

For: Jill Pellew and Miles Taylor (eds.), *The Utopian Universities: A Global History of the New Campuses of the 1960s*

“The New and the Old: The University of Kent at Canterbury”

Krishan Kumar

*Foundations and New Formations*¹

It all began with a name. A new university was to be founded in the county of Kent.² Where to put it? In the end, the overwhelming preference was for the ancient cathedral city of Canterbury. But that choice of site was by no means uncontested. There was no lack of alternatives. Ashford, Dover, and Folkestone all put in bids. The Isle of Thanet in East Kent was for some time a strong contender, and its large seaside town of Margate, with its many holiday homes, undoubtedly seemed a better prospect than Canterbury for the provision of student accommodation, in the early years at least. Ramsgate too, with a large disused airport, was another strongly-urged site in Thanet.

But as far back as 1947, Canterbury had been proposed as the site of a new university in the county. That proposal got nowhere, but the idea that Canterbury – rather than say Maidstone, the county capital, or anywhere else in Kent – should be the place where and when a new university was founded had caught the imagination of many in the county. Thanet might, from a practical point of view, have been the better site. But it lacked the cultural significance and the wealth of historical associations of the city of Canterbury. Moreover the University of Thanet, or the University of Margate or Ramsgate, did not have quite the same ring to it as the University of Kent or the University of Canterbury.³ That at least was the strong opinion of the two bodies that brought the University into being, the Steering Committee of Kent County Council and the group of the great and the good in the county that came together as “Sponsors of the University of Kent” - most prominent among them being its chairman, Lord Cornwallis, Lord Lieutenant of Kent and former chairman of Kent County Council.⁴

Canterbury having been chosen as the site, what to call the new foundation? That proved trickier. The newly founded universities of Sussex and Essex suggested one model, the “county” designation, and that found favour with some of the Kent county representatives. But the predominant view among the Sponsors – the most influential body in the setting up of the university – was that it should be called the University of Canterbury. In this they followed the time-honoured European tradition of naming a university after the town in which it was situated, as with the universities of Oxford and Cambridge, and, somewhat more recently, the new University of York, also in a venerable cathedral city. Sussex and Essex might be acceptable in some places (for what were the alternatives? Falmer? Wivenhoe?) but they were unnecessary novelties in Kent when one had so obvious a choice as Canterbury.

So the University of Canterbury it was to be. It was therefore something of a shock when a sharply-worded letter arrived from the University of Canterbury in Christchurch, New Zealand, pointing out acidly that there already was in existence a University of Canterbury, and that it would take very ill the stealing of its name for the new university. New Zealand might be thousands of miles away, and there are plenty of precedents in the English-speaking world for having same-named universities, often based on towns of the same name (York, Canada and York, England, for instance). But the University of Canterbury was a Commonwealth university, and the University Grants Committee, which oversaw the foundation of all the new universities, made clear its opposition to a name that would give offence to a sister Commonwealth university.

The Sponsors were not pleased but felt they should not insist.⁵ A compromise name was hastily devised. The new university would now be the University of Kent *at* Canterbury, thus appeasing the New Zealanders while at the same time retaining the favoured city of Canterbury in the title. It was a somewhat cumbersome title, without English precedent – though plenty in the USA – though the abbreviation UKC made it easier to say and soon became the familiar form of reference.

Forced as it was, it turned out to be a happy choice, from a number of points of view. It made it clear that the University did indeed represent the county as a

whole, not simply the people of Canterbury. But more importantly it symbolized the marriage of tradition and modernity that came to be the hallmark of the new university. Kent, the county, close to the metropolis of London and with strong ties to it, stood for the modern, the forward-looking aspect of the new university. Canterbury, the city, looked back: to Roman times, when St. Augustine founded the first Christian church in the country there, and made Canterbury the head of the English church; to the glories of the middle ages, when Canterbury flourished as the site of the shrine of Thomas Becket, one of the greatest pilgrimage destinations of medieval times (Canterbury was fourth in terms of popularity after Jerusalem, Rome, and St. James Compostella). Then there was of course Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*, which furnished the University with its banner and its motto: "... and gladly wolde he lerne, and gladly teche".⁶ It would have been unthinkable for the University to ignore the ancient heritage deriving from the city; the problem rather might be how to throw it off, how not to find itself sucked back into a past that had such agreeable associations. That it did not do so had a lot to do with the make-up of the chief founding members of the University.

For there was – perhaps by chance rather than design – a mix of the old and new not just in the initial conception of the University but in the earliest of its principal Officers. The first, and the University's longest-serving, Vice Chancellor, was Geoffrey Templeman (1962-80), formerly Registrar at the University of Birmingham. He brought with him his Assistant Registrar, Eric Fox, and made him Registrar of the new university. Also from the Birmingham Registry came the first Finance Officer, Dennis Linfoot (later succeeding Fox as Registrar). All served long terms, of nearly twenty years each, giving the new university an unusual degree of continuity. Here were men well versed in the running of a modern university, one of the "new" civic universities founded in the latter part of the nineteenth century.

But Templeman had started life as a medieval historian, and, it turned out, had a profound belief in the virtues of the college system of the ancient universities. There was a similar feeling for old forms in David Edwards, the Buildings Surveyor who had responsibility for the initial lay-out of the buildings and the physical development of the site. Edwards had worked both at the University of Oxford and

the City of London, and had much experience with ancient college buildings and old City structures. Most important of all perhaps was the fact that the external chairman of the Academic Planning Board, which was responsible for curriculum structure and academic organization, was Sir Derman Christopherson, Vice-Chancellor of the University of Durham. Christopherson played a key role in the design of the University, staying on after the Planning Board was wound up to be chairman of its successor, the Academic Advisory Committee. In all he served in these pivotal positions from 1962-71. Such an unusually long association meant that he had ample opportunity to shape the university according to his conceptions.

In this the example of Durham was clearly crucial. Durham was and is a collegiate university, modeled to some extent on Oxford and Cambridge. Although Christopherson was not the only one to advocate a collegiate system for Kent – Templeman, the Vice-Chancellor, was an equally passionate believer in it - his Durham experience undoubtedly guided much of his advocacy. Oxford, where he had been an undergraduate, and Cambridge, where he had been a lecturer and where he was later to become Master of Magdalene College, also added their considerable weight to his thinking.

