

THE FOUNDING OF
ST CROSS COLLEGE
OXFORD

An Interested Account
by W. E. van Heyningen

Published by
Oxbow Books
10 St Cross Rd, Oxford, OX1 3TU

© W. E. van Heyningen 1988

ISBN 0 946897 16 6

Typeset at Oxford University Computing Service
Printed in Great Britain by
Parchment, Oxford

CHAPTER ONE

THE POST-WAR CRISIS IN THE COLLEGIATE SYSTEM

1 The Nature of the Collegiate System

IN 1926 Arthur Gray, Master of Jesus College, Cambridge, ignoring the other, younger, English Universities at that time (e.g. London, Manchester, Birmingham), expressed his satisfaction with the Collegiate Universities of Cambridge and Oxford in a way that still is largely valid, even if it smacks too much of self-satisfaction for the present times:

. . . Cambridge and Oxford are of all Universities least cosmopolitan in character. The type of the English University is even less today than it was in its first beginnings the type of the continental University. It is something radically different from the Universities of Scotland or the younger foundations which have sprung up in the outgrowths of the British people beyond the seas. The old English Universities incorporate and assimilate their students. . . .

If we say that this stability of character is due to their antiquity we shall inadequately understand its meaning. The Universities of Bologna and Paris are older than Cambridge and Oxford, but they have none of their individuality. . . the ancient Universities of Salamanca and Seville have more in common with Yale and Chicago than with Cambridge and Oxford. The type is limited to our English soil. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries Cambridge sent out colonies to Ireland and to Massachusetts, whose constitutions were deliberately planned to rival the parent stock, but in another air the plants grown from English seed have developed variations which have little resemblance to their original.

To the foreigner and to the Englishman who has not come under their influences the peculiar attraction of Cambridge and

Oxford may seem inexplicable – a happy ‘sport’ which no genius of man can reproduce. To those who have been privileged to dwell within their reverend halls the source of it is superficially obvious. Chiefly it lies in social considerations – in the happy conjunction of the intimate ties of College with the wider communion given by the University. The great central luminary of the University is the recognized tutelary deity of Cambridge and of Oxford, but the faith of the worshipper is fortified, not diminished by his intenser affection for the familiar godhead of the College hearth.¹

In Oxford (as also in Cambridge) these Colleges have been associated with the University for seven centuries, that is to say for most of its history. The first formal evidence of the development of the University is contained in the papal legate of 1214, but there is evidence that *studia generalia* developed in Oxford in the twelfth century as homes for masters and students gathered from all parts, including, probably, those displaced from Paris. The Colleges came late in the thirteenth century, having been preceded by Academical Halls, which had come into being because the young University soon felt the need to control its members after severe disturbances in the early 13th century. There were all kinds of privately owned halls, but more usually a Master of Arts as ‘principal’ hired a hall near a ‘school’ (i.e. lecture room) with a view to taking in scholars, and in the 13th and early 14th century there were probably well over a hundred such halls. Colleges (or ‘collegiate halls’ as they were called) were a subsequent development. The essential difference between an ‘academic’ and a collegiate hall lay respectively in the absence or presence of an endowment, but this was not the only difference. Members of colleges shared a common life, and their colleges had endowments that compelled them to turn themselves into corporations. It was these endowments that ensured continuity.

Merton College is generally if not universally conceded as

¹ A. Gray, *Cambridge University – an Episodical History*. Cambridge, W. Heffer and Sons Ltd, 1926.

being the oldest of the colleges, having received its statutes in 1264, but it was only with the foundation of Oriel in 1324 that the term ‘college’ came to be used to designate an endowed academic hall or house. The most striking features of the new colleges were the wide diversity among them, and the uncertain manner in which their founders felt their way forwards towards a permanent form for their foundations. So uncertain was it that it took a long time for the collegiate concept to evolve into the recognizable common type that was firmly established by the beginning of the seventeenth century.²

Although the obvious social considerations of the Collegiate Universities that Arthur Gray referred to are undeniably important, we will be more concerned with the advantages to students in the particular attention they receive from the dons of their own Colleges; and with the particular advantages that the dons derive from the fact their Fellowship of a College gives them a great deal of independence (in some cases total independence) from ‘the great central luminary of the University’, yet enables them to play a part in the running of it that is not readily available to dons elsewhere. The assembly of colleges constitutes a kind of democracy. The collegiate structure that is common to the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge in most details is unique – no other university in the world has succeeded in copying it, although some have tried. What they have not seized on, even though some of them are wealthy enough, is the essential point that the Colleges of Oxford and Cambridge, though they could not now exist without their ties to the University, are, each one of them, independent institutions with their own incomes and their own governing bodies. This collegiate system is best described in the words of the report of the Commission of Inquiry into the University that was set up in 1964 and

² J. R. L. Highfield, ‘Chapter 6. The Early Colleges’, in *The History of the University of Oxford*, Vol. 1. pp. 225–264, Ed. J. I. Catto. Oxford University Press, 1984.

presided over by Lord Franks, Provost of Worcester College:³

In the collegiate system, the life of Oxford is broken into small units, each endowed with powers of initiation, decision, and management in educational and social matters. . .

The distinctive feature of the colleges is their status as legally independent and autonomous corporations. They are legally subject to the University only in those respects in which their statutes specifically bind them, though they cannot alter their statutes without the consent of Her Majesty in Council, and this consent will not be given to an alteration which affects the University unless the University's consent has first been given. Their governing bodies, which consist of the head and fellows of the college, have full control over the affairs of the college. The autonomy of the colleges is real, though subject in practice to certain limitations of fact or convention. A college chooses the person who is to preside over it. Its government rests solely with its fellows, that is, the academic staff. . .

College autonomy . . . sustains a corporate life and spirit quite unlike that of a hall of residence or a department. All who belong to such an independent self-governing community, whether fellows, postgraduates or undergraduates are full members of it; they constitute it and share its life in a complex network of relationships. The fellows are responsible for the government, teaching and general supervision of the community. They decide the issues of their society on the basis of one man one vote, and they have the power to make the decisions so taken effective in their society. . .

Oxford's college system, in the first place, makes possible really close personal contacts between members of the staff who are occupied in different intellectual disciplines. It is not just that they meet and eat together, but that they act together day by day in running the college's affairs. They feel the consequences of their own decisions directly and speedily. This increases their sense of collective responsibility and the need to understand one another. This intimate democracy of the college underpins the democracy

³ University of Oxford. Report of Commission of Inquiry. Vol.1. *Report, Recommendations, and Statutory Appendix*. 1966, Oxford, Clarendon Press, paragraphs 25, 27, 30, 35.

of the University. It gives to a member of Congregation, the Parliament of the University, the strength which comes from membership of a vigorous group, and which in other assemblies may be derived from membership of a state, of a party, or of an organized social movement. The college fellow approaches University problems not as an outsider nor a subordinate member of a team, but as one accustomed to dealing with such matters at a practical level and with authority. This is . . . a factor making for vitality in academic work. The existence of these many cells within it gives to the University a flexibility it would otherwise lack. It makes possible experiment and initiative.

2 The Post-War Problem

The collegiate system so much approved by the Commission of Inquiry had already been coming under threat before the Commission was appointed. An increase in the number of subjects taught in the University, and in the number of graduate students taking higher degrees, together with an increase in the number of senior members (i.e. members of Congregation), had taken place, and while these dons and mature students were obliged to be members of colleges, they tended to be second-class members of their colleges. Many of the dons were not fellows of their colleges, and most of the graduate students were not as at home in their colleges as were their undergraduate contemporaries. To an extent these difficulties were met by the establishment of five new Colleges: St Anne's College, for undergraduate and graduate students (formerly St Anne's Society for women students), was incorporated in 1952; Nuffield College, for graduate students, instigated by Lord Nuffield in 1937, came into being in 1954, and was incorporated in 1963; St Antony's College, for graduate students, was incorporated in 1953; Linacre House (later Linacre College), for graduate students, was established by the University in 1962; and St Catherine's College, for undergraduate and graduate students, formerly St Catherine's

Society for home students, came into being in 1962 and was incorporated in 1963. But in spite of these new foundations, only a little more than half, i.e. 560, of the University's 986 graduate staff who were members of the legislative body of the University, i.e. Congregation, were fellows of colleges by the Trinity Term of 1962. Of the 67 Readers only 39 were Fellows; of the 106 Lecturers only 37; of the 138 University Demonstrators only 16; of the 44 Senior Research Officers only 16; of the 9 Graduate Assistants only 1; of the 47 various Departmental Demonstrators, Research Assistants, etc., only 2; of the 171 senior staff in various other categories only 17. On the other hand, all the 96 Professors were Fellows, having by statute been allocated to the particular colleges that were represented on the committees that appointed them; and all the 13 Special Lecturers were Fellows, as well as 278 of the 295 Common University Fund Lecturers, having in effect been appointed by the colleges.

Such a regrettable state of affairs had already been foreseen forty two years previously, when the Royal Commission Report of 1922 stated (in para. 123) that 'it is highly desirable in order that due provision may be made for the expansion of new studies, that the number of official fellowships should be increased, and that college statutes should be modified where necessary for this purpose', and went on to recommend 'a system whereby a certain proportion of college fellowships should be reserved for university lecturers or university demonstrators'. Now that predicted expansion of new studies had taken place, and it had led to a considerable change in the size and functions of the University.

The colleges admit the students and look after them, and the University provides the facilities that the colleges cannot provide for themselves. Before the war the main function of the University had been to provide a repository of books in the University Library, to provide scientific laboratories, and to confer degrees. The colleges, with their own libraries, and some even with their own laboratories, would hardly have noticed

the difference if the University had ceased to exist, except that they would have had to confer their own degrees; and had the colleges ceased to exist, the University would have been little more than a book repository.

After the war the University could with a little trouble have been made into a workable concern without the colleges; but without the University the colleges would either have had radically to re-organize themselves, or to have gone bankrupt.

The problem that was facing the collegiate University of Oxford was also facing the collegiate University of Cambridge, where a Syndicate on the Relationship between the University and the Colleges had been appointed under Lord Bridges, Chancellor of Reading University and past Secretary to the Cabinet. Its terms of reference were to report on any ways in which they thought the relations between the University and the Colleges could be improved, and its report was published in March 1962. A similar inquiry was soon to be made in Oxford.

