British State.⁵⁵ By contrast, the defeat of the University of the United States and the subsequent weakness of the Federal Government on higher education ensured that the American governmental bureaucracy would be staffed more on the principle of patronage than on merit, a pattern only partly modified by civil service reformers of the twentieth century. Indeed, that may have been a motive of Congress in its defeat.

Whatever their specific views on the purposes of education, the new mandarins were more or less united by some version of the liberal political outlook so characteristic of nineteenth-century thought. As far as possible, reform from above was to be accomplished on the cheap. It was to be achieved through a re-distribution of

existing sources rather than, with some exceptions, a supply of new resources. When applied to the heavily-endowed educational sector of Oxbridge colleges, this policy of living of one's own meant that a vast and baffling array of inherited special privileges, exemptions and emoluments designated as "founder's kin," most of which were embodied in statutes, wills and trusts, were subject to review and alteration. Only the State could invade wills and trusts (although their provisions could be evaded in the absence of vigilant oversight). Interestingly enough, in this matter, as noted in the Dartmouth College case, the American legal system was more conservative, more respectful of the intentions of founders, though of course in the United States wills, trusts and charters did not extend back before the seventeenth century. But in England pressure from above could not be easily contained, especially since privilege and exemption were inevitably linked to other functioning parts of the educational system; and in over half a century of State activity the universities of Britain in effect drew closer to the State.

They drew closer despite a governmental policy of financial stringency, and the State's role in re-shaping the existing system of higher education and in establishing standards for the newer, secular university system cannot be underestimated. The Scottish universities, because they had long been in receipt of annual grants, were allowed to keep their subsidy, but with one major alteration in the source

of financing. In 1832 the annual grant derived from the Crown's hereditary revenues was transferred to Parliament, the amount being determined either by Act or annual vote.⁵⁶ The Sovereign's interest was therefore transformed into a public interest, and both Parliament and the Treasury were reluctant to do more. In 1883, under pressure from the Scottish academic community to increase support to their universities, the government proposed a funding solution that appeared to imply a hands-off policy for the future. Indeed, in responding to the surprised Scots and their Westminster representatives, the Treasury replied that government policy was "to start the Universities with a fair and efficient endowment from the State in addition to their other resources." As far as possible, in the interests of their freedom, "the Universities...should economize for themselves their resources and mould for themselves their forms of active life."^{56a}

Newer, and as it invariably happened, under-endowed or under-capitalized institutions, were treated cautiously. A small annual subsidy to the University of London was made after it was chartered in 1836, the State in effect supporting its own creation, its own "national" university. When Manchester (Owens College) asked for financial support in 1852, it was told that government policy forbade offering money to higher education. However, after Manchester was federated with the Victorian University, another examining body formed to regulate the curriculum of a group of

northern university colleges, a small subvention was eventually if hesitatingly arranged. In 1872 Aberystwyth in Scotland received the same message as Owens College, but a decade later the newly-formed examining University of Wales received an ad hoc grant.⁵⁷ Finally in 1889 a scheme of assisting the newer civic universities was agreed upon in light of weak local support relative to the changing missions of higher education. The Treasury still assumed and hoped that government assistance would merely supplement rather than supplant private beneficence.^{57a} Indeed, local aid was made a precondition for State assistance,⁵⁸ and the transition to a new form of university-State financial relationship may now be said to have truly commenced.

The case for State assistance to higher education in the nineteenth century was not put by the mandarins at Whitehall but by educational lobby and pressure groups, scientists and other groups of academicians and Victorian intellectuals. Their reasons were many. Some were concerned about "culture," others about the possible effects of a consumer ethic on educational standards, still others about economic and military competition with Germany in an era of changing technology. The fundamental fear, however, was that the adoption of a research mission in conjunction with what historically had been a teaching mission would prove more costly than the market could or would support. This was an argument that the State found itself unable to resist in the long run. In the meantime it followed nineteenth-century

precedents, proceeding cautiously by limiting financial support to higher education to relatively small amounts, often on an annual or ad hoc basis, thus respecting the wishes of the Victorian taxpayer.^{58a}

One recent writer, discussing the relationship of the British State to science, has called it a "reluctant patron."⁵⁹ The description is apt when describing systematic government policy with regard to research and development. In general nineteenth-century Westminster preferred to rely on private initiative and private sources of assistance to encourage science and technology, although the various ministries of government each compiled a different record in connection with support of various kind of applied science activities. For the British State was not a monolithic body but a collection of ministries and practices representing different traditions of government involvement with society.⁶⁰ These had been formed during the long period of aristocratic domination, but from approximately the 1830s onwards encountered an advancing liberal philosophy of private initiative. The result was a society of two cultures, one representing the aristocratic, metropolitan center, the other the de-centralized periphery of the provincial business and professional communities.^{60a} The contradictions are probably best captured in the work of a new generation of mid-Victorian schools inspectors. Civil servants such as Daniel Robert Fearon admired local initiative. In his London rounds Fearon tried to encourage

the best emerging practices, but in yet other ways he remained dirigiste, and inclined towards administrative rationalization.⁶¹