This might suggest a dyed-in-the-wool traditionalist. Christopherson was nothing of the kind – not surprisingly, as the innovative mechanical engineer that he had been in his days of active research. During the war years he had worked with Solly Zuckerman, the government's principal scientific adviser on military planning. At Durham he had overseen a substantial programme of reform of the colleges. He had also served on the Planning Board of the new University of Sussex, and was enthusiastic about many of the new developments that had taken place there. Here then was not a simple traditionalist trying to impose an old model but a fitting emblem of the fusion of old and new.

The old certainly got its due, perhaps more than it deserved. Oxbridge by way of Durham: for many of the new professors and lecturers that took up their positions in the late 1960s and early 1970s, this seemed to express quite accurately the ethos of their new place of work. Most of them found it highly congenial. That was hardly surprising, since so many of them had been educated or taught in those

institutions. From Durham came Alec Whitehouse, Professor of Theology and first Master of the first college, Eliot College; Graham Martin, first Dean of the Natural Sciences and later Deputy Vice-Chancellor; Reginald Foakes, Professor of English and the second Dean of the Faculty of Humanities; Stephen Darlow, the first University Librarian. Taken with Christopherson's chairmanship of the of the Academic Planning Committee it is not surprising that talk of a "Durham mafia" was common in those early days. From Cambridge came Walter Hagenbuch, Professor of Economics and first Dean of the Social Sciences; from Oxford, Guy Chilver, Professor of Classics and first Dean of the Faculty of Humanities; Bryan Keith-Lucas, Professor of Politics, and first Master of Darwin College; and Maurice Vile, Reader, later Professor of Politics and Deputy-Vice Chancellor; Patrick Nowell-Smith, the first Professor of Philosophy (though, more recently, at Leicester).

All of these had been teaching members of their respective institutions. But they brought in their wake a whole galaxy of young lecturers who had been educated there. Here Kent followed closely a pattern very visible more generally. There was a marked sentiment among many recent graduates from the older universities that the exciting new developments, and the interesting challenges, were taking place in the new universities of the 1960s, whose planning and establishment they followed closely. The older universities remained highly resistant to change – e.g. the very late acceptance of Sociology at Oxford and Cambridge. Particularly if one was interested in new disciplines, such as the social sciences, or new experiments in teaching, such as had been pioneered at Sussex, the new universities were the places to be. When, after graduating in history from Cambridge and sociology from the London School of Economics, I looked around for a job, I applied only to the new universities. I had no desire to be anywhere else.⁷

As with all of the new universities, Oxbridge was particularly well represented at Kent. Keith-Lucas's Politics department contained no less than four members from the very same Oxford college, Nuffield, where Keith-Lucas had been Fellow and Bursar. The Department that I joined in 1967, the Department of Sociology and Social Anthropology, was headed by an Oxford-classicist turned anthropologist, Paul Stirling. His lieutenant was the Cambridge-educated (English

literature) Derek Allcorn. They recruited heavily from Oxbridge, such that more than half of the initial department of about a dozen lecturers had been educated at Oxford or Cambridge. The third entity here was the London School of Economics, where Stirling had taught Anthropology and where many of the Oxbridge-educated lecturers had received their graduate education in the social sciences. The only university outside the magic triangle to make any kind of showing was Hull, where Allcorn had been teaching and from which he recruited two outstanding sociologists (including Frank Parkin, whose sparkling contributions did much to enhance the department's reputation).

The fact that it was in the Social Sciences as much as in the Humanities - where one might have expected it anyway - that Oxbridge figured so heavily in the early years is a striking testimony to its importance in the early history of the University. Tradition here was in its element. It showed itself in many other ways: the adoption of highly traditional subjects such as Theology and Classics (rejected by many of the other new universities - Essex even spurned History); the elaborate graduation ceremony in the grand setting of Canterbury Cathedral, with Orations (though not in Latin) in classic style; the traditional structure of governance, with a Council overseeing a Senate, which in turn oversaw the various Faculty Boards (Humanities, Natural Sciences, Social Sciences); above all in the adoption of the collegiate system.

Though not the only new university to set up colleges - York and Lancaster were other examples - no other new university followed the Oxbridge model so closely (some grumbled, slavishly). Here, going even beyond Durham, as well as York and Lancaster, it was the Vice-Chancellor Geoffrey Templeman who was the most ardent and tireless campaigner for a full-scale college system. If that might seem surprising, given that Templeman's experience as a student, teacher, and administrator had all been at the resolutely non-collegiate University of Birmingham, it was all of a piece of the fusion of old and new that characterized Kent from its outset. Equally typical it was not knowledge or experience of Oxbridge but - apparently - a tour of some Australian universities where the college system operated that most convinced Templeman of the virtue of colleges.⁸

The colleges of course lacked the munificent endowments of the Oxbridge colleges and were in no sense financially independent. Nor did they select students themselves, like the Oxbridge colleges, though a proposal of this kind was mooted at various times, one as late as 1975. But in other respects they mirrored closely the Oxbridge colleges. Each was to be a microcosm of the university as a whole, each a community of “masters and scholars”. Not only were students resident in the colleges, but there was provision for staff residences too, and staff and students dined together nightly in the grand dining halls designed for each college (complete, in the case of the first college Eliot at least, with a raised dais for “High Table” dining for staff). In the early years, staff actually processed to their separate tables through standing ranks of students – an echo of old Oxbridge that not surprisingly later disappeared.⁹

The most striking departure from the practice of those other new universities that also adopted colleges – York and Lancaster – was that the colleges did not simply house separate Departments, as in those universities, but were representative of each Department (the laboratory-based sciences to some extent excepted). Staff members from each Department, that is, were distributed across all the colleges, not concentrated in a college that housed their Department. Sociologists, economists, historians, mathematicians, physicists, teachers of literature and languages, were to be found more or less equally distributed in all colleges.