CHAPTER TWO

THE REVOLT OF THE KAFFIRS¹

By the Michaelmas Term of 1961 the 506 non-fellows, or at any rate a large number of them, were beginning to express their dissatisfaction with their inferior role in the University. On 28 September M. Webb of the Geography Department brought up the question with M. M. Spencer of the Education Department, and continued the discussion the next day with G. Bennett of the Commonwealth Institute, S. McKerrow and R. Lambert of the Geology Department, and A. Peterson of the Education Department.²

Webb and Bennett then called a meeting of non-fellows in Queen Elizabeth House on Monday 9 October 1961. There were thirteen present, namely P. H. T. Beckett (agricultural economics department), G. Bennet (Commonwealth Institute), D. A. T. Dick (human anatomy department), R. H. Freeborn (Russian department), Mrs M. Holdsworth (Commonwealth Institute), B. E. Juniper (botany department), R. St.J. Lambert (geology department), L. Leyton (forestry department), R. L. Lucas (agriculture department), W. S. McKerrow (geology department), D. Nichols (zoology department), A. D. C. Peterson (education department), M. M. Spencer (education department), M. J. Webb (geography department), and F. White (forestry department). After this meeting a 'memorandum concerning the position of senior teaching staff of Oxford University, and other members of Congregation who

¹ The name good-naturedly given by Sir Maurice Bowra, Warden of Wadham, to Members of Congregation who were not Fellows of Colleges at the time. They called themselves Non-dons, a name given to them by *The Times*.

² 'The Origins of St Cross College', M. M. Spencer, *St Cross College Record* 5, 36-41, 1984.

The Revolt of the Kaffirs

are not Fellows of Colleges' was prepared by Lambert, McKerrow and Webb for discussion at a further meeting to be held on 1 November 1961. They were '... particularly concerned, in the first instance, over the omission of non-Fellows from the list of the co-opted members of the Committee on the Relationship between the University and Colleges, which we felt weakened the Committee, as there is no member of it, who, for the present time, is directly in a position to speak for some one quarter of the academic staff. We feel that the University, including as it does nearly as many non-Fellows as Fellows, is not adequately represented on the Committee.' They had calculated from the information in the Calendars for 1951 and 1961 that there had been little change in the proportion of non-Fellows in the last ten years; and that the figures taken from the *Application for the coming Quinquennium* suggested that the number of non-Fellows would rise from 185 to at least 204.

In the meantime, the condition of the non-fellows happened first to be drawn to the attention of the University at large at a meeting of Congregation on 24 October 1961 (and to world at large when it was reported at some length in *The Times* the next day), when D. A. T. Dick of the Department of Human Anatomy, a non-fellow, intervened to oppose the movement of a decree by Professor G. Temple, Sedleian Professor of Natural Philosophy. The decree was for the rejection of an offer of £14,000 from the University Grants Committee to finance a flexible scale of salaries for university teachers in Oxford. Dick said that the argument for rejecting the grant was fallacious, since it would mean the perpetuation of the present inequalities of stipends which existed between members of the scientific departments who were not fellows and those who were fellows and thus received higher total emoluments. He thought that the money offered could be used to remove this difference, at least partially.

A second meeting was held on 1 November 1961 in the lecture room of the Department of Geology. It was brief, because although a fair number attended it was clear that many

more might be concerned. It was therefore decided to have a recruiting drive for a bigger meeting in two weeks' time. After a short discussion, J. French of the Sir William Dunn School of Pathology was deputed to ask his colleague, W. E. van Heyningen, a Senior Research Officer, to preside over the next meeting, since he was one of the more senior non-fellows known to be interested. van Heyningen, though greatly honoured, accepted this invitation with some reluctance.³

That meeting was duly held in the University Museum Lecture Theatre on Wednesday 15 November 1961 with van Heyningen in the chair, 'to consider the following subjects which concern members of the University engaged in teaching and research who are not Fellows of Colleges.

1 Brief report of meeting on November 1st and any subsequent major developments.

2 Status

(a) lack of representation of non-fellows on university committees especially the committee on the relationship between the University and the Colleges.

(b) distribution of fellowships among subjects.

3 Amenities.

(a) provision of accommodation for teaching.

(b) common room facilities.

4 Stipends

(a) disparity of prospects compared with Senior Lecturers of provincial universities and College Fellows.

(b) housing, meals, and other benefits not available to non-fellows.

5 Consideration of further action.'

³ Appointed Reader in Bacterial Chemistry in 1966. Although a Curator of the Bodleian Library, he was not much interested in university politics, being more concerned with his research, and with the administration of the School of Pathology on behalf of Sir Howard Florey. He was at this time fortunate in being an extra member of the Common Room of Exeter College, which had a '*concordium amicabilis*' with Emmanuel College, Cambridge, where he had been a Ph.D. student before the war.

van Heyningen sent a copy of this agenda to the Vice-Chancellor, A. L. P. Norrington, President of Trinity College. The further action under item 5 above consisted of electing a Standing Committee (which came to be known as the Committee of Non-Fellows), consisting of M. Argyle, V. S. Butt, R. Cecil, D. A. T. Dick, J. E. French, A. Jones, W. S. McKerrow, J. Tajfel, D. Lambert, with R. H. Freeborn as secretary, and W. E. van Heyningen as chairman. The committee (with Tajfel absent) met in McKerrow's room in the Geology Department on 21 November 1961, and agreed that Cecil and Freeborn should prepare a draft of a memorandum on the problems affecting the relationship between the University and the Colleges, to be circulated to the other members of the standing committee before the next meeting on 28 November; and that van Heyningen should send a letter to the Vice-Chancellor informing him of the formation of the Committee of Non-Fellows, and of its intention to draw up a memorandum which would in due course be presented to him. van Heyningen duly informed the Vice-Chancellor on 22 November.

The memorandum went as follows:

This memorandum has been prepared by a committee appointed at the second of two meetings held on November 1st and 15th. Certain problems were discussed which affect those members of the University engaged in teaching and research who are not Fellows of Colleges. The memorandum merely draws attention to the main problems; no details are presented and no solutions are proposed at this stage. Of recent years there has been an increasing number of appointments to University posts with merely nominal College affiliation. There is a strong feeling among those who hold such appointments that they do not have the opportunity of playing their full part in the life of the University. This situation is likely to be further aggravated by the creation of more posts of this nature as envisaged in the application for the Quinquennium 1962/67. The problems arising from this situation concern a large number of the academic staff in many parts of the University and, although there is a common feeling of frustration, different

individuals are inevitably affected in a number of different ways.

These problems can be summarised under the headings of responsibility and status, amenities, and stipends. Those who are not College Fellows are given little say in University administration or in such vital matters as the admission of students whom they subsequently have to teach. They are hardly ever appointed to University Committees; they have not even been appointed to the Committee on the relationship between the University and Colleges. There is also an anomaly in the distribution of Fellowships among subjects; Fellowships are particularly sparse among subjects which do not have large numbers of honours students. The lack of amenities, too, is serious. Some of those engaged in teaching are not even provided with any accommodation for the purpose. Many have no common room facilities. This does not only imply that they have nowhere to entertain but, far more important, they lack the means of making contact with their colleagues in other Faculties.

Then there is the question of stipend. The 'wage structure' of the University is no less complicated than that in other walks of life, and anomalies abound. Nevertheless, it is true that the non-Fellow has poorer prospects than his colleague who is a Fellow. Because of the College system in Oxford there is no senior lecturer grade and the number of readerships is very limited. Moreover, the University does not help with housing on the same scale as most provincial universities; in Oxford such benefits are almost entirely limited to College Fellows.

Not all these problems apply to everyone, but each applies to some; the order in which they are mentioned in this memorandum does not imply an order of importance. These problems together constitute an important issue, which affects the future character of the University. There is a danger that a division will arise within the University – if indeed it has not already arisen – between those who are Fellows of Colleges and those who are not. Unless a determined attempt is made to change this situation it is likely that a second-class society will continue to develop, with harmful consequences to the life of the University.

The Vice-Chancellor's reply was sympathetic. On 30 November 1961 he wrote to van Heyningen:

I have informed the Committee on the Relationship between the University and the Colleges of the formation of your Committee representing Senior Members of the University who are not Fellows. They were much interested, and hoped that in due course they might have the opportunity of seeing your memorandum.

I am hoping to have another meeting in the vacation of a small sub-committee (of the 'Relationship' Committee) which is looking into this very question of 'College Affiliations', and if you would like at any time to discuss your proposed memorandum with me, I shall be delighted.

It was then agreed then the Vice-Chancellor would receive a delegation consisting of van Heyningen, R. H. Freeborn and R. Cecil for an informal discussion on 13 December 1961, and van Heyningen sent him a copy of the memorandum.

The memorandum was discussed at a meeting in van Heyningen's laboratory in the Sir William Dunn School of Pathology on Tuesday 5 December 1961. No record of that meeting has been found, but Freeborn's hand-written note about it suggests that there was a discussion about the proposed meeting with the Vice-Chancellor after he had been sent the memorandum by van Heyningen, accompanied by signatures of the non-fellows. The subjects proposed for discussion were the inauguration of a fact-finding committee, the Vice-Chancellor's solutions, seeking the Vice-Chancellor's permission to give evidence before the Robbins Committee,⁴ the question of college affiliation, the principle of representation of non-fellows, and the circulation of the Robbins Report.

On 14 December 1961 van Heyningen submitted the memorandum, supported by the signatures of 130 Members of Congregation with full-time University, Departmental and

⁴ A 'Committee appointed by the Prime Minister under the Chairmanship of Lord Robbins' to report in Higher Education. Its Report was presented to Parliament by the Prime Minister by Command of Her Majesty in October 1963 and published soon after (HMSO). It was not critical of the collegiate universities of Oxford and Cambridge.

Chapter Two

Institutional appointments, to the Vice-Chancellor for consideration by himself and Hebdomadal Council's Committee on the Relationship between the University and the Colleges.

A note by van Heyningen dated 5 February 1962 went as follows:

I was beginning to think it was time that we heard from Mr Vice-Chancellor, but I didn't like to press him, so I arranged to dine in Trinity, which I did last night. Mr Vice-Chancellor explained to me how he had not been able up to now to arrange the meeting of the Committee on the relations between the colleges and the University because he had so many other pressing matters to deal with at this time. He said he hoped the Committee would meet within the next two weeks and promised to get in touch with me as soon as they had. He did ask me to make a note of the fact that the response from the richer colleges had not been at all promising and this made him pessimistic. I didn't quite know what he meant by this and I didn't like to ask him to explain in detail since we were talking more or less in public out of the sides of our mouths. I think the idea may have been that the richer colleges might have been persuaded to have more fellows or perhaps to contribute to a scheme whereby more fellows might be taken in.