9. Conclusion

British higher education policies and practices before 1860 increasingly diverged from American ones, reflecting the greater interest of central government in higher education. The various anomalies and carryovers that had long characterized the higher education system were gradually either eliminated or modified, and the system itself was greatly if not completely rationalized. Rationalization consisted of separating elements hitherto considered as one. For example, gradually but surely Church influence over higher education was either removed by the end of the nineteenth century or confined to the "private" sector of colleges. As secular and lay influence grew, the State assumed a more dominant role in higher education, taking a special interest in establishing machinery to guarantee the protection of academic standards from market forces. The invention of the examining university was a further rationalization of the system, an ingenious solution to an impending difficulty, creating and preserving a distinction between "college" and "university" by taking advantage of the newly-discovered interest in competitive and qualifying examinations and by using the growing desire for degrees to regulate entry into select occupations. As a further refinement, degrees were subdivided into honors and

ordinary. The university "idea" was imposed on the system from above as a "higher" idea and became in time the mark of a superior institution,⁶² universities being also "public" or "national," the repositories of a higher mission, colleges remaining "private" and parochial, the repositories of special or limited missions. Given this new and emerging conception of a university, it was easier for the Treasury or Parliament to justify expenditure on universities than on university colleges, and the State consequently chartered and funded the new examining universities with less reluctance than in the case of civic and municipal colleges as a legitimate sphere of activity, as well as a cheap and effective instrument of quality control. In sum, higher education began to be treated as a "system," reflecting the drift towards a government policy.

If such rationalization of the higher education system is characteristic of nineteenth-century Britain, it is less characteristic of the American system before the Civil War. It was not until after the 1860s that rationalization of higher education became an appealing idea. Before then, the collapse of the colonial political structure led to an increasing diversity of institutional forms, resulting in the promiscuous chartering of colleges, the failure of the idea of a national university, and the outcome of the Dartmouth College case. The first "university" was not created until after the Revolution (Harvard, 1780), and in this instance the word designated or reflected the presence

of one or more professional schools attached to a liberal arts college. Yet this operational definition of a university never became legal or in any way official, and the word retained the ambiguities it possessed in Britain before the 1830s. The words "university" and "college" remained synonymous in everyday usage. A university in the United States was no more or less authorized to grant degrees than a college, and aspiring universities did not have to begin life as university colleges affiliated with degree-granting, examination centers with de facto control over the teaching syllabus. The titles "university" and "college" conveyed no sense of "private" or "public;" and while the title "university" might be coveted by "any college that aspired to be grand, as did numerous institutions in the South and West,"^{62a} elsewhere a "college," especially an older one, was equally and often more prestigious. No higher "idea" of a university successfully emerged, and all ideas of a university were in practice considered meritorious.⁶³

It is true that the American Revolution separated Church and State; but religious associations continued to influence the expansion of higher education, as indeed they did in Britain up through the 1830s, with a brief spurt again just after mid-century when Keble College was founded at Oxford and Selwyn College at Cambridge. But American denominational colleges and universities were founded continuously and in substantial numbers throughout the

nineteenth century in a religiously plural environment, the secular and religious spheres intermixed in a broadly ecumenical Protestant spirit (even in Roman Catholic institutions). Furthermore, while the Supreme Court "legally" distinguished private from public and prevented states from automatically assuming control of independently-created foundations, the distinctions continued to be confused or convergent in a nation which rendered both conceptions subservient to a notion of "community" and in parallel fashion had replaced service to Church and State with service to "society."⁶³ It is not even certain that at the time of the Dartmouth decision, the preservation of a hard and fast distinction between public and private was intended, though it contributed to its crystallization.^{63a}

In any case, the vulnerable financial position of most new independent foundations settled the issue in a special way, as they turned for assistance to "society" (which in America included the "State"), that is to say, to the market. To a certain extent, the same development occurred in the free market society of nineteenth-century Britain where new, under-financed university colleges went in search of patrons. However, the ease with which degrees could be given in America and the absence of any such conception as an "examining university" or a "national" or "imperial" university (although the London experience was known) left new institutions vulnerable to consumer influence on the curriculum and degree programs, producing early (1820s)

experiments in a modular course structure which today is still criticized for lacking coherence and integration.^{63b} Doubtless this necessity was reinforced by the governing structure of higher education institutions, by the combination of weak or non-existent regent houses or academic senates and strong lay boards incorporating a mix of social, political and economic interests. The guild idea of self-government was attenuated, and academics did not have a logical, a "natural" or historical center to which they could automatically turn for financial or academic support.