Colleges, unlike those in Oxbridge, were not teaching institutions – for their classes and lectures students moved between colleges depending on courses – but they were where teaching staff taught. Students came to your college room for their classes, or as far as possible to seminar rooms in your own college. All staff members were also tutors (“moral tutors”) to students – not necessarily only within their own subject - within their college. An effort was made to identify staff as well as students with colleges, and it worked to a remarkable degree – as was made clear when this principle came under attack in later years. The colleges quickly developed their own identities. Eliot and Rutherford, the two oldest colleges, came to stand for ritual and tradition; Keynes and Darwin, the younger members, for

daring breaks (e.g. no High Table, Senior Common Rooms and Junior Common Rooms close to each other to allow for greater interaction of staff and students). Staff as well as students were aware of these differences and chose accordingly. When, after a year of arriving, I moved from Eliot to Keynes, I and those who moved with me were acutely conscious of a change of culture.

A fair attempt to match this emphatic gesture to tradition was made in the naming and design of the colleges. If the college system was old, at least their names should be new. No Alcuins or Vanbrughs, as at York.; no – to come nearer home – Anselms, Becketts, Chaucers, or Marlowes, historic names which were already abundantly distributed around the city of Canterbury. The decision was made to name all the colleges after outstanding men and women of twentieth-century Britain.¹⁰ Conveniently in the year – 1965 – that the first college was opened, the poet T.S. Eliot died, thus making it easy to name the first college after him. Proper due having been paid to the humanities, the next college had to be named after a scientist, hence Rutherford (1966). That left social science, so the third college was Keynes (1968).

The fourth college was named after Darwin (1970). This of course broke the twentieth-century rule. The first choice had been Russell, after the great twentieth-century philosopher. But Bryan Keith-Lucas, the Master-designate of the fourth college, disapproved of Russell's politics and his well-known advocacy of "trial marriages", which Russell himself had energetically put into practice. This distaste was shared by several members of the University's Council and Senate. After much hand-wringing and canvassing of alternative names it was decided – following Keith-Lucas's suggestion – to call the new college Darwin, of course after a great nineteenth-century Kentish luminary. But it spoilt the symmetry and consistency of the twentieth-century rule, and raised suspicions as to Kent's equal commitment to the modern as well as to the ancient.

Women were conspicuously absent from this act of recognition and commemoration, so the fifth college - opened much later, in 2008 - was named Woolf, after Virginia. Later still, reflecting an even greater daring, the sixth college, opened in 2015, was named Turing, after Alan Turing, the great mathematician and

computer scientist who was also a homosexual and who has become something of an icon for the promoters of gay rights. So at least there has been a clear re-assertion of the twentieth-century principle, within the context of greater inclusivity and an acceptance of newer norms. It should also be pointed out that the first college, Eliot, and all subsequent ones, were mixed: Kent apparently has the distinction of being the first university in the country to have introduced the principle of mixed residences. Common as this became later, it was certainly a radical move at the time, and was so noted (student newspapers had a good deal of fun with the “Privacy Rule” that futilely tried to keep men and women apart in their own areas during the night hours between 11 pm - “12 midnight on Saturdays” - and 9 am).

The promotion of the new within the framework of the old is further shown in the physical design of the colleges. The University of Kent sits on a hill just outside Canterbury, amidst fields that had originally been part of a sheep farm. It commands splendid views over the city and the Stour valley – the big windows in the dining halls of Eliot and Rutherford were indeed carefully designed to frame Bell Harry, Canterbury Cathedral’s magnificent central tower, making the dining halls the best places from which to view the Cathedral. The view from between the two colleges (now rather spoiled by in-building) is equally stunning.

The first architect, Lord Holford, working closely with his associate Anthony Wade and the Surveyor David Edwards, had the idea of placing the first two colleges – Eliot and Rutherford - on the hill directly facing the city, thus mimicking the traditional Kentish forts similarly placed in various parts of the county. The colleges do indeed have a fort-like appearance, as though guarding (or possibly intimidating) the city. Holford wished to show the local in the new built environment, as much as was shown in the conversion of the original farmhouse, Beverley Farm, into first an administration building, later a student residence. But the architecture of the colleges was to be resolutely modern, not to say modernist. All the colleges, not just the first two, have clean, functional lines, with no decoration. They follow the pattern of the other “plate-glass universities” in being airy and full of light.

Whatever local and traditional features they incorporate the overall design is uncompromisingly modern.

The later colleges, under different architects, give up even any attempt to follow local traditions, being modern in the style of modern buildings everywhere. The same is true of most of the other buildings on the campus, the older Library and Gulbenkian Theatre as much as the shining new music building, the Colyer-Fergusson Building, with its state-of-the-art concert hall, and the Jarman Arts Building (named after the gay rights activist, artist and film maker Derek Jarman), liberally sprinkled with contemporary works. Abstract modernist sculpture is to be found at various points throughout the campus, as with most of the new universities. Kent may be in an old city, it seems to be saying, and respects the old traditions, but don't mistake it for anything but a modern university of the most forward-looking, progressive, kind.

If the colleges were a mix of the modern and the traditional, the original curriculum was innovative in the highest degree, boldly going where few had gone before. The enemy, as Christopherson and the Academic Planning Committee saw it, was Departmentalism, the division of disciplines into self-contained compartments which fought each other for resources and jealously policed their borders. Christopherson himself favoured the introduction of Schools, on the Sussex model, but reluctantly yielded to the preference for Faculties (though School re-emerged with the School of Mathematical Studies). But the Faculties – of Humanities, Social Sciences, and Natural Sciences – were not composed of Departments, as in traditional universities. Instead disciplines were organized in “Boards of Studies”, so that Sociology, for instance, came under the Board of Studies in Sociology and Social Anthropology. The very fact that the two disciplines could be linked together like this showed that the “Board” designation was not simply a trivial concession to the reformers but had genuine implications for a broader definition of disciplines and the possibility of interdisciplinary work.

Probably the most radical departure was in the organization of the degree structure. There was a Part I, to be taken by all undergraduates, which lasted not just the usual first three academic terms of the first year but, going beyond the long

vacation, included the fourth term of the second academic year. This was to make clear that Part I was not simply a flourish, a concession to outside expectations and conventions, but an integral part of the student's three years at the university. Nor was the Part I simply an introduction to the various disciplines – Economics, Politics, etc. – as was conventional but was instead composed of “Topics” all of which were interdisciplinary, taught by a team which included staff from several disciplines, and which met regularly to discuss method and substance. I myself was involved in a topic, “Exploring Reality”, which included teachers in Sociology, Philosophy, English Literature, Film Studies, Art History, Theology, Biochemistry, and Physics.¹¹ Other topics included “The Idea of the University” and “Cities and the Built Environment”.