On 1 March 1962 van Heyningen wrote to the Vice-Chancellor to express his Committee's regret at not having had any further communication from him on the subject of the memorandum submitted on 14 December, and to ask if they could expect a response from the Committee on the Relationship between the University before their next meeting, to which the Vice-Chancellor responded on 12 March:

I am sorry that I have had nothing to report. The plans which I was hoping might materialize for mutual aid among colleges – by which I mean from rich to poor – came to nothing, and of course something of this kind was thought, by my Committee, to be a pre-requisite to any practical steps about better 'integration' of academic staff with Colleges.

The failure has been due not so much to any lack of goodwill as

The Revolt of the Kaffirs

to inability to find an agreed basis of action, and I am not unhopeful of reaching the target by another route – possibly next term.

Meanwhile, we heard that the Cambridge (Bridges) Committee⁵ were likely to make such drastic recommendations that we thought it would be wise to wait and see what these would turn out to be. I imagine we shall know in a few days – or hours – and that we shall then have to do some hard thinking.

On 28 March 1962 the Committee of Non-Fellows wrote to the University Registrar:

We are a Committee appointed at a meeting of a number of Members of Congregation which was held on 15 November 1961. We were instructed to examine the problems of Members of Congregation holding full-time University appointments who are not Fellows of College. Accordingly, we submitted a Memorandum on this subject to Mr Vice-Chancellor on 14 December 1961 for consideration by the Committee on the Relationship between the University and the Colleges. A copy of this Memorandum is enclosed.

Mr Vice-Chancellor suggested recently that it might be appropriate to await the appearance of the Report of the Cambridge University Syndicate on the Relationship between the University and the Colleges (Bridges Report). We have studied the Report and believe, as may be judged from our Memorandum, that many of its recommendations are relevant to the situation in Oxford.

In view of this we now ask Council to reconstitute the present Committee on the Relationship between the University and the Colleges so as to include an independent Chairman, other independent members and some Members of Congregation who are not Fellows of Colleges.

On 4 May 1962 van Heyningen informed the Non-Fellows Committee:

⁵ A committee investigating, and about to make proposals on, a similar problem of non-dons that was, hardly surprisingly, being debated in Cambridge.

Chapter Two

Dr Freeborn, Dr Cecil and I met Mr Vice-Chancellor yesterday, 3 May. He informed us that it had been suggested by Council that he should arrange for the co-optation of two or three Non-Fellows to the Committee on the Relationship between the University and the Colleges. As soon as I receive a letter to this effect, a meeting of the Non-Fellows Committee will be called to discuss appropriate action. In the meantime I am available on the telephone for anybody who wants any further information about our meeting with Mr Vice-Chancellor.

On 10 May 1962 the Vice-Chancellor wrote to van Heyningen:

When you came to see me the other day, with Cecil and Freeborn, I told you that Council had considered your letter of 28 March, and thought that it would not be desirable to reconstitute the Committee on the Relationship between the University and the Colleges in the way you suggested. I mentioned to you that, in my view, there is good practical reason for not so reconstituting it, namely the time factor. It would take some weeks to find the right external chairman, and other independent members, and the new Committee would have to start from scratch; whereas the existing Committee has already done some work on the 'integration' problem. Council therefore asked me to raise again with the Committee the question of the co-optation of a representative of your group. They have also asked the Committee to expedite its work on the integration problem. I should add that they asked me to make it clear to you that they think the issues raised by you are very important, and need to be considered as soon as possible.

The committee met this morning. They came to the conclusion that the best way to get rapid and effective results would be to set up a special sub-committee consisting of three of their own members and two members of your group, to assemble the facts and report, as soon as possible, to the main Committee.

The three members appointed by the Committee are Mr A. R. W. Harrison of Merton (Chairman), Dr J. W. Linnett of Queen's and Miss Whiteman of Lady Margaret Hall. We hope that you and Dr Cecil would be willing to serve on this sub-committee. I am to say, however, that if you feel that the Arts should be

The Revolt of the Kaffirs

represented, we should be very happy to co-opt Dr Freeborn instead.

I shall be glad to hear from you as soon as possible, so that we can get things moving. I have it in mind to write to the Colleges and tell them about this, and I am assuming that you will inform the members of your group.

On 12 May 1962 van Heyningen replied:

I thank you for your excellent letter of 10 May which I have now discussed with our Committee. They asked me to say that they will be very glad to have two representatives co-opted on the Committee on the Relationship between the University and the Colleges. I will be glad to serve on the sub-committee and we hope that you will co-opt Dr Freeborn rather than Dr Cecil since we think it is important that the Arts should be represented. I took the liberty of speaking to Mr Harrison on the telephone to explain to him that I will be in New York all June and to express the hope that the sub-committee could arrange to have one or more meetings in May.

CHAPTER THREE

THE RESPONSE OF THE UNIVERSITY

1 The Harrison Committee

THE University responded to the Memorandum from the Committee of Non-Fellows on 10 May 1962, with the appointment by Hebdomadal Council's 'Committee to review the relationship between the University and the colleges' of a subcommittee whose terms of reference were 'to submit a report to the committee setting out the facts of the problem of closer integration of university employees into the college system (and the related problem of a revision of *Statt. Tit. XXV*) and suggesting some ways in which this problem might be solved'. The members appointed to this subcommittee were three members of the 'relationship' Committee, namely Mr A. R. W. Harrison, Fellow of Merton College, Dr J. W. Linnett, Fellow of The Queen's College, and Dr E. A. O. Whiteman, Fellow of Lady Margaret Hall; and two members of the Committee of Non-Fellows, namely Dr R. H. Freeborn, nominally attached to Brasenose College, and Dr W. E. van Heyningen, nominally attached to Exeter College. Harrison was Chairman, and the committee came to be called the Harrison Committee.

The Committee met fifteen times, and submitted its report in November 1962.¹ The report started with the words 'The fact that gave rise to the setting up of the subcommittee can be simply stated – only a little more than half of the University's graduate staff in Trinity Term 1962 who were members of Congregation were also fellows of colleges', and proceeded then to give the figures given in section 2 of Chapter 1, namely that only 560 [57%] of the 986 members of Congregation were

¹ *Report on the closer integration of university teaching and research with the college system. Supplementary to Gazette No. 3214. Oxford University Press, 1962.*

fellows of colleges, although those who were not fellows were by statute obliged to be members of colleges. (And, as has been pointed out in Chapter 1, the 13 Special Lecturers and 278 of the Common University Fund Lecturers among those 560 fellows were in effect employed by the Colleges with subsidies from the University. In other words it could be argued that only 261 of 725 Members of Congregation with essentially University appointments [36%] were fellows of colleges.)

The Report continued with a consideration of the following points: (a) 'A college has in fact still the power to confer a greater status on its most newly elected fellow than the University has to confer on any save (perhaps) a professor.' (b) The academical social life of Oxford, and the opportunities for appointments to University committees, were based on the colleges.² (c) University staff who were fellows of colleges received greater emoluments (as well as free meals) than those who were not. (d) There had been an increase in administrative staff, library staff and museum staff whose functions and status would benefit from college fellowship.

The Committee could well see why the colleges had not elected more non-fellows to fellowships. Most of their fellows had been elected for the teaching of undergraduates, for which many of the non-fellows were not suitable; they were unwilling to increase the size of their governing bodies; and many of the new staff appointments for which there were no fellowships had been made without reference to the colleges. These genuine concerns are well illustrated by a letter Harrison had received from a fellow of a college. It is worth quoting at length:

It is obviously very desirable that every Senior Member of the University should be effectively related to a College. What this relationship should be, depends, it seems to me, on the purpose of the collegiate system itself.

A fellow is essentially a member of Governing Body of a

² e.g. van Heyningen was the first non-fellow to be elected to Hebdomadal Council, in 1963.

College and, in Oxford, it is normal for Fellows to be Tutors, i.e. to have tutorial and 'pastoral' care of undergraduates. The system requires that the people who run it should, for the most part, have this interest in the College and its junior members.

It follows (i) that a Fellowship is a post, not a rank. (ii) that the prestige attaching to a Fellowship derives from doing this job. (iii) that Professorial and Senior Research Fellowships are in a sense parasitical, being given to distinguished people who are an ornament to the society, but don't do the main work of the College, (though they do some of it, i.e. are members of the Governing Body, but not tutors.) (iv) that there is a limit on the number of Fellowships which can be created without devaluing the Fellowship as such, viz. (a) The Fellows must be not too numerous to form a fully self-governing community. If a College Council is needed, a good deal of the point of being a Fellow is lost. (b) Tutorial Fellows must clearly preponderate.

If the conditions of (iv) (a) and (b) are not observed, it seems to me that Tutorial Fellows will not be able to do their job and a Fellowship will cease to be what we at present value it for being. Would it not be self-frustrating to confer the title of a Fellowship so widely as to produce a state of affairs in which little but the title remained?

In Cambridge, I gather, the Collegiate system is far less of a reality than it is here precisely because the above conditions often no longer hold. Colleges are too large and Governing Bodies are too large; teaching and 'pastoral care' are separated; and teaching is largely done out of the College. Cambridge, then, it might be argued, has gone so far towards weakening the College system that there is not much of a case for resisting the Bridges proposals on this ground (though the smaller foundations might reasonably contest this).

I don't myself see that an individual in virtue of holding a University (or indeed, a College) lecturership has a right to a Fellowship, though I think he ought to have a reasonable chance of getting one – as members of the 'smaller' faculties, at present do not. It is true that a Fellowship carries with it advantages along with its responsibilities, and that it is a pity that not everyone can enjoy these advantages. But it is equally a pity that a Fellowship at some colleges carries with it greater advantages (though not

greater responsibilities) than a Fellowship at another. Indeed the differentials here are in every way much greater. If one is to remove anomalies the discrepancy between Fellows of different Colleges is every bit as anomalous as that between Fellows in general and University Lecturers.

Except, of course, that the latter are cut off from the social life of the Colleges – at least many of them are. We need a better Halifax House and Common-room membership more widely spread. I wonder too whether club facilities couldn't be provided for institutes as is often done in American Universities.

These views are rather conservative, but that is because I think that, for the sake of the undergraduate, it is important, overridingly important, to conserve the College system as an undergraduate-centred thing, which means that the Tutorial Fellows should continue to be effectively in control. I very much hope we shan't lose sight of this.