In Britain, with its long history of centralized activity and royal and parliamentary authority, there was such a logical or natural center. But ironically the Victorian State was reluctant to be an outright patron of universities. Once the State had put universities on its desired funding basis, principally to make them accessible by the broad and influential body of non-aristocratic rate-payers - the bald-headed men at the back of the omnibus, as Lord Macaulay once referred to English public opinion - it preferred to leave actual governance to the academy. This action strengthened the traditional guild idea of university governance. The bi-cameral constitution of most universities placed governance in the hands of a body of graduates and a body of residents, and by the end of the nineteenth century or the beginning of the twentieth, the former had lost ground to the latter. The absence now of mediating bodies,

the removal of the Church or alumni or the "public" or "society," placed university-State relations on a new and direct footing, setting in motion the negotiations that eventually led to the creation of a new "mediator," the University Grants Committee, yet another legacy - it can be argued - of creative Victorian liberal statecraft.

In the United States the lines of governance continued to be seriously blurred. No body of learned men or women succeeded in separating control of higher education from the wide community of interested citizens who had enlisted universities and colleges in the battle for survival against barbarism and never ceased to leave them alone. So as British universities became more "national" in the nineteenth century, American ones remained "provincial," still served their states, regions and localities, each attempting, as their numbers grew, to find a special niche in the market. Not until the twentieth century, and especially after the Second World War, did certain research universities or elite colleges aspire to a wider role, either through the adoption of national admissions policies or through the establishment and expansion of graduate research and professional education. These policies were not always appreciated by lay boards, alumni, or in the case of public universities, state legislatures, whose loyalties and affections lay with those communities whose essential support in the last century prevented the emergence of those

"clearer" lines of demarcation appearing in contemporary Britain.⁶⁴

The system of higher education in place today in Britain and the United States emerged after 1860. But by that date, directions of the two systems were already visible. In the U.K., a greater interest by Westminster in higher education was leading to rationalization, policy, and increasing central control. In the U.S. the role of Washington was subordinate to state and private initiative. Federal policy, except in a negative sense, hardly existed; and when it did emerge after the Civil War, it was remarkably self-denying, tending to drive authority and decisions down and away from the Capitol toward state-houses, institutions, teachers and students. The differences between the two countries in their policies toward their colleges and universities have continued to widen and deepen. It is an open question whether the British government reforms of the 1980s reversed those long trends.

ENDNOTES

¹"From the very beginnings, the expressed purpose of colonial education had been to preserve society against barbarism, and, so far as possible, against sin," writes Henry May, The Enlightenment in America (New York, 1978), 32-3. He also points out that the European Enlightenment was a movement of towns, and towns were not so central to early nineteenth-century America or to the colonial period. The importance of education was consequently magnified. "Nothing in the colonies remotely resembled the serene stagnation of Gibbon's Oxford." Ibid., 34, 361. Recent work - see Dame Lucy Sutherland, The University of Oxford in the Eighteenth Century, a Reconsideration (Oxford, 1973) - has shown that Gibbon's Oxford had a "hidden" educational economy of some vitality, but the spirit of the point holds.

²John S. Whitehead and Jurgen Herbst, "How to Think about the Dartmouth College Case," History of Education Quarterly, 26 (Fall, 1986), 344.

³Jurgen Herbst, From Crisis to Crisis: American College Government, 1636 - 1819 (Cambridge, MA, 1982).

⁴Martin Trow, "Aspects of Diversity in American Higher Education," in Herbert Gans et al, eds., On The Making of Americans (Philadelphia, 1979), 271-90.

⁵David W. Robson, "College Founding in the New Republic, 1776-1800," History of Education Quarterly (Fall, 1983), 323-41.

⁶Herbst, Crisis, 16.

⁷Ibid., 47.

⁸Ibid.

⁹Ibid., 61.

¹⁰Martin Trow, "Comparative Reflections on Leadership in Higher Education," European Journal of Education, 20 (1985), 143-59.

^{10a}W.H.G. Armytage, Civic Universities: Aspects of a British Tradition (London, 1955), 128-40, 153-56; See also the essays in Barbara Smith, ed., Truth, Liberty, Religion, Essays Celebrating Two Hundred Years of Manchester College (Oxford, 1986).

¹¹Herbst, Crisis, 77. Another historian observes that, "The founders [of the mid-eighteenth century colonial colleges]...transplanted the essentials of the educational

system of the English dissenting academies and saw the system take root." Beverly McAnear, "College Founding in the American Colonies, 1745-75," in The Mississippi Valley Historical Review, 42 (June 1955), 44.