Equally bold, though destined not to last long, was the provision of a “long vacation term” between the second and third years (something of course that already existed in some Oxbridge science degrees). Like the 4-term Part I, this was intended to break up the usual divisions of the academic calendar. The economics of student life – many needed to work in the long vacation – finally put paid to this, but it is a good indication of the determination to re-think and re-imagine the structure of degrees. The 4-term Part I in particular mean that the disciplinary concentration of Part II was never as large a part of the student learning experience at Kent as was normal elsewhere, where Part I is something to be hastily got through – and often much resented by subject teachers - before one proceeds to the real business of subject specialism. There was even, more radically, a proposal for a continuation of the Part I syllabus as Part IA, which would allow a student in the second and third years to pursue a range of topics all of which were interdisciplinary. This, which would have brought Kent closer to the “generalist” pattern of much American undergraduate education, never made it beyond the planning stage, but it is once more a tribute to the adventurousness of the Academic Planning Committee, and their determination to break out of departmentalism.

Generally the Academic Planning Committee put itself firmly behind the new. as shown in several ventures. If the Humanities reflected tradition, with strong support for Classics, Theology, History, Philosophy, English Literature (which

though also included American, African and Caribbean literature), there was no lack of commitment to the newer Social Sciences, Sociology, Social Policy, Anthropology, Politics, Psychology, Law. It was indeed in these disciplines that the University made some of its strongest showings, as expressed by the rankings in the various research assessment exercises. There was also the establishment of joint degree programmes, such as that in Sociology and English. This was genuinely joint in that staff from both English and Sociology contributed in equal measure to the several “bridge” courses that were the core of the degree, and students took an equal number of their other courses in both English and Sociology. No other university, it appeared, which had tried similar ventures – Essex was one – was ever able to sustain such a strong and lasting commitment from both disciplines.

The degree in Sociology and English was a good example of how a fully-fledged college system, with staff distributed evenly across the colleges, could generate new initiatives in the curriculum. It was entirely owing to the fact that the two instigators of the degree, Steven Lutman from English and myself from Sociology, found ourselves frequently together in the Senior Common Room of Keynes College, that we came up with the idea of the joint degree to reflect our common interests. We rapidly recruited two other members of the college – Louis James from English and David Morgan from Sociology – and the degree was born. A similar initiative, this time emanating from Eliot College, was the joint degree in Anthropology and Computing, again arising out of Common Room conversation.

One further bold initiative, this one the brain-child of the second Dean of the Social Sciences, Maurice Vile, was the institution of more than half a dozen Interdisciplinary Lectureships, in such areas as Development, the City, Race and Ethnicity. Remarkably - and unthinkable in these more parsimonious days - the lecturers appointed to these positions were given three years in which to develop their courses in these areas, during which time they had a very much reduced teaching load in the Boards of Studies to which they were loosely attached. For them, and for other enterprises of a similar kind in the social sciences, there was established the Centre for Research in the Social Sciences, one of a number of such multidisciplinary Centres, such as the Unit for the History, Philosophy and Social

Relations of Science (later the Centre for History of Cultural Studies of Science). The University of Kent in those days did not merely pay lip service to multidisciplinary – the word was not in any case much in vogue then. It was simply part of the working assumption of the people who set up the university. The new universities had to be different. Here was an unprecedented and probably unrepeatable opportunity to throw the pieces up in the air and let them settle in new ways. With remarkable unanimity, the University put itself behind these initiatives – even as it willingly paid its due to the seductions of the past that beckoned from the ancient city at the foot of the hill.¹²

Retreat or Renewal?

The German sociologist Max Weber wrote memorably of the “routinization of charisma”, when the innovations of great prophets and leaders get buried and often transformed in the bureaucratization that must more or less inevitably follow if the enterprise is to last. Whether that was absolutely necessary in the case of the new universities, with their bold new ideas about curriculum and academic organization, is a moot point. Undoubtedly though they were all responding to powerful new forces in a changed environment, which brought about a substantial change of direction.¹³ The retreat was across the board, shown no less in Sussex and Essex than in Kent.

The first to go were the new Part I structure and the long vacation term, which had ended by the mid- 1970s, to be replaced by the more traditional three-term, one- year Part I, followed by a two-year specialized Part II. But it was only in the late 1980s and 1990s that the interdisciplinary topics of Part I were given up for more conventional introductions to Part II subjects. Slowly too the radical Interdisciplinary Lectureships were abandoned, and staff in those positions were forced to give up their special designations and seek a home in one of the regular Boards of Studies (some, unhappy with the situation, such as Hannan Rose, Interdisciplinary Lecturer in Race Relations, simply left).

But “Boards of Studies” also disappeared, to be replaced by the 1980s by conventional Departments. A sign of what that might mean – the end of some

imaginative couplings - was the break up of the Board of Studies in Sociology and Anthropology into two separate Departments.¹⁴ Now students of Sociology would not be exposed to studies of non-Western societies, with all that might contribute to their understanding of society in general. The subject would be even more “Eurocentric”, or at least “Westocentric”, than it had already begun to show a tendency towards in the earlier part of the century, replacing the broader vision of its nineteenth century founders. Correspondingly, anthropologists were cut off from sociological approaches that would have much to teach them as their traditional subjects – “primitive”, non-industrial societies - disappeared in the general modernization and “development” of Third World, non-Western, societies. The passing of the Interdisciplinary Lectureship in Development Studies, held by Henry Bernstein (who departed soon after), was a further blow in this direction.

What was happening, of course, was what was happening everywhere, the return of departmentalization, the original enemy. The conviction gained ground at the highest levels of the University that the best way to be “productive” – the new mantra emanating from powerful quasi-governmental outside bodies – was to be organized into Departments on the traditional model. That would allow for a concentration of energies that – so it was alleged - were lost when staff were attached to too many multidisciplinary projects and spread out over too many sites.¹⁵ This, it has to be said, was a matter of faith, rather than based on any hard evidence. Impressionistically at least Kent authors were at least as productive before the changes as they were after, as shown by the many high rankings of subjects in the early years of the research assessment exercises – not matched again until quite recently (see further below).