Added to the difficulties touched on so far, there was the further difficulty that there had been a great increase in the number of graduate students – of Oxford and of other universities – working in Oxford for higher degrees; and although they too were nominally obliged to belong to colleges, they were not effectively members of them.

The Harrison Committee stated their conclusions thus: 'Our proposals, very briefly, are that all members of the graduate staff of the University ought to have some form of affiliation with some form of graduate society, that this cannot be fully achieved without the creation of new societies (and the expansion of certain existing ones), but that homes could and should be found for many within the existing colleges. We make these proposals in the firm conviction that the members of the academic staff of a collegiate university (the merits of which we have not thought necessary to argue) should have the opportunity of participating in something more than a '9 to 5 job' in the university department in which they are primarily employed. As things are, however, a large number of the academic staff of this university are not given any such opportunity, and, if the University expands much farther

without anything being done, they will form the majority. If they do, then Oxford will cease to be a collegiate university and will become instead a university to which some colleges are affiliated; our proposals are designed to prevent this from ever happening.'

Dr Anne Whiteman, although in general agreement with the committee's assessment of the problem, expressed certain misgivings – she feared that colleges might be pressed to make elections to fellowships when the interest of the college was not the first consideration; that appointments to faculties and departments might be delayed by the need to find a college fellowship to go with the post; and that fellowships in graduate colleges might be in excess of those needed for pastoral oversight.

As to *Statt. Tit. XXV* mentioned in the first paragraph of this chapter, this provided that holders of certain posts, including professorships, might be elected to professorial fellowships. The Committee thought 'that the term "university fellow" would more happily describe any fellow who held his fellowship by virtue of his university appointment', but in fact this sensible term never came to be used, either for professors or for those others who were later also to be entitled to fellowships by virtue of their university appointments.

The Harrison Report was submitted to the Committee on the Relationship of the University and Colleges, and then to the Hebdomadal Council in November 1962, and a copy of it was sent to every resident member of Congregation in December. The colleges were invited to comment on it, and their replies were referred to the Committee.

In mid-March 1963 the Vice-Chancellor (now Walter Oakeshott, Rector of Lincoln College)³ had a discussion with a

³ The atmosphere was cordial. A letter from the Vice-Chancellor to van Heyningen two days before that meeting had stated 'May I just add how much I appreciate the way you are handling all this? I had a talk yesterday with the [new] Warden of Merton [Harrison] – most encouraging.'

'Promotion Committee' of non-fellows consisting of van Heyningen and Freeborn together with D. Patterson, A. D. C. Peterson and J. S. Rollett. It is worth recording a brief account of that meeting, since it illustrates the way minds were working at the time.

van Heyningen reported that his committee had asked the non-fellows whether they were interested in the formation of a graduate college and the majority had shown considerable enthusiasm for the idea. They were eager to proceed as soon as possible, and thought it was essential for such a college to have the support of the University, and essential also that it should have a building – there was talk of Rhodes House becoming available to the University for other purposes, could it be secured for a college? They thought it would probably be necessary, were such a college founded, for the University to introduce some rule under which no new University post could be created unless affiliation with some college could be arranged (a prophecy which eventually turned out to be correct, as will later be seen). The Vice-Chancellor was sympathetic to the proposal of a new college, but thought it should not be attempted too quickly, otherwise it would arouse opposition. As to Rhodes House, it had tentatively been offered to the University for the accommodation of central administration, and canvassing its use for some other purpose might result in withdrawal of the offer.

He asked what the objects of the college would be. Since the creation another Nuffield or St Antony's would be far too expensive, did the committee rather have in mind a first-rate social club with a common table? van Heyningen replied that the intention was to form a non-residential graduate college with all the facilities commonly found in colleges, e.g. dining hall, common rooms, and seminar rooms. It was intended to devise new and interesting ways of running the college, and to provide the necessary supervision of junior members.

The Vice-Chancellor asked how much this would need, and whether the promotion committee had any source of funds in

mind. van Heyningen thought the University's approval had to be obtained before launching an appeal, and hoped that the University itself might contribute. Freeborn continued on the subject of Rhodes House. He said the rough estimate for converting it was £50,000, with £30,000 needed a year to run it. The Vice-Chancellor said that even if Rhodes House became available, the Indian Institute Library would have to be housed there as well as the existing Rhodes House library; the Rhodes Trustees would have to approve any conversion work, they probably would not allow extensions in the garden, and they would probably preserve the right to use certain public rooms occasionally. There might still be enough room left for a college, and it was just possible that the University might be able to help with University Grants Committee building money, but the prospect of Rhodes House was still very remote.

van Heyningen then asked what the Vice-Chancellor thought the next steps ought to be, and the Vice-Chancellor said that there was absolutely no recurrent money available for any college project during the remainder of the quinquennium. He thought during the long vacation the promotion committee should make soundings of possible benefactors, and at the beginning of the next term he would arrange a meeting between the promotion committee and half a dozen members of Council to discuss the next steps. Peterson asked (with pre-vision) whether there was any possibility of the richer colleges helping in such a project, and the Vice-Chancellor replied that such an approach should come from the promotion committee rather than from the University – it could indeed be one of the steps to take during the Long Vacation.

van Heyningen asked what the current position was with the non-fellows problem – nothing had been heard since the Harrison Report was circulated. The Vice-Chancellor replied that the comments of the colleges on the Harrison Report had been referred to a sub-committee under the President of Trinity.

On 24 June 1963 van Heyningen wrote the first of the many

begging letters he was to write. A Mr Charles Stewart Moss had made an enormous benefaction to Board of Education in Flint, Michigan, for the furtherance of higher education, and there were reasons, now forgotten, that suggested that this foreign body might be approachable. At least two million dollars were asked for, to provide a building for a graduate college. There was no reply. A week later he wrote to Mr Anthony Sampson of *The Observer*, who had written an article about some Oxford colleges turning in on themselves instead of following the example of the Cambridge colleges in endowing a new graduate college – did he know where we could find a few million pounds? Mr Sampson's reply was friendly, but since he was not a connoisseur of millionaires, he did not for the present know of any likely ones.

2 The First Norrington Committee

Indeed the Committee on the Relationship of the University and Colleges had appointed a further subcommittee on 14 February 1963 'to consider the problem in the light of the replies received from the colleges and of such further information as they thought it was necessary to collect.' It consisted of the President of Trinity (Mr Thomas Norrington, Chairman), Dr E. A. O. Whiteman, Mr G. D. G. Hall, Fellow of Exeter College, and Mr A. R. W. Harrison. There were no non-fellows on it.

The Norrington Report was published in January 1964. It was based on the Harrison Report, the data on which it had been based, including the anonymous replies to a questionnaire circulated to all non-fellows, the comments of the colleges on the report, and their replies to a questionnaire circulated by the new committee.

The Committee reviewed the current situation: the time had passed when teaching of undergraduates was the main business of the University, done mostly in the colleges, with the

University providing so few posts that there was no difficulty in providing college fellowships for the holders of these posts. Now things were changed. New subjects were being taught, both in the existing Honours Schools and in new Honours Schools; and the growth of science, and of graduate studies in science and arts, had altered the balance. The teaching of science was now largely being done by the University, because of its cost, and because it required more than simply tutorial services. Graduate studies were more the business of the faculties and the departments than of the colleges. And the ratio of students to fellows had risen from less than ten to one in 1938-9 to more than twelve to one in 1962, which meant that some 200 fellows would be needed to restore the 1938-9 ratio.

The colleges had agreed that the situation was bad, and that action should be taken to improve it, and indeed several fellowships had been created since October 1962; but they disagreed with some of the implications, or apparent implications, of the Harrison Report. They held the reasonable view that University academic staff could not expect to have normal college fellowships without acceptance of the duties and responsibilities that arose from the nature of collegiate society, and went beyond the advancement of learning. Although the colleges had a special concern for the teaching of their own undergraduates, they had also always had professorial fellows, and some others whose main work was outside the college. They believed there were some non-fellows, such as readers, whose academic distinction made them especially eligible for fellowships; as also were those whose undergraduate tutorial work lay in subjects studied by very few undergraduates. It was generally agreed that only a limited number of fellowships could be created in the existing colleges for those listed in the Harrison report, and that such additional fellowships would raise difficulties of accommodation and finance. At least ten colleges were in favour of the creation of new 'graduate societies'.

The Norrington Committee were agreed that 'The root of the matter is status . . . Fellowship status belongs to a fellowship,

and any substitute would be an inferior imitation.' They believed that a fellowship also tended to make its holder more effective academically, and they quoted Trinity College's opinion that: 'Professors, readers, and other non-tutorial fellows gain greatly, not only as effective members of the University but as workers in their own subjects, from membership of a governing body in which they are exposed, at college meetings and in college committees, to the personal problems of undergraduates and postgraduates, and to questions that arise in other faculties than their own.'

The Committee agreed with the Harrison Report that there were about 250 non-fellows whose distinction or whose duties in the field of teaching or research made them eligible for status in the University equivalent to that of fellows in existing colleges. There were 23 readers and about 7 others whose distinction made them especially eligible for fellowship at existing colleges, though not necessarily at undergraduate colleges. There were about 60 whose undergraduate teaching and experience fitted them for fellowship at undergraduate colleges. And there were about 150 whose work involved little or no undergraduate tutorial teaching.

As to this last group, the committee stated 'We are in no doubt that the right solution to the problem of the integration of this class into the college system is the foundation of new collegiate societies.' The committee went on to suggest that there should be at least two new societies. One such already existed in embryo in the form of Linacre House, and it was suggested that consideration should be given to its establishment as an independent graduate college.⁴

Similar problems were being faced in Cambridge. The Committee noted that in July 1963 the Regent House in Cambridge had approved recommendations of the Council of

⁴ Linacre House was established by the University in 1962 as a Society for men and women graduates reading for advanced degrees in all subjects. It changed its title to Linacre College in 1965.

the Senate that a grant of £330,000 from the Wolfson Foundation for the building of a University Centre be accepted; that three colleges, Gonville and Caius, St John's and Trinity, had agreed to establish a new graduate society to be called Darwin College; and that Corpus Christi College was considering the establishment of graduate offshoot that came to be called Leckhampton.

In the meantime, the members-to-be of the new college proposed by the Promotion Committee to the Vice-Chancellor in March 1963 had formed a lunch club that met at fortnightly intervals. At such a meeting on 3 March 1964 the Promotion Committee agreed that they should call themselves the Oxford Collegiate Society, and that the Society should be limited to those who had paid their subscriptions by the time of the meeting. By that time van Heyningen and Alan Jones, Lecturer in Islamic Studies, had accepted invitations to serve on a further committee under the presidency of Thomas Norrington, and had resigned from the Promotion Committee. The Oxford Collegiate Society submitted the following resolution to the Hebdomadal Council:

We, the undersigned members of Congregation, wish to found a non-residential graduate college open to men and women. We have already formed a society with a regular subscription, and we lunch together at fortnightly intervals.