¹²Ibid., 111.

¹³Ibid., 86-7.

¹⁴David W. Robson, Educating Republicans, the College in the Era of the American Revolution, 1750-1800 (Westport, CT, 1985), 19.

¹⁵Herbst, Crisis, 76.

^{15a}For remarks on funding in relation to institutional independence, see Bernard Bailyn, Education in the Forming of American Society (New York, 1960), 44.

¹⁶Robert H. Wiebe, The Opening of American Society (New York, 1984), 353.

¹⁷Stanley Elkins and Eric McKittrick, "A Meaning for Turner's Frontier: Democracy in the Old Northwest," Richard Hofstadter and Seymour Martin Lipset, eds., Turner and the Sociology of the Frontier (New York, 1968), 120-51.

¹⁸Robson, "College Founding," 323.

¹⁹Herbst, Crisis, 136.

²⁰Ernest Ashton Smith, Allegheny - A Century of Education, 1815-1915 (Meadville, PA, 1916), 1-22.

²¹This pattern of a preparatory year in lieu of secondary school was a common feature of American colleges and universities until the establishment of a broad system of public high schools around the end of the nineteenth century. It also helps explain the radical variability of academic standards in the American college and university, a variability which reflected the diversity of the student body. English-style "public schools" apart, the absence of a "reliable" system of secondary schooling also characterized both English and Scottish higher education until the last decades of the nineteenth century, producing dilemmas in the higher education system corresponding to those found in the United States. However, England and Scotland acted strongly to resolve those dilemmas by introducing high and roughly common standards of entry to universities, while the U.S. has accepted and continues to live with them.

²²Smith, 18.

- ²³On the links between student recruitment and college finance and function, see David F. Allmendinger, Jr., Paupers and Scholars: The Transformation of Student Life in Nineteenth-Century New England (New York, 1975).
- ²⁴Smith, 53-4.
- ²⁵Wiebe, 353.
- ²⁶David Madsen, The National University (Detroit, 1966).
- ²⁷Richard Hofstadter and Wilson Smith, American Higher Education: A Documentary History, Vol. I (Chicago, 1961), 158.
- ²⁸Herbst, Crisis, 232-244; John S. Whitehead, The Separation of College and State: Columbia, Dartmouth, Harvard, and Yale, 1776 - 1876 (New York, 1973), 53-89; Whitehead and Herbst, ibid.
- ²⁹Hofstadter and Smith, 219.
- ³⁰Whitehead and Herbst, ibid., 338.
- ^{30a}Bailyn, 47.
- ^{30b}Robert D. Anderson, Education and Opportunity in Victorian Scotland (Oxford, 1983), 53.
- ^{30c}T.W. Moody, "The Irish University Question in the Nineteenth Century," in History, 43 (1958), 90, 95, 101.
- ³¹Substance of the Speech of Sir Charles Wetherell before the Lords of the Privy Council on the Subject of Incorporating the London University (London, 1834), 23
- ³²John Gascoigne, "Church and State Allied: the Failure of Parliamentary Reform of the Universities, 1688-1800," in A.L. Beier, et al, eds., The First Modern Society (Cambridge, 1989), 403.
- ³³See Nicholas Hans, New Trends in Education in the Eighteenth Century (London, 1951), and Margaret Bryant, The London Experience of Secondary Education (London, 1986). An ethic of consumption had long since spread to the colonies. According to one historian, consumerism helped draw the colonies together by helping to create a distinct American national mentality. See T.H. Breen, "'Baubles of Britain': The American and Consumer Revolutions of the Eighteenth Century," in Past and Present, 119 (May 1988), 73-104.
- ^{33a}Information on London is taken from Negley Harte, The University of London 1836-1986 (London, 1986) and from the sources cited in Sheldon Rothblatt, "London: A Metropolitan

University?," in Thomas Bender, ed., The University and the City (Oxford, 1988), 119-149.

³⁴For similar reasons, the founders of Hackney College in London, a late eighteenth-century foundation of Baptist origin, preferred the word "college" to the appellation "academy," not "for the sake of imitating the Establishment, but because the word academy (applied of late to every common school) does not convey a proper idea of our plan of education." Bryant, 109, 168.

³⁵Henry Malden, On the Origin of Universities and Academical Degrees (London, 1835), 146-7

³⁶Henry Malden, On the Introduction of the Natural Sciences into General Education (London, 1838), 3.

³⁷James Williams, The Law of the Universities (London, 1910), 14-15.

³⁸Anderson, Education and Opportunity, 82. The State's interest in maintaining a uniform standard of achievement at the top of the educational system was also provided for in the Scottish Universities Act of 1858 which required innovation in any one of the four universities to be approved by the others (Anderson, 257).