Perhaps the most significant casualty of the new turn was the college system as it had been originally conceived. Not that students did not continue to choose colleges and to reside in them; and the addition of two new colleges, Woolf (2008) and Turing (2014), showed that colleges remained the principal social units. What was undone however was the diffusion of staff throughout the colleges, as representatives of their subjects: the key part of the original, Oxbridge-derived, model, unique at Kent among the new universities (and explicitly rejected at both

York and Lancaster, despite their collegiate structure). Now, as at York and Lancaster, each Department was to be housed in a particular college and staff were to be concentrated there. All sociologists were to be in Eliot, all political scientists in Rutherford, all economists in Keynes. This was supposed to provide increased “synergy”: staff would bump into each other in the corridor or the Senior Common Room and share ideas or talk over departmental business. The kind of “synergy” that, in the old model, had produced the joint degree in Sociology and English, was apparently of the unproductive kind.

With the loss of this central element of the college system went a general weakening of the system as a whole. A centralized body, *UKC Hospitality*, took over the arrangements for dining and accommodation. There would now be dining only in Rutherford; dining halls in all the other colleges were closed and turned over to other functions. Provision was made for other dining outlets – suitably differentiated as to style and cuisine – in other parts of the campus and students were encouraged to pick and choose; they might by chance bump into a staff member doing the same. Colleges lost their function as dining units bringing staff and students together – one of the principal elements of the original vision. Even the residential principle was weakened, with the construction of student residencies – Park Wood – at some distance from the colleges and separate from them. Kent remained a collegiate university in name, but much of what had made its system distinctive – different from, say, York or Lancaster – no longer applied.

Once the representative principle – each college a microcosm of the University as a whole – had been broken, the parts could be treated as more or less modular, readily moveable, units. Departments found themselves being bodily shunted from one place to the next, like parcels of goods. Sociology, starting in Eliot, woke up one day in Darwin, and then, in a further move, was bundled out of the colleges altogether and placed in a corner of the Cornwallis Building, home to a number of social science research units. Even more unceremoniously, in one those acts of “rationalization” that was all the rage in the 1980s and 1990s, Sociology lost its independence altogether and was merged in the joint super-department named the School of Social Policy, Sociology and Social Research.

In fact, in a further twist, Departments themselves were abolished, and subjects came to find themselves in “Schools”: the “School of English”, the “School of History”, the “School of Physical Sciences”. Some of these are basically single-discipline Schools, like the old Departments; some, such the School of European Culture and Languages (which includes Classics as well as modern European languages and literatures), or the School of Anthropology and Conservation, corral subjects that are not thought to be viable as free-standing disciplines. Needless to say such “Schools” have little in common with the Sussex prototypes that Christopherson hoped to introduce at Kent. They are basically cost-cutting exercises devised to disguise the fact that many disciplines are no longer supported as they once were. As such they can be the effective prelude to extinction, if and when the need arises.

Ironically, if not perhaps entirely unsurprisingly, all this reorganization did not have the hoped-for result: increased research productivity, or, more precisely, increased national recognition and higher rankings. Quite the opposite. From the high positions previously enjoyed, many Kent subjects, especially in the Humanities and Social Sciences, slumped dramatically in the rankings produced by the Research Assessment Exercises in the 1980s and 1990s. The situation was not helped by the appointment in 1980 of a Vice-Chancellor, David Ingram, a physicist who had previously been Principal of Chelsea College (formerly a College of Advanced Technology) in London, who felt that Kent’s main problem was that it was not scientific enough, that science had been sacrificed to the humanities and social sciences. His efforts – as for instance in an attempted merger with Mid-Kent College, defeated by a rattled Senate – to turn Kent into an Imperial College-in-the-Shires predictably ended in disaster.¹⁶ Kent had neither the structure nor the resources to establish world-class scientific and technological schools (though it had always had some scientific departments with a high reputation, such as the Department of Electrical Engineering, and it developed a highly enterprising Faculty of Information Technology, under Brian Spratt).¹⁷ The main result of this effort was to starve the Humanities and Social Sciences, on which Kent had built its reputation, of much-needed resources at a time when cold winds were blowing from the new

Conservative Government of Margaret Thatcher (“there is no such thing as society”, and how, pray, did medieval history contribute to Gross National Product?). It also played its part in the departure of a number of Kent’s best-known academics, many to overseas universities, dismayed by this turn of policy as well as by the new political climate.¹⁸ The 1980s and 1990s, it is fair to say, was a low point for Kent, when much of what had been achieved in the previous thirty years seemed to be unraveling.

It is good to record that in recent years, under new leadership, especially that of the present Vice-Chancellor, Dame Julia Goodfellow, appointed in 2007, Kent has staged a remarkable recovery.¹⁹ In 2016 it was ranked (by the *Times Higher Education*) 20th out of all UK Higher Education Institutions, the result in part of a high ranking – 17th – in the Research Excellence Framework of 2014. This has to compare with rankings of 50 or over in the 1980s and 1990s. In 2016 it was shortlisted for the *THE*’s University of the Year Award. Something is clearly working well. Part of this clearly has to do with Kent’s determined effort to break out of its purely regional and national shell and reach out to the wider world (see further below).

Kent remains, as it always has been, one of the most popular institutions for students, consistently scoring 90% or above for overall satisfaction in the National Student Survey. In the 2016 Whatuni Student Choice Awards, Kent ranked 12th out of 125 UK universities.²⁰ Some of this popularity undoubtedly has to do with its location, close to both London and the Continent (both made even more accessible now with a high-speed service to London and a Eurostar station stop at Ashford). That was always one reason too why so many staff, coming from London and elsewhere, and initially expecting to stay for no more than a few years, ended up by spending the better part of their careers there. Taken with Canterbury – the second most popular destination for tourists after London – the coastal towns of Ramsgate, Broadstairs, Dover and Folkestone, and the beautiful countryside and country villages of East Kent, the University and its surroundings have always provided a very attractive environment in which to live.