Before we can make further progress, we have two urgent needs: University recognition, which is a prerequisite for raising funds from outside sources, and suitable temporary accommodation for use as an operational base.

May we respectfully request Council to help us obtain these.

G. M. Adran, Radiologist, Nuffield Institute for Medical Research; J. M. Argyle, Lecturer in Social Psychology; K. A. Ballhatchet, Reader in Indian History; J. R. Baker, Reader in Cytology; P. H. T. Beckett, Lecturer in Agriculture; G. M. Brown, Lecturer in Petrology; K. O. C. Burridge, Lecturer in Ethnology; V. S. Butt, Lecturer in Botany and Biochemistry; P.

Chaplais, Reader in Diplomatic; R. S. Y. Chi, Lecturer in Chinese; B. A. Coles, Senior Research Officer in Physical Chemistry; W. T. Davies, Lecturer in Nuclear Physics; A. C. R. Dean, Senior Research Officer in Physical Chemistry; D. A. T. Dick, Lecturer in Human Anatomy; G. W. Dimpleby, Lecturer in Forestry; J. M. Edmonds, Lecturer in Geology; H. Frankel, Research Officer in Agricultural Economics; R. H. Freeborn, Lecturer in Russian; W. A. Gordon, Lecturer in Forestry; G. R. Gradwell, Senior Research Officer in Entomology; T. G. Griffith, Lecturer in Italian; W. R. C. Handley, Lecturer in Forestry; F. W. Hodcroft, Lecturer in Spanish; P. R. Horne, Lecturer in Italian; M. R. House, Lecturer in Palaeontology; J. O. Jones, Director, Institute of Agrarian Affairs; D. Kay, Senior Research Officer in Pathology; H. B. D. Kettlewell, Senior Research Officer in Genetics; J. J. MacGregor, Lecturer in Forestry; W. S. McKerrow, Lecturer in Geology; D. R. McLintock, Lecturer in Germanic Philology; J. W. F. Mulder, Librarian, Oriental Institute, Tutor in Korean; G. C. F. Newton, Senior Research Officer in Pathology; D. Patterson, Cowley Lecturer in Post-Biblical Hebrew; A. D. C. Peterson, Director, Department of Education; C. J. W. Pitt, Lecturer in Forestry; A. L. Pollard, Librarian, Modern Languages Faculty Library; D. S. Richards, Lecturer in Arabic; A. R. Robbins, Senior Lecturer in Surveying; J. S. Rollett, Senior Research Officer, Computing Laboratory; B. V. Rollin, Lecturer in Physics; H. G. Schenk, Senior Lecturer in European Social and Economic History; Miss T. Schulz, Research Officer, Institute of Economics and Statistics; H. N. Southern, Senior Research Officer, Bureau of Animal Population; M. M. Spencer, Secretary, Institute of Education; J. A. Spiers, Senior Lecturer in Theoretical Physics; G. H. Thompson, Lecturer in Forestry; T. W. Tinsley, Lecturer in Forest Pathology; A. Ward, CUF Lecturer in English; M. A. Yates, Senior Tutor and Lecturer, Department of Education.

In addition to those fifty signatories there were about a dozen more senior members of the University actively associated with the project of eventually forming a non-residential graduate college, open to women and men, with a high ratio of fellows to graduate students in the early stages. Such a college would cope

with only about half of those 150 senior members of the University cited in the Norrington Committee Report whose work involved little or no undergraduate teaching.

3 The Second Norrington Committee

Congregation approved the policy proposed in the report of the Norrington Committee⁵ on 25 February 1964, and the Hebdomadal Council appointed a committee to make detailed proposals for carrying out this policy. The committee consisted of the members of the previous Norrington Committee, supplemented by the Principal of Linacre House (J. B. Bamborough), the Professor of Pharmacology (W. D. M. Paton, Fellow of Brasenose College), with Alan Jones (University Lecturer in Islamic Studies) and W. E. van Heyningen to represent the non-fellows.

van Heyningen had been elected Member of the Hebdomadal Council on 30 May 1963 (with strong support from the non-fellows),⁶ and had now suggested on Council that there should be three representatives of the non-fellows on the proposed new Norrington Committee. He had also written to the Vice-Chancellor to propose that there should be another scientist on the Committee beside himself, and, after discussion with the Regius Professor of Medicine (Pickering), had suggested Professor Paton (Pharmacology). The Principal of Linacre House had written to the Vice Chancellor to object to the suggestion of three representatives of the committee of non-fellows (which, on grounds he did not state, he did not regard as representative of all non-fellows); and van Heyningen

⁵ *Further report on the closer integration of university teaching and research with the college system.* Supplement No 1 to the *University Gazette* (January 1964). Oxford University Press, 1964.

⁶ This election attracted much attention from the local and national press, since only two of six scientific candidates were elected. 'Six scientists in election contest' said the *Oxford Mail*; 'Scientists fail to win more seats' said *The Times*; 'Scientists outvoted in Oxford Elections' said the *Daily Telegraph*.

had agreed to reduce the number to two, and had suggested Alan Jones in addition to himself. This was to turn out to have been an excellent suggestion.

The report of this committee was published in November 1964.⁷ It started on the premise that Congregation's approval of the policy proposed by the previous Norrington committee implied doing away with the division of comparable university officers into those who held college fellowships and those who did not; and this implied the provision of new fellowships, partly at existing colleges and partly at new colleges. This led to the conclusions (a) that there should be a clear statement of which university posts should carry entitlement to fellowship of a college, (b) that the obligation to provide such fellowships should be statutory, and therefore (c) that there should be a sufficient number of such fellowships.

The notion of statutory entitlement to fellowship was not new, since it applied already to all professorships in the university, and was combined with the permanent allocation of the professorships to particular colleges. The committee now concluded that the holders of some other university posts should also be entitled to fellowships on appointment; that holders of other university posts should eventually but not immediately be entitled; and that the new colleges, like the existing colleges, should be able elect fellows who were not entitled by statute. They recommended that entitlement to a fellowship should be limited to: 1. titular professors (by decree) and readers; 2. full-time university lecturers and senior research officers appointed by the General Board, as soon as their appointments were confirmed to retiring age; and 3. holders of certain posts that were still to be enumerated. They estimated that there were at the time 20 Readers who were not fellows of colleges who should be entitled to fellowships, 110 Lecturers and Senior

⁷ *Report of the committee appointed by the Hebdomadal Council to make detailed proposals for carrying out the policy contained in the further report on the closer integration of university teaching and research with the college system.* Supplement No. 1 to the *University Gazette* (November 1964). Oxford University Press, 1964.

Research Officers, and about 30 in category 3. They did not recommend that any of the entitled fellowships should be stipendiary, as they were not at Linacre House.

As was stated in the first Norrington Report, the provision of fellowships to those who were entitled to them implied the foundation of two new colleges. The new committee recommended that both of them should be non-residential and should cater for junior as well as senior members, male and female. It believed that for some years the ratio of junior to senior members was likely to be smaller than at Nuffield and St Antony's Colleges, and therefore much smaller than in undergraduate colleges.

Guided by the tirelessly efficient University Surveyor, Mr Jack Lankester, the committee had sought premises where it would be possible to make a start on the new colleges, and after considering various possibilities, had found two that met their requirements. They were:

(1) the three-quarter acre site of the former Vicarage of St Cross Church, at 10 St Cross Road. In addition to the Vicarage (3,300 sq. ft.), there was the Old School, containing a room of about 500 sq. ft. and a small caretaker's flat. This site had the advantage of being near the main laboratories and libraries, but the buildings would need to be replaced. This is where St Cross College started, and whence it got its name.

(2) Court Place, the eighteenth century residence in Iffley of the late Sir Alan Gardiner, the distinguished Egyptologist. This had the advantage of an 8.5-acre site with a long river frontage, but the grave disadvantage of its great distance from the heart of things. Other places had been considered, including 15 Banbury Road (now part of the University Computing Service) and 'Cherwell', the large old Haldane house on the right bank of the River Cherwell, at the end of Linton Road. In the event, nothing came of Court Place, and much came of 'Cherwell', or rather its site, as we shall see.

It was expected that the University Grants Committee would make a grant for the purchase of 10 St Cross Road from

Merton College, and it was hoped that it would make a grant for Court Place as well. The Norrington Committee estimated that the two new colleges would need £50,000 by way of capital expenditure, and annual grants of £12,000 each (apart for funds for new fellowships). The retiring Vice-Chancellor had announced that four of the richer colleges had made a capital grant of £29,000 and an annual grant, for ten years, of £18,000. These colleges were All Souls, Christ Church, Merton and St John's, to whom St Cross College will always be particularly grateful.⁸ The Norrington Committee earnestly hoped that other colleges might be prepared to help close the gap, and this hope was soon to be fulfilled.

At about this stage in the proceedings, in August 1964, Alan Jones was asked by the Norrington Committee, as a way of tackling the problem of assigning the prospective fellows to the prospective colleges, to make a suggestion for dividing them. He devised a division between two hypothetical Colleges, Isis and Osiris, that provided a practical way of giving implicit recognition to the Collegiate Society, whose members and supporters (and seven others) he assigned to Osiris College. He did this in a way that ensured that the balance of subjects between the hypothetical colleges was very similar, with Isis College receiving more Readers. The hypothetical fellows of Osiris College were: Adran, Antill*, Badenoch, Barry, Burridge*, Chaplais, Clowes, Coles*, Collison, Dean*, Dick*, (Mrs) Dick, Edmonds*, Freeborn*, Gordon*, Gradwell, Handley*, Handscomb, Harrison, Hobby, Hulin, J. O. Jones, Kraay, Lambert, McGregor*, McLintock, Needham*, Nye*, Patterson*, Peterson, Philip*, Pitt*, Pirenne, Richards*, Robbins*, Rollett*, Rollin, Scott, Southern*, Spencer*, Thompson*, Tucker*, Ruth van Heyningen* (those marked with asterisks eventually became Fellows of St Cross College, see later). 'I do not suggest that this division is in any way

⁸ Their escutcheons are to be seen in the Blackwell quadrangle of St Cross College.

definitive.' stated Jones 'It simply shows a straightforward way of tackling the problem.'