³⁹J.T. Fowler, Durham University, Earlier Foundations and Present Colleges (London, 1904), 22.

⁴⁰N.R. Tempest, "An Early Scheme for an Undenominational University," in Universities Review, 32 (February 1960).

^{40a}Fowler, 26

^{40b}Unless otherwise noted, sources for the University of Durham are taken from Fowler, *ibid.*; Alan Heesom, The Founding of the University of Durham (Durham, 1982); C.E. Whiting, The University of Durham, 1832-1932 (London, 1932); and C.E. Whiting, ed., The University of Durham 1937 (Durham, 1937).

^{40c}Malden, Origin, 143: "I wish merely to show that the English universities in their present state are very different from their original form...and hence to refute the argument...that the University of London is not composed of the essential elements of a university, and is not of the form of a legitimate university, merely because it differs from the present form of Oxford and Cambridge."

⁴¹Whiting, University of Durham, 39-40.

⁴²Ibid., 42.

⁴³Ibid., 71-74.

⁴⁴On the matter of an "open" university at Durham, see the debates on the second reading of the University of Durham Bill in the House of Lords for May 22, 1832, cols 1209-1218.

⁴⁵Malden, Natural Sciences, 5.

⁴⁶See Sheldon Rothblatt, "Historical and Comparative Remarks on the Federal Principle in Higher Education," in History of Education, 16 (1987), 151-180.

⁴⁷For details about Scotland, unless otherwise stated, see Robert D. Anderson, ibid., and his article, "Education and the State in Nineteenth-Century Scotland," in The Economic History Review, 36 (November 1983), 518-534.

⁴⁸Anderson, Education and Opportunity, 36-8.

⁴⁹For examinations see Sheldon Rothblatt, "The Student Subculture and the Examination System in Early 19th-Century Oxbridge," in Lawrence Stone, ed., The University in Society, I (Princeton, 1974), 247-304; and "Failure in Early 19th-Century Oxford and Cambridge," in History of Education, 11 (March 1982), 1-22.

⁵⁰Anderson, ibid., 4.

⁵¹Ibid., 291.

^{51a}Indeed, the curriculum of the pre-university college in America, especially in the nineteenth century, was modelled on this Scottish curriculum "characterized by a concern for breadth" and still resembles it more closely than it does the single subject English honors degree.

⁵²Anderson, ibid., 358-361; George Elder Davie, The Democratic Intellect. Scotland and Her Universities in the Nineteenth Century (Edinburgh, 1961), and the sequel, The Crisis of the Democratic Intellect (Edinburgh, 1986).

⁵³See W.O. Aydelotte, "The Business Interests of the Gentry in the Parliament of 1841-47," the Appendix to George Kitson Clark, The Making of Victorian England (London, 1962), 290-305; and W.L. Guttsman, The British Political Elite (London, 1963), 99-108 et seq.

⁵⁴See George Kitson Clark, "Statesmen in Disguise: Reflections on the History of the Neutrality of the Civil Service," reprinted in Peter Stansky, The Victorian Revolution: Government and Society in Victorian Britain (New York, 1973); and, inter alia, Franklin B. Wickwire, "King's Friends, Civil Servants, or Politicians," in The American Historical Review, 71 (October 1965), 18-42.

⁵⁵Noel Annan, "The Intellectual Aristocracy," in J.H. Plumb, ed., Studies in Social History (London, 1955), 241-87. For professionalism and the service society culture, see Harold Perkin, The Origins of Modern English Society, 1780-1880 (London, 1969, reprinted 1972), 252-270, 319-339, and The Rise of Professional Society, England since 1880 (London, 1989).

⁵⁶Christine Helen Shinn, Paying the Piper, the Development of the University Grants Committee, 1919-1946 (Lewes, 1986), 22.

^{56a}Anderson, Education and Opportunity, 259. The Land-grant endowments in the U.S. embodied exactly this principle of a one-time subvention to then-independent institutions. In both cases, additional regular sources of income were later required, though the sources differed in the two countries. The Morrill Act of 1862 and its successors were specifically designed "to force the states to significant increases in their efforts on behalf of higher education. The Federal government, having promoted the establishment of new colleges, made it incumbent upon the states to supply the means of future development and expansion." Gordon C. Lee, "The Morrill Act and Education," British Journal of Educational Studies, 12 (1963), 27.

⁵⁷Shinn, 23.

^{57a}This was very similar to the attitudes of state governments to state universities in the U.S. all through the nineteenth century, despite the provisions of the Morrill Act.

⁵⁸Ibid., 23, 28, 60.

^{58a}An absolutely crucial difference between funding patterns of British and American higher education is that in the former support for both teaching and research eventually came from central government. By contrast, in the U.S., state governments, student fees, alumni gifts and endowments came to support the basic teaching function, while foundations, the Federal government and industry have come to support most university-based research. Efforts are currently being made in Britain to shift the funding of British higher education toward American models.