Matters that are not purely academic are, in other words, a necessary part of the story Kent's development, as it would be in the case of any university.

Universities are not just places where one works but also where one lives. So far I have dwelt mostly on the formal academic side of the University's activities. It is time now to say something of the more general cultural and intellectual life. As compared with the erratic academic record, this can be said to a story of slow but steady progress.

It began with the lucky fact that the first college was named after T. S. Eliot, in the year of his death, for that led to the endowment by Eliot's publisher Faber and Faber, and the patronage of Eliot's widow Valerie Eliot, of the T. S. Eliot Memorial Lectures, which have always been the most prestigious lectures at the University. The fact that the poet W. H. Auden was persuaded to give the first set in 1967 established the high ambition and standing of the lectures, and there has never been any difficulty in securing the most distinguished scholars and artists for these lectures. Among the memorable ones in my experience were those given by Seamus Heaney, George Steiner, Jonathan Miller, Anthony Burgess, Julia Kristeva, Helen Vendler, John Carey and Edward Said.²¹ Audiences for these lectures have always been large, including not just members of the University but many people from the surrounding region. One of the lecturers, the Oxford Professor John Carey, remarked that one could never get such an audience for lectures at Oxford, since people were spoilt for choice and audiences were very thinly dispersed. The Eliot Lectures were indeed one of the central events of the year, well publicized in the university and the city. What has also been important about them was the way they quickly established a certain cultural identity for the new university, as a place that could attract some of the best intellectuals in the world, who in addition to giving the public lectures resided in the colleges and interacted with staff and students over a period of nearly a week. Not all were equally sociable, but several – Julia Kristeva, John Carey and Edward Said stand out in my mind – were notable for the amount of time they spent with various members of the university community.²²

Other cultural ventures included the Gulbenkian Theatre, home not just to student productions but also to those by visiting companies from London and

elsewhere. The Gulbenkian Theatre since 1969 has also housed the Gulbenkian Cinema, Canterbury's regional branch of the British Film Institute, and a venue for a wide variety of English and foreign language films of both the mainstream and non-mainstream variety. It had been one of the most successful initiatives of the early years, again as a centre for both "town and gown", and has continued to flourish. In recent years it has been complemented by the Colyer-Fergusson Building, opened in 2012, with its splendid concert hall and practice rooms. Generally music and the arts has been one of the most successful areas of Kent's activities, one where in recent years it has been able to attract a considerable amount of private outside funding – over 6 million pounds in the case of the Colyer-Fergusson Building.²³ This contrasts with a relatively thin record of private philanthropy in the early years – Kent's proximity to London, as an alternative pole of attraction for gifts and bequests, seems in this case to have worked against it.

One further initiative needs to be mentioned, one that straddles the formally academic and the non-academic work of the University. This is the Centre for the Study of Cartoons and Caricature, the original impetus for which came from a Politics lecturer, Graham Thomas, who in 1973 was able to secure a large holding of original cartoons – over 20,000 – from the *Daily Mail* and the *Evening News*. With support from the Leverhulme Trust and the Nuffield Foundation, this has now become the largest centre of its kind in the country. Now called the British Cartoon Archive, it currently holds 140,000 cartoon originals, with 10 new cartoons added every day, electronically deposited by the major newspapers. The Centre got off to a flying start with a lecture by the well-known art historian Sir Ernest Gombrich, on "The Art of the Cartoon", and continued in a similar vein not long after with a sparkling lecture by the historian A. J. P. Taylor, on "The Left in the Thirties". What has made the Centre special is not simply the opportunity it offers for research – in art and design, in political, social, and cultural history – but the way it has used its unique collection for mounting a series of highly popular public exhibitions, both local and national. A high point was the exhibition of "Vicky" cartoons at the National Portrait Gallery in London in 1987-8. The cartoons have also done the rounds of exhibitions in many other parts of the country. Certainly they have

become one of the major attractions at the University, a judicious blend of entertainment and instruction.²⁴

What's in a Name?

We end where we began, with naming. On 1 April 2003, the University of Kent at Canterbury formally changed its name to the University of Kent. This abbreviation was not for reasons of economy or ease of utterance, nor was it seen as merely cosmetic. As with the original act of naming, it signified an important change in the way the university saw itself, and how it wished to present itself to the world.

The dropping of "UKC" does not mean that the University is turning its back on the city of Canterbury. That would be impossible, for both symbolic and practical reasons. If anything, ties have increased, since the early years when there was some tension between the old established city institutions of King's School and the Cathedral, on the one hand, and the new upstart on the hill. Relations were smoothed as each got to know the other better, as for instance in the very successful joint venture between the University and the Cathedral, the Centre for the Study of Religion and Society. The Archbishop of Canterbury is in any case *ex officio* the University's Visitor (which means he is the final court of appeal), and the Cathedral has become the irreplaceable focus of the University's graduation ceremony (the early graduation ceremonies were in Eliot College, reflecting the still unresolved relations between the Cathedral and the University). The University without the City would be hard to imagine.

But the University has to some extent outgrown the city, overflowed it. It is now more clearly a county-wide, all-county, university, truly the University of Kent. It has put out off-shoots in all directions. It is now not just the University of Kent at Canterbury but also the University of Kent at Medway and the University of Kent at Tonbridge, with various new combinations on the horizon.²⁵ It has broken out of its East Kent fastness to move more to the centre and the north, to be nearer the large centres of population of Maidstone and the Medway towns, nearer to London, the great metropolis, linking up indeed with the University of Greenwich in the Medway venture. There are now partnerships now not just with Canterbury Christchurch

University – itself now rivaling the University in the city – but also with West Kent College, South Kent College, and MidKent College. In 2008 Wye College, specializing in agricultural science and a constituent part of the University of London, came under Kent's remit jointly with Imperial College London. The “University of Kent at Canterbury” clearly would now truly be a misnomer, however much many regret the loss of the familiar UKC.