In December 1964, after the publication of the second Norrington Report the previous month, the Committee considered a letter from the University Surveyor about the parlous condition of the old rectory at 10 St Cross Road, which implied that the best thing would be to demolish the property and put up a new building. However, in view of the intention to institute both of the new colleges at the same time, this was considered unacceptable, and Norrington and van Heyningen were asked to consult the Surveyor about its immediate repair and improvement.

Later in the month the committee considered draft Statutes defining Entitlement to Fellowships, St Cross College, and what was then called Court College. These, with a change in the name of Court College, are discussed below.

At about this time Norrington and van Heyningen had a discussion about possible heads of the two proposed colleges, and it was agreed to sound out Isaiah Berlin. van Heyningen went to All Souls College to put the question, and Berlin's reply was that he was not interested in being head of either college; but if he were, it would be the one that would be on the St Cross site. In December 1964 van Heyningen wrote to John Sparrow, Warden of All Souls, to ask whether All Souls, in addition to the generous help it had already offered in concert with the other richer colleges, would consider compounding its generosity by providing a new building on the St Cross site. The Warden's reply was that he would mention the new situation with regard to St Cross College to the All Souls College Committee, and would let van Heyningen know if there was a favourable reaction. van Heyningen then wrote 'What do you think about a Leckhampton⁹ idea for All Souls/St Cross, especially if we could persuade Isaiah Berlin to be Head of it?

⁹ Leckhampton was a newly-formed graduate off-spring of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.

No need to answer this.' And indeed there was no answer. But we shall see that later Berlin did indeed become head of one of the proposed new colleges, but not the one that came to being on the St Cross site.

By the end of February 1965 the Norrington Committee submitted identical draft statutes for the establishment of two new graduate colleges, and for the establishment of entitlement to fellowships. It was provisionally suggested that the one on St Cross Road should be called St Cross College, and the one at Court Place, Iffley should be called Iffley College, but that there would be no objection to the names being changed at some future day if it were thought desirable to do so.

The draft statute for St Cross College (identical with that of Iffley College) is shown in Appendix A. It been somewhat modified in the course of the twenty three years that have followed, as may be seen in the current issue of Statutes, Decrees and Regulations.

At the same time as the statutes of St Cross and Iffley Colleges were drafted in 1965 the statute defining entitlement to fellowships in these (and other colleges) was drafted. It is shown in Appendix B. This entitlement statute still stands, as may also be seen in Statutes, Decrees and Regulations. Over the years the University struggled valiantly with it, finding fellowships for those people already in posts carrying entitlement. Now, as we have seen, no appointment to an entitled post may be made unless a college fellowship has been found for it in advance, since Entitlement exists permanently in the Statutes of the University, in spite of attempts to abolish it. It is now a rule of the University that no appointment to an entitled post shall be made unless a Fellowship of a College has already been made available for that post. A committee of 'three wise men', namely Lord Franks, former Provost of Worcester, Lord Bullock,¹⁰ former Master of St Catherine's College and former

¹⁰ Recently (1988) van Heyningen asked Bullock whether he agreed that Entitlement had been the saving of the collegiate system, and he agreed.

Vice-Chancellor, and Sir John Habbakuk, former Principal of Jesus College and former Vice-Chancellor, went through the difficult task of finding Colleges for a small residue of entitled persons, and after that a rota of colleges was established in order in which they would be assigned entitled posts.¹¹

At the time the statutes relating to St Cross and Iffley Colleges were being drawn up in February 1965, further consideration was being given to the sites for the two proposed new colleges, and van Heyningen was invited by the Norrington Committee to join a sub-committee to draw up a brief for an architect for the St Cross and Iffley sites.¹² The University Surveyor, Jack Lankester, provided an appreciation of their present condition. Court Place in Iffley could be made ready for occupation at the beginning of the new academical year; but St Cross was likely to be a more complicated problem, and he was inclined to think temporary accommodation would have to be found at 15 Banbury Road for five years. If 15 Banbury Road were not immediately available, then it might be feasible to adapt the old school on the St Cross site for dining, and to provide huttled accommodation for a common room. He warmed up to this idea, because huttled accommodation could be 'custom-built'. 'Above all,' he stated 'the society would be securely on its own site, using its own address from the start, and of course ideally placed to consider the plans for developing the site, and overseeing the development. Great advantages, I feel, for the morale.'

In the end Lankester and van Heyningen agreed that the Old Vicarage on the St Cross site should be demolished, but that the old Victorian school stone building with the attached caretaker's house on the north west side of the site should be

¹¹ See letter (SCU/3; MC 2866/86) from Vice-Chancellor to heads of all Societies, 21 November 1986.

¹² Some of the prospective fellows were not enamoured of the name 'Iffley College', and Mr Merry of the Bodleian Library suggested Cherwell and Isis for St Cross and Iffley respectively since they were close to these rivers. Despite the riparian charm of this notion, there was in the end no Iffley College.

preserved (at that time there was not yet a preservation order on it). The school room could serve as a library and meeting room, and the caretaker's house could serve as a lodging for a prospective cook-housekeeper (perhaps with a husband who could be the college porter). A new 'custom-built' wooden hut, measuring 84 ft by 30 ft could be erected on the north side of the site, just east of the school building, leaving space for a large lawn to the south. This work was carried out immediately. The wooden hut consisted mainly of a large common-room, with rooms for the prospective Principal and the Bursar, a general office, a small kitchen, a cloakroom and lavatories. Lankester and van Heyningen chose the furniture (some of which was made in the University Surveyor's workshops to Lankester's design), the wall-papers, the curtains and the carpets; the ground for the lawn was prepared and seeded, and a row of *Prunus Sargentii* was planted to screen the car-park by St Cross Road from the hut and the lawn. All this was done in preparation for the first meeting of the Governing Body of the new college in the Michaelmas Term of 1965.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE BEGINNING OF ST CROSS COLLEGE

IN May 1965 Council appointed a committee to make recommendations in connection with the appointments of the heads of the two new graduate societies. The committee consisted of the Vice-Chancellor, the President of Trinity, the Principal of Linacre House, Mr Derek Hall Fellow of Exeter (and member of the two Norrington Committees), and Alan Jones (member of the second Norrington Committee). In the Trinity Term of 1965 the Hebdomadal Council received a statement from the Vice-Chancellor on behalf of that committee, and it was agreed that the Principalship of St Cross College should be offered to W. E. van Heyningen and that of Iffley College to C. A. Coulson, Rouse Ball Professor of Mathematics and Fellow of Wadham College. Behind this decision a battle had had to be fought by Alan Jones in the case of the Principalship of St Cross, since there were those in high places who had opinions that differed from his, and perhaps from those of some of the other forty-three entitled University officers who had opted to become Fellows of St Cross, and are listed in Appendix C.

At the end of September 1965 the Principal-designate (pending confirmation of his appointment as Principal by Congregation on 12 October) issued the following notice:

St Cross College, Oxford The first college meeting will be held at 2.15 p.m. on Tuesday 5 October in the Mure Room of Merton College. Gowns will be worn. The agenda will be the drawing up of agenda for future college meetings. Fellows are advised that this may be a lengthy meeting.

This first meeting of the Governing Body of St Cross College was held in the week before Full Term. The Old School Room was not yet ready to be used, and the first few meetings were to

take place in the Mure Room of the ever-helpful Merton College, where the prospective Fellows of St Cross had already met several times. The only Fellows who were not there, having sent apologies for their absence, were Edmonds, Gordon, and Williams. It was indeed a lengthy meeting, lasting for three hours.

The first action was to elect M. M. Spencer and T. W. Tinsley to Fellowships by Special Election, with immediate effect. They had played prominent parts in the non-fellows movement, but their University appointments at that stage had not formally qualified them for entitlement to fellowships. The Principal-designate then proposed that the minutes of the meeting should record the gratitude of the college to:

- 1 The Governing Body of Merton College for their encouragement and helpfulness, and in particular for their willingness to part with the St Cross site;
- 2 The Committee of Non-Fellows and the Collegiate Society;
- 3 The Harrison Committee;
- 4 The Norrington Committee;
- 5 The twelve colleges which had contributed capital and recurrent funds, namely Merton College, Christ Church, St John's College, All Souls College, The Queen's College, University College, Brasenose College, New College, Corpus Christi College, Jesus College, Lincoln College, and Trinity College;
- 6 Council and Congregation;
- 7 The University Registrar and his staff;
- 8 The University Surveyor and his staff.

The Principal-designate then informed the Fellows that of the College's capital of £22,000, £15,000 had been spent on clearing the site, grading and seeding it, laying terraces, erecting the wooden hut and palings, and converting the old school room. £5,500 of the residue, together with £4,000 from the University Grants Committee, had been spent on furniture and fittings.

It was agreed that the consideration of large matters, such as College Statutes, the composition of the Governing Body, and

the question of College Officers, should be deferred for some time, while the Fellows got to know each other.

The enthusiasm was so great, and there was so much to discuss, that there were six meetings of the Governing Body during that first Term, instead of the usual two meetings that other colleges had. (There were five in the second Term and six in the third; then they decreased to 14, 10, and 8 a year in the following three years.)

At the second meeting, on 13 October, held again in Merton, it was decided to elect the Warden of Merton, Robin Harrison, and the President of Trinity, Thomas Norrington, who had both done so much to bring the College into being, to the first Honorary Fellowships of the College. After some discussion of the merits of alternative names for the College (St Cross was regarded as an *ad hoc* temporary name), it was decided to adjourn the discussion *sine die*; but it was agreed to seek the consent of Council to change the title of the Head of the College from that of Principal to that of Master. The Principal then announced that the College would move into its newly-prepared quarters on the 25th of October.

The third meeting was held on 27 October 1965 in the lecture theatre of the Institute of Economics and Statistics in the St Cross Building on Manor Road. It was decided to engage the Black Boy Caterers to provide lunches in the College at an annual expense of £2,181. The Master reported that Iffley College did not wish to join St Cross College in a letter of thanks to the University to be published in the *University Gazette*, and it was agreed that St Cross would publish such a letter on its own. The Master asked the Governing Body to appoint a Vice-Master.

The fourth meeting was held on 10 November 1965. It was the first to be held in the College, in the newly-refurbished Old School. K. Knowles gave a report of the Common Room Committee. It was agreed that the Cross that the Master had retrieved from the portico of the demolished St Cross Rectory should be used as a mace at meetings of the Governing Body (it

is still to be seen in the present College). It was agreed that the first Founders' Feast should be held in Trinity College on 9 December 1965.