⁵⁹Peter Alter, The Reluctant Patron, Science and the State in Britain, 1850-1920 (Oxford, Hamburg, New York, 1987).

⁶⁰For a summary of such activity and secondary source references, see Sheldon Rothblatt, "The Diversification of Higher Education in England," in Konrad H. Jarausch, ed.,

The Transformation of Higher Learning, 1860-1930 (Chicago, 145-148.

60a The two contrasting cultures of Victorian Britain are analogous to distinctions appearing in America in the early nineteenth-century. For "aristocratic" read "colonial/Federalist," and for "liberal" read "Jacksonian." The cultural/political substance of these distinctions, however, differed sharply in the two societies.

61 Bryant, ibid., 278-284.

62 Sheldon Rothblatt, "The Idea of the Idea of a University and its Antithesis," Conversazione (Seminar on the Sociology of Culture, La Trobe University, Australia, 1989).

62a Richard Hofstadter and Walter P. Metzger, Academic Freedom in the United States (New York, 1955), 369.

63 Rothblatt, Idea.

63a Whitehead and Herbst, 338.

63b For the modular system see Sheldon Rothblatt, "Merits and Defects of the American Educational System," in Liberal Learning, 75 (January/February 1989), 22-25.

64 Lawrence Cremin writes that irrespective of their source of support or funding, all American institutions of the last century saw themselves as in some sense community institutions because they were "educative." He concludes that such a self-conception inevitably embroiled them in all kinds of distinct public controversies. American Education, The National Experience, 1783-1876 (New York, 1980), 487. Once again, the observer is struck by the remarkable parallels between Scotland and the United States up to about the 1830s or the 1850s.

IGS Working Papers

1987

- 87-1 THE ROCKY ROAD TO PRIVATIZATION
Lyle C. Fitch
- 87-2 TOWARDS A TYPOLOGY OF NEW SUBNATIONAL GOVERNMENTAL ACTORS IN
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS
Ivo D. Duchacek
- 87-3 INFORMAL PLURALISM AND LDP GUIDANCE--EXAMINATION OF JAPAN'S
PROTECTIONISM OF RAW SILK IMPORTATION
John Q. Zhao
- 87-4 THE RELUCTANT REVIVAL OF LANDOWNER RIGHTS
Dennis J. Coyle
- 87-5 A CRITICAL THEORY OF COMMUNITY
Dennis J. Coyle
- 87-6 THE REAGAN PRESIDENCY AFTER SIX YEARS
Eugene C. Lee (moderator)
- 87-7 THE POLITICS OF THE AIDS VACCINE OR HOW THE CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE
SEARCHED FOR THE MAGIC BULLET--AND WOUND UP SQUABBLING WITH THE TRIAL
LAWYERS THE BUDGET-CUTTERS AND THE ALZHEIMER'S ESTABLISHMENT
David L. Kirp and Hugh Maher

1988

- 88-1 WHAT DO DECISION MODELS TELL US ABOUT INFORMATION USE?
Evert A. Lindquist
- 88-2 EARTHQUAKE ENGINEERING AND PUBLIC POLICY: KEY STRATEGIES FOR SEISMIC
POLICY
Stanley Scott
- 88-3 RESEARCH APPLICATIONS: PERSPECTIVES ON THE CALIFORNIA SEISMIC SAFETY
COMMISSION
Stanley Scott
- 88-4 CORPORATE CAMPAIGN SPENDING AND INITIATIVE OUTCOMES IN CALIFORNIA
Tom E. Thomas
- 88-5 AMERICAN ALL-MAIL BALLOTING: A SUMMATION OF A DECADE'S EXPERIENCE
Randy H. Hamilton
- 88-6 DO YOU HAVE TO BE CRAZY TO DO THIS JOB? CAUSES AND CONSEQUENCES OF
JOB SATISFACTION AMONG LOCAL LEGISLATORS
Edward L. Lascher Jr.
- 88-7 CALIFORNIA AGENCY RECONNAISSANCE PROJECT REPORTS
Todd R. La Porte, David Hadwiger, Steven Stehr
- 88-8 ARE CHICANOS ASSIMILATING?
Jorge Chapa
- 88-9 WHITE REACTIONS TO BLACK CANDIDATES: WHEN DOES RACE MATTER?
Jack Citrin, Donald Philip Green, David O. Sears
- 88-10 ISSUES IN RURAL AND SMALL DEVELOPMENT, CASE STUDY: WATSONVILLE SANTA
CRUZ COUNTY CALIFORNIA
Trish Ramos, Lakshmi Srinivas, Miriam Chion, Ana Lopez, Harry Hecht,
Chris Broughton, Robert Murray
- 88-11 THE UNITED STATES AIR TRAFFIC SYSTEM: INCREASING RELIABILITY IN
THE MIDST OF RAPID GROWTH
Todd La Porte