There is more than this. Attached to the new formal name, the University of Kent, is the informal logo, “The UK's European University.” Kent's proximity to the Continent has always been one of its signature features, and in recent years this has been heavily accentuated with large numbers of continental students, many under the *Erasmus* programme, arriving at the University, as is readily clear from the languages spoken in its bars and cafés. Along with this has been a move across the Channel, Kent putting out roots on the Continent. The first of these – set up in 1999 – was the Brussels School of International Studies, a postgraduate institution offering Master and Doctoral degrees in several social science subjects, as well as History, drawing on the parent Kent departments. Later came a postgraduate centre in Athens, partnered with the Athens University of Economics and Business, and specializing in “Heritage Management”. A postgraduate centre in Paris now offers year-long MAs in several of the Humanities subjects, with Kent staff regularly making the agreeable journey – Eurostar to Paris is easily available via Ashford – to the French capital to teach. Lastly – for the moment – there is the newest postgraduate centre, attached to the American University of Rome, specializing in the classics and Roman history. Europeanization rides high at Kent, and it is not surprising that its spokesmen – including successive Vice-Chancellors – have spoken out volubly and vigorously against a British withdrawal from the European Union. For Kent this is not just a matter, as for many other British universities, of valuable exchange programmes and joint research projects, but of the very image it now promotes.

I arrived at Kent in 1967 and left in 1996, returning thereafter as a part-time Visiting Professor in Sociology from 2006-11. To walk across the campus now is to be struck by the enormous changes that have taken place since those heady days of

the 1960s. Six colleges instead of four, together with a host of new buildings that have filled in many of the agreeable green spaces that allowed for walking, thinking, and viewing. A student body that has swollen to nearly 20,000, from the 5000 that began the experiment, and of that larger number 22 per cent from overseas, from the Continent and further afield. 600 academic and research staff, compared to the barely 200 in the first decade. New subjects – a new School of Architecture, for instance - and new combinations of subjects, proliferating. We are in a new world. But then I stand between Eliot and Rutherford –admittedly a more cramped space now than before – and see Canterbury Cathedral rising gloriously out of the old city: the iconic view, on every piece of publicity produced by the University. Some things don't change. Kent may no longer be the University of Kent *at* Canterbury, but its centre, and perhaps its heart, is most certainly *in* Canterbury. The old continues to nourish the new.

That may in a sense be the University's main legacy, at least fifty years on. It has shown how certain traditions of the English university system can successfully be grafted on to new shoots. Some of those as we have seen have been eroded, but their spirit lives on, ritually re-enacted in the graduation ceremonies in Canterbury Cathedral each year. The colleges remain central to student life, to an extent perhaps not matched in any of the other new universities. New academic subjects are added, but so far - unlike some British universities – Kent has not seen fit to abolish such traditional subjects as Classics and Philosophy (though they have had to be fitted to the new curricular structures). Even the extensions of Kent overseas, especially in continental Europe, can be agreeably be tied to the traditions of internationalism of the medieval universities - Kent was for many years the official administrative centre in the UK of the EU's *Erasmus* programme of student exchanges. What "Brexit", Britain's departure from the European Union, might mean for Kent is as unclear as it is in most other cases. But it cannot be a reassuring prospect for the "UK's European University". The ties that have developed with the city of Canterbury – now, with many institutions of higher education within it, virtually a "college town" on the American model – might turn out to be one of its surest sources of strength in the difficult years ahead.

Endnotes

¹ I joined the University of Kent, as a lecturer in Sociology, in 1967, and left it in 1996. Much of what I have to say in this essay is based on my own observation and experience of developments during this period, eked out with regular visits thereafter, especially when I was a Visiting Professor there (2006-11). This partly explains the absence of detailed references; the essay is in essence a personal memoir, rather than a scholarly account of the University's development.

² The Government accepted the proposal for the new university – largely powered through by John Haynes, Chief Education Officer of Kent County Council - in 1961; it received its charter in 1965.

³ It has to be said that Miss Alice Coleman, a University of London geographer, Thanet resident and Chairman of the Promotion Committee for the University of Thanet, remained unconvinced to the end that Canterbury was the right choice. Graham Martin, *From Vision to Reality: The Making of the University of Kent* (Canterbury: The University of Kent at Canterbury, 1990), p. 18. This is the place to say how helpful I have found Martin's book for the early history of the University. Thanks also, for the provision of much helpful material, to the University Archivist Ann MacDonald, and to Triona Fitton, whose *Hidden History: Philanthropy at the University of Kent* (Canterbury: The University of Kent, 2015) contains many unexpected gems. Conversations with Jan Pahl and Colin Seymour-Ure, old friends and veterans of the University, have not only been highly enjoyable but immensely useful in putting together this picture of Kent.

⁴ Lord Cornwallis (1892-1982), the second Baron Cornwallis, came of an old Kentish family whose ancestors included the Cornwallis who surrendered at Yorktown in 1780. He was active in Kent's public life, having served as chairman of Kent County Council in 1935-6, as well as later being Lord Lieutenant of the county. He also played first-class cricket for Kent between 1919-26, captaining the side in 1924-6. It is said that it was his love of the old cricket ground, St. Lawrence's, in Canterbury, that particularly endeared him to the city and reinforced his commitment to

Canterbury as the preferred site for the new University. Apart from chairing the “Sponsors” committee, he was later Pro-Chancellor of the University (1960-71) and remained to the end of his long life one of the University’s strongest supporters. *Debrett’s People of Kent*, edited by Julie West (London: Debrett’s Peerage Limited, 1990), sv. “Cornwallis”.

⁵ The discontent led to the resignation of one of the sponsors. For the letter from the University of Canterbury, and the sponsors’ response, see “Second University Sponsor Resigns”, *The Times*, 17 October, 1962.

⁶ The fact that in the *Tales* this is said by the Clerk of Oxenford no doubt made it seem even more appropriate, in view of the influences on the new university, and the provenance of so many of its early staff.

