

THURSDAY, AUGUST 5, 1920.

*Editorial and Publishing Offices:*

MACMILLAN & CO., LTD.,  
ST. MARTIN'S STREET, LONDON, W.C.2.

Advertisements and business letters should be  
addressed to the Publishers.

Editorial communications to the Editor.

Telegraphic Address: PHUSIS, LONDON.

Telephone Number: GERRARD 8830.

### University Grants.

A FEW weeks ago (June 17, p. 477) reference was made in these columns to the financial position of the Universities and institutions of University rank, and a plea was put forward for more adequate Government financial support. We are not unmindful that the Government has already recognised that it has responsibilities in this respect, but we greatly doubt whether it has fully realised their extent. The majority of these institutions are of comparatively recent foundation, and from the first have led a precarious existence; restricted resources and even poverty have almost uniformly been their lot. Nevertheless, they have ministered to the needs of higher education in a truly remarkable way; they have helped this country to hold its own in the face of world competition, and materially contributed to its success in the Great War. This being so, one would think that the encouragement and development of higher education would be among the first and primary cares of the Government. While we believe that this really is the intention, yet, if we may judge from certain proposals recently made, the Government does not fully appreciate the present state of affairs in the Universities. Apart from the question of new and additional accommodation due to the great influx of students, and altogether apart from the necessities of internal development which are yearly becoming more and more insistent, there stand out the dominant facts that the great body of University teachers are quite inadequately remunerated, and that there are no really practicable sources which can be tapped to provide proper and adequate emoluments for them. It is within our knowledge that the present economic position is pressing most severely upon a large number of University teachers, and that the financial position of many Universities is precarious.

If there is one thing more than another which  
NO. 2649, VOL. 105]

has been insistently pressed upon the University Grants Committee on its visitations—and, we are glad to say, has uniformly received a sympathetic hearing—it is this question of inadequate remuneration. A University is essentially a corporation of men and women, and if the teaching side of this corporation is dissatisfied or labours under a sense of injustice, its work loses its spontaneity and efficiency, and the interests of higher education, and with them those of the nation, will suffer in consequence. Obviously this is a truism which need not be laboured. When men and women have to eke out inadequate stipends by extraneous work the effects, though almost imperceptible at first, are bound to be serious in the long run. But this is not all. Inadequate remuneration reacts unfavourably upon the supply of efficient teachers. Talented young students will look elsewhere for their life's work. Already, as we have indicated on a previous occasion, the financial inducements of industry have depleted the Universities of some of their ablest teachers, and there are no uncertain indications that this depletion is likely to become more serious still.

Now, the Chancellor of the Exchequer recognises that the Government must do more, and he proposes to ask Parliament to increase the Treasury grant-in-aid from 1,000,000*l.* to 1,500,000*l.* in the Estimates for 1921–22. He does not propose to ask for any supplementary grant this year. We respectfully submit that this proposal is totally inadequate. As a matter of fact, we would point out that Parliament is not to be asked for a larger sum than is given this year; what is proposed is simply to make the non-recurrent 500,000*l.* recurrent. We repeat that such a sum is totally inadequate for present needs. A recent statistical inquiry instituted by the Association of University Teachers has elicited the fact that the average salary at present paid to an assistant lecturer is 250*l.*; to a lecturer, 366*l.*; and to a professor, 800*l.*, from which, of course, must be deducted the superannuation premiums of 5 per cent. or so. When we consider the largely increased salaries paid to teachers in other branches of the profession, let alone the inducements offered in industry, it is obvious that such average salaries will not attract the right type of teacher to the University in the future. We repeat that the proposed grant-in-aid is absolutely inadequate under present economic conditions, and would respectfully urge upon the Chancellor of the Exchequer to reconsider the whole question.

If this is the case regarding the general financial

A A

position, what must be said about the question of superannuation? A short time ago a deputation consisting of representatives of the governing bodies of the Universities and institutions of University rank in England and Wales, together with representatives of the Association of University Teachers, waited upon the Chancellor of the Exchequer to put before him certain proposals regarding the present unsatisfactory state of superannuation in the Universities. Briefly these proposals were to the effect that the Government should grant University teachers the same, or similar, superannuation benefits as already granted to other branches of the profession under the School Teachers (Superannuation) Act, 1918, plus certain other benefits which the University teachers were prepared to pay for themselves by an annual premium on their salaries. The deputation was a most representative one and absolutely unanimous in its proposals. We now understand that the Chancellor is "prepared to consider the advisability of proposing to Parliament a further non-recurrent sum to assist the Universities in meeting the grievance of those senior members who are precluded from profiting to the full by the benefits of the University Superannuation Scheme." At the same time, it is announced that the Council of the Federated Superannuation System of the Universities has undertaken to obtain the information upon which the proposed non-recurrent grant will be made.

In all this there is not a word about giving University teachers the same, or similar, privileges that school teachers have in their non-contributory Government scheme. Not a word about facilitating the transference of teachers from the schools to the Universities or from the Universities to the schools, so that there would be no loss of superannuation benefits on the transference. Not a word about full retrospective benefits, irrespective of whether the service has been in schools or in Universities. Not a word about the consequent unity of the teaching profession. It would seem that the policy is to make such transference as difficult as possible. Now, obviously such a policy cannot be in the interests of education. It may be that we have placed too narrow an interpretation upon the words quoted above. We hope so. For, unless we are profoundly mistaken, the great bulk of the University teachers will be bitterly disappointed if the Government does not at least grant them benefits equivalent to those already granted to 95 per cent. of the teaching profession in the country.

NO. 2649, VOL. 105]

### Tanks and Scientific Warfare.

*Tanks in the Great War, 1914-1918.* By Brevet-Col. J. F. C. Fuller. Pp. xxiv+331+vii plates. (London: John Murray, 1920.) Price 21s. net.

THIS remarkable book is a clear and straightforward history of how the British Army learnt to use the most revolutionary weapon the great war produced. It is written by a confirmed believer in that weapon, whose belief probably became more and more complete as the Tank Corps gradually grasped a few of the principles involved in its use. It is somewhat of a pity that the author does not devote a chapter to the process by which the Tank Corps arrived at the tactics which eventually proved so successful. It took something like two years to overcome the prejudices raised against tanks in official quarters, and this in war-time, when progress is relatively rapid compared with that in peace. It is therefore to be hoped that the principles so ably set forth by Col. Fuller, and so well proved in the late war, will never again be overlooked.

It is only natural that it took many months for the Tank Corps to evolve anything like effective tank tactics. Many methods had to be tested in battle before being discarded, and it is not unusual, but rather a matter for congratulation, if the tactics evolved for the battle of Hamel were primarily suggested by the Australians, for it serves to show the close co-operation obtained, and the openmindedness of those in the Tank Corps to adopt the suggestions of others.

The history of tank tactics is an instance of how an effective weapon may be entirely wasted unless its use is understood. As to how much blame attaches to the Tank Corps for the use of tanks in the Ypres salient and similar misuses up to the first battle of Cambrai the author is silent, nor does it matter much, except that it serves to show how necessary it is for the expert on the new weapon to have some say in such matters. However, if, as Col. Fuller says on p. 58, the following lessons were learnt as the result of the first use of tanks on the Somme in 1916, especially No. 2, then the later tank actions need a lot of explanation.

The battle of Cambrai, although it demonstrated what tanks in numbers over good ground and without a preliminary bombardment could do, yet would have been a far greater success had the tank tactics as finally adopted at the battle of Hamel been in use. There is no question that the town of Cambrai itself would have been taken on the first day of the attack had proper co-operation with the infantry been maintained. The