- 88-12 THE REAGAN PRESIDENCY AFTER SEVEN YEARS
Eugene C. Lee (moderator)
- 88-13 THE IOWA CAUCUSES IN A FRONT-LOADED SYSTEM: A FEW HISTORICAL LESSONS
Nelson W. Polsby
- 88-14 MODERNIZATION OF THE U.S. SENATE
Nelson W. Polsby
- 88-15 AMERICAN DEMOCRACY IN WORLD PERSPECTIVE AND WHAT TO DO ABOUT IT
Nelson W. Polsby
- 88-16 THE ARROGANCE OF OPTIMISM
Martin Landau, Donald Chisholm
- 88-17 FROM CRISIS TO COMMUNITY: THE 1988 OIL SPILL IN THE PITTSBURGH
METROPOLITAN REGION
Louise Comfort, Joel Abrams, John Camillus and Edmund Ricci et al.
- 88-18 TECHNOLOGY AND ADAPTIVE HIERARCHY: FORMAL AND INFORMAL ORGANIZATION
FOR FLIGHT OPERATIONS IN THE U.S. NAVY
Gene I. Rochlin and Energy Resources Group
- 88-19 INSIDE JAPAN'S LEVIATHAN DECISION-MAKING IN THE GOVERNMENT
BUREAUCRACY
Brian Woodall and Nobuhiro Hiwatari
- 88-20 THE DECAY OF FEDERAL THEORY
S. Rufus Davis
- 88-21 INFORMATION NETWORKS IN INTERNATIONAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE
Louise K. Comfort
- 88-22 THE LOGIC OF UNCERTAINTY: INTERORGANIZATIONAL COORDINATION IN
INTERNATIONAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE
Louise K. Comfort
- 88-23 CRISIS AS OPPORTUNITY: DESIGNING NETWORKS OF ORGANIZATIONAL ACTION
IN DISASTER ENVIRONMENTS
Louise K. Comfort
- 88-24 ENVIRONMENTAL ETHICS IN CALIFORNIA
Carolyn Merchant
- 88-25 COLD TURKEYS AND TASK FORCE: PURSUING HIGH RELIABILITY IN
CALIFORNIA'S CENTRAL VALLEY
Todd R. La Porte and Ted Lasher
- 88-26 BRUCE KEITH'S ALMANAC: PATTERNS OF VOTING IN CALIFORNIA
Bruce Keith
- 88-27 LOCALITY AND CUSTOM: NON-ABORIGINAL CLAIMS TO CUSTOMARY USUFRUCTUARY
RIGHTS AS A SOURCE OF RURAL PROTEST
Louise Fortmann

1989

- 89-1 AMERICAN IDENTITY AND THE POLITICS OF ETHNIC CHANGE
Jack Citrin, Beth Reingold, Donald P. Green
- 89-2 UKIAH, 1904: A MODEST FOOTNOTE TO THE HISTORY OF THE COUNCIL-MANAGER
FORM OF MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT IN THE UNITED STATES
Randy H. Hamilton
- 89-3 THE UNIVERSITY OF LONDON: AN AMERICAN PERSPECTIVE
Eugene C. Lee, Frank M. Bowen
- 89-4 LONDON 2001
Peter Hall