At the fifth meeting on 24 November 1965 the Master reported that in accordance with the Governing Body minute 11-4 (c) he had appointed A. Jones as Vice-Master of the College.

At the sixth meeting 8 December 1965 the Master announced the first of the several gifts of silver to the College. His former College in Cambridge, Emmanuel, had sent him an artificer's drawing for a proposed salt-pepper-mustard set, asking for his approval of the design. He had suggested a certain small change and this had been accepted by Emmanuel and by their artificer. Later a delegation from Emmanuel (led by D. S. Brewer, now Master of the College) came to Oxford to make the presentation. Exeter College, to which the Master was attached as a member of common room, presented a silver-gilt cup with a lid; Balliol College invited the Master to come to Balliol and make a choice from a large number of pieces – he chose a large epergne; K. O. L. Burridge, Fellow of the College, gave an epergne; the Oxford Collegiate Society gave a candlestick; and Neville Coghill, Fellow of Exeter College, gave a sugar castor. At the eighth meeting, on 26 January 1966, the Master reported that the Mayor of Southampton, whom he had told about his quest for benefactions at the Needle-and-Thread Dinner in The Queen's College, had presented a cricket bat to the College.

At the tenth meeting, on 23 February 1966, it was agreed that K. G. J. C. Knowles should be appointed Bursar of the College with immediate effect. By now the University had acquired the enormous and beautiful Nuneham Courtenay Mansion, presumably as a benefaction, and the College considered it as a possible residential annexe. The Master and several of the Fellows had visited the Mansion, and had looked at it covetously and seriously, regardless of the expense of running it, and its distance from the City. However, at this

tenth meeting of the Governing Body it was decided to abandon the idea of acquiring it – not for the obvious reasons, but, strangely enough considering its great size, because it could provide accommodation for only fifty graduate students.

At the eleventh meeting, on 9 March 1966, the Master reported that, although knowing nothing much about computers, he had taken much interest in them, and had conceived the idea of a computer-based college. He had discussed the idea with many eminent authorities on the subject, and it had met with much enthusiasm. Sir Leon Bagrit in particular had been most interested in the idea of domesticating the computer. He was at that time perhaps the greatest authority on computers in Britain, and had recently delivered the Reith Lectures on computers on BBC radio. He had insisted that the college should do the thing properly, and provide 20,000 square feet of space, a concrete floor two feet thick, air-conditioning, and thirty kilowatts of electricity. Since this did not seem practicable, the Master had discussed an alternative idea with Dr Jack Howlett, Director of the Atlas Computer Laboratory at Chilton. He had suggested that it would be more practicable to link the College with the Atlas by means of a telephone line to a terminal in the college. The Governing Body now agreed that the College should be computer-based, and the Master was authorised to take the discussion with Dr Howlett further. At the same time a Computing Committee was set up.

In the meantime the College, though penniless, was considering the possibility of acquiring land for further developments in the St Clement's area, and the minutes of the 12th meeting of the Governing Body on 20 April 1966 mention the possibility of a joint venture with St Hilda's and Corpus Christi Colleges in this area. However, nothing came of these notions, except that The Queen's College eventually built on the land.

The rest of 1965 passed uneventfully while the new college settled in. In 1966 the College interviewed the first graduate students to apply for admission in the eighth week of Trinity Term, and selected five of them, who became members of the

College in the Michaelmas term. They are listed in Appendix D.

Early in 1968 the question of finding Colleges for those who were entitled to fellowships was looming large again. At the thirty-eighth meeting of the Governing Body, on 14 February 1968, the Master reported that the opinion seemed to be growing in certain circles that St Cross should take more than half of those becoming entitled to fellowships. Wolfson College had circulated a confidential statement to all colleges suggesting that, owing to their commitments to the Ford and Wolfson Foundations, they should take less than half of those entitled. The College therefore empowered the Master to make the following statement to the Conference of Colleges on the next day, 15 February 1968:

I represent St Cross College. My Governing Body has asked me to state loudly and firmly that of course we are willing, and proud, to accept our share of those Entitled Fellows who come our way under the terms of the Decree that was consequential upon the Statute of Entitlement and the Statutes setting up St Cross College and Iffley, now Wolfson, College (and today I am empowered to discuss only those coming under this Decree).

Our stand simply is what it has always been – namely that we will accept half of those Entitled Fellows for whom it has not been possible to find places in other colleges – if there were twenty such Fellows, we would welcome ten of them, whatever the difficulties. My Governing Body is not yet privy to the difficulties of Wolfson College in this connexion, but some of the College Officers are, and as men of the world we have to understand the cogency of the points that the President of Wolfson has made. It would not be for us to complain if Wolfson felt able to accept say only five of their ten Fellows – but we must insist that we could not, and would not, take the other five – we would take our ten against Wolfson's five, but not fifteen, or even eleven.

My Governing Body is already giving careful consideration to its position after 1970. We consider that we have a continuing duty to the University and we intend to devise a scheme whereby a good proportion of our Fellowships should always be reserved for Entitled Persons.

At the thirty-ninth meeting of the Governing Body, on 28 February 1968 A. W. Williams reported he had represented the College at a meeting of the Conference of Colleges, where this statement had been well received. The question of entitlement continued to be a thorn in the side of Congregation, even if its pricks were necessary. In May 1969 a decree proposing the suspension of entitlement was put to Congregation, but it was defeated. Fortunately for the collegiate system, entitlement is still with us, and today a University post cannot be advertised unless a college fellowship has previously been found for that post.

Early in 1973 the question of the College's moving to St Aldates came up. St Catherine's Society for Home Students had been founded in the eighteen eighties to enable adults who could not afford to belong to colleges to read for Oxford degrees, and in 1935 the Society moved into a new building on St Aldates, designed by the architect Worthington, who has designed several worthy buildings in Oxford. After the war, Alan Bullock, the Censor of St Catherine's Society decided to change it into a full-blown College for undergraduate and graduate students, and raised the money to build the present St Catherine's College. The building they vacated was then taken up by the newly founded Linacre College for graduate students. Now Linacre College was going to leave its quarters in St Aldates and move into more commodious quarters in Cherwell Edge on the corner of St Cross and South Parks Roads.

The possibility of St Cross moving to St Aldate's was discussed at the eighty-first meeting of the Governing Body on 7 March 1973, and again at a special meeting on 25 April 1973. There it was '... agreed in principle that the College would be prepared to move to St Aldates if it were offered to the College, subject to agreement on terms.' By this time there had been much discussion in Congregation about the difficulty of finding fellowships in college for the fairly large residue of entitled persons for whom fellowships had not yet been found. There had been some discussion about the possibility of the former

Linacre building on St Aldates being made available to St Cross if it would become a 'college of entitlement' At the eighty-third meeting of the Governing Body on 13 June 1973 it was agreed that the Standing Committee should consider the question of a possible move to St Aldate's, and what the attitude of the College might be on the 'minimum terms' for becoming a 'college of entitlement'. At the eighty-fourth meeting on 28 June 1973 the Governing Body agreed that if the other colleges would offer fellowships to 50% of the present non-fellows, St Cross would offer Fellowships to the remainder. The matter lay latent for some months, then early in 1974 the Vice-Chancellor, Allan Bullock, Master of St Catherine's College, telephoned the Master of St Cross to inform him that St Cross could have the St Aldate's building if it would take up the residue of non-fellows. This matter was discussed a Special Meeting of the Governing Body on 6 February, when the Master put the following question to it: 'Would we be prepared, under conditions subsequently to be approved, to move to St Aldates?' Twenty Fellows voted yes, sixteen voted no, and four abstained.

The Master then informed the Vice-Chancellor of the decision of the College, and shortly after that the Vice-Chancellor telephoned the Master to say that the Vice-Master had been to see him to voice his strong objection. This brought about an uproar in the College, and A. Jones was roundly condemned for this apparently treacherous deed. Actually he was within his rights, because in the absence of a Visitor to the College to whom any Fellow could appeal in case of a dispute with the Governing Body, he had gone to the Vice-Chancellor, since the College was still under the wing of the University. A. Jones then felt obliged to resign as Vice-Master, and his place was taken by T. W. Tinsley.

As a result of this furore, the idea of Linacre was dropped – until the ninety-ninth meeting of the Governing Body on 28 January 1976, when it was again offered to the College. The Master expressed the view that the College should try for it, but

not half-heartedly; if not whole-heartedly then the College should decline the offer. The College declined the offer.

That was just as well, because very shortly after that the College was presented with a far more desirable opportunity. E. M. Brookes, a Fellow of the College, and University Land Agent, had informed the Master that Pusey House was in straightened circumstances, and might consider amalgamation with St Cross College.

Pusey House is a distinguished Oxford institution whose origins lie in the Oxford Movement started in the 1930's by Edward Bouverie Pusey, Professor of Hebrew and Canon of Christ Church, John Keble, Fellow of Oriel and Professor of Poetry, and John Henry Newman, Fellow of Oriel and Vicar of the University Church of St Mary. They had become alarmed at the spread of rationalism in the Church of England, since they feared that it would detract from the holiness of religion. To counter this trend they wrote a number of tracts maintaining that 'the true doctrines of the Church of England were contained in the writings of the fathers and of the Anglican divines of the 17th Century.' Pusey House started with the inheritance of his library, and the foundation of 'Dr Pusey's Library' on St Giles Street in 1884, which was intended to carry on his work. It was rebuilt on the same site in the centre of Oxford, opposite St John's College. It is one of the most beautiful buildings in a city of beautiful buildings, designed by the architect Temple Moore in 1911, started in 1914, and finished by his son in 1926.

At the one hundredth meeting of the Governing Body on 3 March 1976 the Master, supported by the Vice-Master, put forward a proposal that the College should '...consider the formation of Pusey College by amalgamation of St Cross College with Pusey House.' At the hundred and first meeting on 10 March 1976 it was agreed in principle to amalgamate with Pusey House to form a college preserving the aims both of St Cross College and Pusey House, and that a committee consisting of the Master, E. M. Brookes, D. G. Browning, A.

Jones and T. W. Tinsley should be set up to negotiate such an amalgamation. The Master then went to discuss the matter with the Principal Librarian of Pusey House, Cheslyn Jones, and a lengthy series of negotiations was set in train. Since the Master was within a year of retiring, he withdrew from the negotiations, which resulted in an agreement that the College should buy a 999-year lease of those parts of the building that were not essential to Pusey House, as well as the land at the back.