- 89-5 THE DISTRIBUTION OF ACADEMIC EARMARKS IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT'S APPROPRIATIONS BILLS, FY 1980-1989
James Savage
- 89-6 AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION: PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE
Martin Trow
- 89-7 AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION: "EXCEPTIONAL" OR JUST DIFFERENT?
Martin Trow
- 89-8 1992, EUROPEAN INTEGRATION AND THE TIMES
David Morgan
- 89-9 THE AMBIGUOUS STATUS OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY IN AUSTRALIA
Anthony Pecotich and Kelvin Willoughby
- 89-10 ERNST FRAENKEL LECTURE, FREE UNIVERSITY OF BERLIN THE AMERICAN ELECTION OF 1988: OUTCOME, PROCESS AND AFTERMATH
Nelson W. Polsby
- 89-11 PARTY, STATE AND IDEOLOGY IN THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 1967-76
K.G. Armstrong
- 89-12 HOW MUCH DOES LAW MATTER? LABOR RELATIONS IN ROTTERDAM AND U.S. PORTS
Robert A. Kagan
- 89-13 TECHNOLOGY AND THE FUTURE: ISSUES BEFORE THE BUSH ADMINISTRATION
Edward Wenk, Jr.
- 89-14 MUSIC OF THE SQUARES A LIFETIME OF STUDY OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION
Herbert Kaufman
- 89-15 WHY PRETEND ONE SIZE FITS ALL: AN EXAMINATION OF MANAGEMENT ISSUES THAT CONCERN SMALL FEDERAL AGENCIES
Randy H. Hamilton
- 89-16 SANTA CRUZ COUNTY PLANNING ISSUES: PAPERS ON PLANNING, HOUSING AND FORESTRY
Edward J. Blakely and Ted K. Bradshaw
- 89-17 THE RESEARCH ON HIGHER EDUCATION PROGRAM: AN APPRECIATION OF ESKIL BJORKLUND
Martin Trow
- 89-18 BINGO! AN UNTAPPED REVENUE FOR CALIFORNIA CITIES
William B. Rumford, Jr. and Randy H. Hamilton
- 89-19 CHOICE VS. CONTROL: INCREASING ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS IN INTERDEPENDENT ENVIRONMENTS
Louise K. Comfort and Keun Namkoong
- 89-20 THE CASE FOR EXPERIENTIAL KNOWLEDGE
Gene I. Rochlin
- 89-21 SAINTS AND CARDINALS IN APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEES: ACADEMIC PORK BARRELING AND DISTRIBUTIVE POLITICS IN AN ERA OF REDISTRIBUTIVE BUDGETING
James D. Savage
- 89-22 THE ELUSIVENESS OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT THEORY AND PRACTICE: DOMESTIC AND THIRD WORLD PERSPECTIVES JOINED
Ted K. Bradshaw
- 89-23 LEARNING FROM RISK: ORGANIZATIONAL INTERACTION FOLLOWING THE ARMENIAN EARTHQUAKES
Louise K. Comfort
- 89-24 DESIGNING AN EMERGENCY INFORMATION SYSTEM: THE PITTSBURGH EXPERIENCE
Louise K. Comfort

- 89-25 TOP BUREAUCRATS AND THE DISTRIBUTION OF INFLUENCE IN REAGAN'S EXECUTIVE BRANCH
Steven D. Stehr
- 89-26 TOWARD A DISPERSED ELECTRICAL SYSTEM: CHALLENGES TO THE GRID
James Summerton and Ted K. Bradshaw
- 89-27 ON CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM: THE ROOT OF ALL EVIL IS DEEPLY ROOTED
Daniel Hays Lowenstein
- 90-1 THE EFFECT OF CAMPAIGN SPENDING, TURNOUT, AND DROPOFF ON LOCAL BALLOT MEASURE OUTCOMES and THE INITIATIVE AND CALIFORNIA'S SLOW GROWTH MOVEMENT
David Hadwiger
- 90-2 TURNING CONFLICT INTO COOPERATION: ORGANIZATIONAL DESIGNS FOR COMMUNITY RESPONSE IN DISASTER
Louise K. Comfort
- 90-3 THE DREDGING DILEMMA: HOW NOT TO BALANCE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
Robert A. Kagan
- 90-4 NONVERBAL BEHAVIOR AND LEADERSHIP: EMOTION AND COGNITION IN POLITICAL INFORMATION PROCESSING
Roger D. Masters and Denis G. Sullivan
- 90-5 DOMINANCE AND ATTENTION: IMAGES OF LEADERS IN GERMAN, FRENCH, AND AMERICAN TV NEWS
Roger D. Masters Siegfried Frey, and Gary Bente
- 90-6 GOVERNMENT POLICIES AND HIGHER EDUCATION: A COMPARISON OF BRITAIN AND THE UNITED STATES 1960 TO 1860
Sheldon Rothblatt and Martin Trow
- 90-7 EARTHQUAKE SAFETY FOR NEW STRUCTURES: A COMPREHENSIVE APPROACH
Stanley Scott
- 90-8 CALIFORNIA AGENCY RECONNAISSANCE PROJECT: TEACHING PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION THROUGH FIELD RESEARCH
Todd R. La Porte and David Hadwiger

SEND ORDER TO:
Institute of Governmental Studies
102 Moses Hall
University of California
Berkeley, CA 94720
(415) 642-5537

PLEASE PRE-PAY ALL ORDERS
UNDER \$30: checks payable to The Regents of the University of California.
SALES TAX: California residents add sales tax.
HANDLING AND SHIPPING: add 20% of sales price. Allow 4 weeks for delivery.

Please add my name to the *PAR* mailing list (free). _____
TITLE _____ **QUANTITY/COST** _____

SUBTOTAL _____
SALES TAX _____
HANDLING (20%) _____
TOTAL _____

NAME _____
ADDRESS _____

CITY _____ **STATE** _____ **ZIP** _____

U.C. BERKELEY LIBRARIES



C098094406