The price of this purchase would be £350,000. The Master had for some years been discussing with Richard Blackwell, and with Per Saugmann of Blackwell Scientific Publications, the possibility of a benefaction from this celebrated Oxford institution, and was about to put the hard question of the purchase price to Richard Blackwell, when he received a telephone call from Per Saugmann at a strange hour of the night. This is how Per Saugmann put it in a privately published booklet, *In Memory of Richard Blackwell*, DSC, MA, HON D Litt 1918-1980 (for sadly Richard Blackwell had died):

Perhaps the venture that somehow gave us the greatest pleasure was our involvement with St Cross College. It was to be our last. The story is well known, but the College was looking for a considerable sum of money to improve its location, and had been doing so for twelve to fourteen years. They invited me to lunch one day, and it became quite an expensive meal, but it seemed right that Blackwell's should celebrate its centenary through its contribution to the University. Richard and I dined together that evening to discuss the suggestion and I could see him become captivated by the idea; he suddenly said 'Tell the Master he has got his college.' I rang Kits van Heyningen at midnight and apologized for the late call - and gave him the news. He said he practically fell out of the bed, for his agony as a fund-raiser was over. The next morning he called on RB, and Richard said 'Don't forget to remember PS.' Here again his generosity came to play; this was very typical, and they have not. But the College had named its main quadrangle the Richard Blackwell Quadrangle, and we have been given a link that we could not have bettered.

Chapter Four

What Per Saugmann meant by the phrase 'and they have not' in his penultimate sentence, but was too modest to mention, was that the Dining Hall of the College is named the Saugmann Hall.

Appendix A

Section III. – OF ST CROSS COLLEGE

1. St Cross College shall be a society through which persons who are graduates of other universities (or, in the opinion of the Governing Body, possess comparable qualifications) and who are not members of any college or society, may be admitted as members of the University.
2. The Governing Body may admit to membership of St Cross College
 - (i) students desiring to work for research degrees under the Committee for Advanced Studies;
 - (ii) other graduate students desiring to pursue academic work in Oxford;
 - (iii) other persons at the discretion of the Governing Body, provided that no persons shall be admitted under the provisions of the clause until such time as the Hebdomadal Council shall, at the request of the Governing Body of the college, determine; and that the maximum number of persons presented for matriculation in any one year thereafter shall be fixed by the Hebdomadal Council.
3. The members of St Cross College shall have, in relation to the University, the same privileges and obligations as members of existing colleges.
4. The Governing Body of St Cross College shall consist of the Principal and Fellows, and shall have full powers (subject to the provisions of this statute) to do all that may be necessary to administer St Cross College as a graduate society for men and women, provided that
 - (a) it shall submit a report annually to the Hebdomadal Council and Congregation;
 - (b) it shall submit estimates to the Curators of the University Chest in Hilary Term in respect of the ensuing financial year, and shall satisfy those curators that no charge will fall on university funds, except such as may be provided by statute or decree.
5. The Principal of St Cross College shall be appointed by the Hebdomadal Council, with the approval of Congregation, after the Hebdomadal Council has considered any recommendations which the Governing Body may submit, on such terms and conditions as the Hebdomadal Council and Congregation shall determine.
6. The officers of St Cross College shall be appointed by the Governing Body

Appendices

on such terms and conditions as it may determine, subject to the approval of the Hebdomadal Council and Congregation. 7. The Governing Body of St Cross College may elect to Official Fellowships of the college, on terms and conditions determined by the Governing Body and approved by the Hebdomadal Council, university officers entitled to fellowships under the provisions of any university statute or decree. 8. The Governing Body of St Cross College may elect suitably qualified persons to Fellowships by Special Election at the college, on terms and conditions determined by the Governing Body and approved by the Hebdomadal Council, provided that such fellowships shall not exceed ten in number. That statute has been somewhat modified in the course of the twenty three years that have followed, as may be seen in the current issue of Statutes, Decrees and Regulations.

Appendix B

SECTIO I. – OF PERSONS WHOSE OFFICES ENTITLE THEM TO HOLD FELLOWSHIPS

The persons whose offices entitle them to hold fellowships shall be persons enumerated in the Schedule annexed to this Sectio, together with such other persons as the University may from time to time add to the Schedule by statute or decree.

SCHEDULE

- (a) Titular Professors (by decree), Assistant Professors, Readers.
- (b) University Lecturers, including University Lecturers appointed in accordance with the provisions of *Statt. Tit. XIX, @ 16, cl. 3 (2)*, and Senior Research Officers appointed by the General Board when their appointments have been confirmed to retiring age.
- (c) First Assistants, Lecturers, and Research Officers, Scale III, appointed by the Committee for the Advancement of Medicine when their appointments have been confirmed to retiring age.
- (d) Persons enumerated in *Statt. Tit. XXIV, Sect. II, Schedule A*.
- (e) The following persons:
 - Keepers of departments in the Ashmolean Museum
 - Sub-Librarians in Bodley's Library
 - Secretary of Bodley's Library
 - Librarian of the Taylor Institution

Appendices

Curator of the Pitt Rivers Museum
Curator of the Museum of the History of Science
Director of the Institute of Economics and Statistics
Director of the Computing Laboratory
Director of Clinical Studies
Director of Postgraduate Medical Studies
Director of the Nuffield Institute for Medical Research

Appendix C

THE FOUNDING FELLOWS OF ST CROSS COLLEGE, OXFORD

Albert George Antill, M.A., St Catherine's, University Lecturer in Agricultural Economics
Ruth Barbour, M.A., St Hugh's, University Lecturer in Greek Paleography
William Horton Beckett, M.A. (M.A. Cantab, B.Sc. Lond) Balliol, Lecturer in Agricultural Economics
Jerzy Eugeniusz Bialokoz, M.A. (M.Sc. Birm, Ph.D. Lond), Magdalen, Lecturer in Engineering Science
Dennis Britton, M.A. (M.A. Cantab), The Queen's, Lecturer in Prehistory
George Malcolm Brown, M.A., D.Phil., University, Lecturer in Petrology
Kenelm Oswald Lancelot Burridge, M.A., Exeter, University Lecturer in Ethnology
Barry Arclay Coles, M.A., D.Phil., Magdalen, Senior Research Officer in Physical Chemistry
William Thomas Davies, M.A. (M.A., Ph.D. Cantab), Keble, University Lecturer in Nuclear Physics
Alistair Campbell Ross Dean, M.A., D.Phil., D.Sc. (B.Sc. Glasgow), St Catherine's, Senior Research Officer in Physical Chemistry
David Andrew Thomas Dick, M.A., D.Phil., Merton, University Lecturer in Human Anatomy
James Marmaduke Edmonds, B.Sc., M.A., St Edmund Hall, University Lecturer in Geology
John Edward French, D.Phil., D.M., Exeter, University Lecturer in Pathology
Gareth Page Gladstone, M.A., Christ Church, Reader in Bacteriology

Appendices

William Anthony Gordon, M.A., Trinity, University Lecturer in Forestry
Thomas Gwynfor Griffith, B.Litt., M.A. (M.A. Dublin), The Queen's, University Lecturer in Italian
William Richard Cecil Handley, M.A., St John's, University Lecturer in Forestry
Frederick William Hodcroft, M.A. (M.A. Manc.), Exeter, University Lecturer in Spanish
Alan Jones, M.A. (M.A. Cantab), Balliol, University Lecturer in Islamic Studies
Kenneth Guy Jack Charles Knowles, M.A., New College, Senior Research Officer in Economics and Statistics
James John MacGregor, B.Litt., M.A., Balliol, University Lecturer in Forestry
Mary Marshall, M.A., Lady Margaret Hall, University Lecturer in Geography
Arthur Edwin Needham, M.A., D.Sc., St John's, University Lecturer in Zoology
Peter Hague Nye, B.Sc., M.A., Balliol, Reader in Soil Science
Fitzwalter Camplyon Osmaston, M.A., St John's, University Lecturer in Forestry
David Patterson, M.A. (M.A., Ph.D. Manc.) Christ Church, Cowley Lecturer in Post-Biblical Hebrew
Ian Gilbert Philip, M.A., The Queen's, Secretary of the Bodleian Library
Charles John William Pitt, M.A., Wadham, University Lecturer in Forestry
Harold Kenneth Pusey, M.A., St Edmund Hall, University Lecturer in Zoology
Alwyn Rudolph Robbins, B.Sc., M.A., D.Phil., Hertford, Lecturer in Surveying and Geodesy
Alistair Hamish Tearlock Robb-Smith, M.A., Oriel, Nuffield Reader in Pathology
John Sydney Rollett, M.A. (M.A., Ph.D. Leeds), Magdalen, Senior Research Officer in Computing
Henry Neville Southern, M.A., The Queen's, Senior Research Officer, Bureau of Animal Population
Marshall Macdonald Spencer, M.A. (M.A. Cantab), Secretary for Educational Studies.

Appendices

John Ashley Spiers, M.A., D.Phil., Wadham, Lecturer in Theoretical Physics
Donald Martell Sutherland, M.A., New College, Librarian of the Taylor Institution
Thomas William Tinsley, M.A. (B.Sc. Durh., Ph.D. Leeds) University Lecturer in Invertebrate Virology
Gerald Harvey Thompson, B.Sc., M.A., St Edmund Hall, University Lecturer in Forestry
James McLean Todd, M.A., Queens, Secretary to the Delegacy for the Inspection and Examination of Schools
Richard George Tucker, B.Sc., B.M., M.A., D.Phil., Balliol, University Lecturer in Biochemistry
Ruth Eleanor van Heyningen, M.A., D.Phil. (M.A. Cantab), Somerville, Senior Research Officer in Ophthalmology
Alan Ward, M.A., Wadham, University Lecturer in English
Arthur Warriner Williams, D.M., Balliol, Director of Postgraduate Medical Studies
Stuart Swinford Wilson, M.A., Brasenose, University Lecturer in Engineering Science
Nicolas Zernov, M.A., D.Phil., Keble, Spalding Lecturer in Eastern Orthodox Culture
Jack Zussman, M.A., D.Phil., Lincoln, Reader in Mineralogy

Appendix D

THE FIRST GRADUATE STUDENTS OF ST CROSS COLLEGE, OXFORD

Michaelmas Term 1966

John C. Cunningham, Worcester College, Virology, one year
Andrew Drummond, Jesus College, Classics, two years
Robert L. Kitching, Imperial College, London, Zoology, three years
Jennifer C. A. Smith, St Anne's College, Russian, three years
John F. Wheldrake, Exeter College, Biochemistry, one year