⁷ The same was true for many of my Cambridge friends who had also continued their postgraduate education in London. For some reflections on this situation, particularly as regards the development of Sociology in the 1960s and 1970s, see my “Sociology and the Englishness of English Social Theory” in *The Idea of Englishness: English Culture, National Identity and Social Thought* (Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate, 2015), pp. 165-198; see also Mike Savage, *Identities and Social Change in Britain since 1940* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2010), 124-134, who quotes the sociologist Ray Pahl (Cambridge and LSE) on his “excitement” and “enthusiasm” at being at the new University of Kent (*ibid.*, p. 129). On “the barnacles that had grown on the hulls of those graceful Victorian yachts” - Oxbridge and the “redbrick” universities of the 19th century - and the flight of dons and students to the new universities, see Noel Annan, *Our Age: The Generation that Made Post-War Britain* (London, Fontana, 1991), pp. 504-508. Annan however – former Provost of King’s College, Cambridge – thought that the innovative spirit of the new universities had died rather quickly, and that in retrospect they can be seen to have brought in few fundamental changes, overwhelmed by concerns about “professional advancement” and the example and prestige of the older institutions (*ibid.*, 508).

⁸ Martin, *From Vision to Reality*, p. 109. Martin unfortunately does not mention which of the Australian universities impressed Templeman in this respect, but both Sydney and Melbourne Universities have a thriving collegiate system influenced by

Oxbridge – though the colleges are mainly residential and cultural, not, as in Oxbridge, teaching institutions.

⁹ It is said that the practice began, not at the request of the College authorities, but as a spontaneous gesture on the part of the students when staff first came down to the dining hall in Eliot College. It then became, for some time at least, the regular custom. This being the rebellious Sixties, it is a testimony to the strength of tradition, even among those least committed to it.

¹⁰ Though there was initially quite a tussle over this, as Martin shows (*From Vision to Reality*, pp. 122-6). There were indeed people who favoured great Kentish men of the past as college names. Names canvassed included Anselm, Becket, William Caxton, and Wat Tyler. The modernists held their ground, giving way only over Darwin in deference to the susceptibilities of the new Master.

¹¹ So successful was this that it was turned into a book of essays by the course teachers, *Exploring Reality*, edited by Michael Irwin (London: Allen and Unwin, 1987).

¹² There was occasionally a price to be paid for this enthusiasm for interdisciplinary work. Scholars attempting to move to older and more traditional institutions sometimes found that questions were asked about their willingness and ability to teach in more traditional departments, within the bounds of traditional disciplines. Henry Bernstein, former Interdisciplinary Lecturer in Development Studies at Kent, reported such difficulties. But he overcame them, securing senior posts first at Manchester then at SOAS. Generally Kent staff do not seem have suffered unduly from their commitment to interdisciplinarity, securing senior positions at both the ancient universities (e.g. John Davis, who set up the Anthropology and Computing degree at Kent, becoming Professor of Social Anthropology at Oxford and later Warden of All Souls College) and at the Redbricks (e.g. Nicholas Manning, active in both Sociology and Social Policy at Kent, becoming Professor of Social Policy at Nottingham). But it was certainly necessary to have published in certain journals, central to one's primary discipline, to be able to make such moves. A similar situation applies in the United States, where interdisciplinarity is generally

encouraged but where it is salutary to have at least one foot firmly planted in one of the traditional disciplines.

¹³ To account for this change of climate is a complex business, demanding more space than is available here. Partly, and at the most basic level, it can be seen as a widespread “retreat from the Sixties” in the 1970s and 1980s, a reaction against the radical calls of that decade for new practices and experimentation in virtually all areas of society – economic, political, cultural. The “May Events” of 1968 in Paris might be regarded as the high-point of this radical current, after which there was a drawing back everywhere. Since universities and students had been central to the movements of the Sixties, the reaction was bound to affect the educational sector, especially the higher educational sector, particularly hard. Going with this was the growth of what came to be known as “neoliberalism”, a conservative ideology which achieved some sort of victory in the elections of Margaret Thatcher in Britain in 1979 and Ronald Reagan in the United States in 1980. What that meant was an attack on “progressive” education, and a tightening of state control over universities, together with more stringent demands that they justify the public money that was spent on them. The overall effect was highly inhospitable towards experimentation, and led many universities to re-assert traditional forms and methods of teaching and academic organization. For a brief account of this reaction, see Annan, *Our Age*, 509-22; on the change of mood in the 1970s and 1980s, see Peter Clarke, *Hope and Glory: Britain 1900-2000* (London, Penguin Books, 2004), pp.319-400.

¹⁴ This too seems a common occurrence – for instance it happened in the 1970s at the University of Virginia, where I now teach, and where Sociology and Anthropology, once jointly taught, separated into different departments. The drive towards departmentalism, into more and more specialized units, wars with that towards “Schools” and more interdisciplinary work; but safety and security, the forces of professionalization and concerns of career advancement, seem frequently to win out over the more adventurous initiatives. In the 1970s and 1980s this was promoted by the funding authorities themselves, in many cases. See further below.

¹⁵ It is important to stress that the return of departmentalization had as much to do with external factors, emanating from the Thatcher government, as with internal

pressures. In 1989 the Universities Funding Council (later the Higher Education Funding Council for England, HEFCE) was charged by the Government to determine the cost of each subject taught in the universities. To meet these requirements, Kent required for the first time that each member of staff declare a single discipline to which they wished to be affiliated. This created the basis for the formation of departments, involving the break-up of many interdisciplinary relationships. A further erosion of interdisciplinarity occurred when finance was devolved to departments, based on the number of students taught. This encouraged departments to tailor Part I subjects – in order to boost recruitment - to the specialized teaching of Part II, completing the abandonment of the original Part I structure. Interdepartmental rivalry, competition for students and resources, and all the usual features of departmentalism, became a regular part of the scene, especially damaging when the numbers of students in the humanities and the “soft” social sciences began to decline, as they did in the 1990s and early 2000s.

¹⁶ Though later there was a broader and more successful approach, leading to the establishment in 2001 of the University of Kent at Medway, a joint venture with Mid-Kent College, the University of Greenwich, and Canterbury Christ Church University. This complemented other out-reach programmes of the past two decades, as in the University of Kent at Tonbridge, incorporating the School of Continuing Education. See further below.

¹⁷ It is however an indication of how little scientists felt supported that even the Department of Electrical Engineering lost one of its most prominent members, Igor Aleksander, a leading authority on artificial intelligence, in 1974, after six years in which he had been an enthusiastic and highly committed member of the Department. His departure, first for Brunel then Imperial College, London, was I know from personal knowledge very reluctantly undertaken, and was solely because he felt that support for the sciences would not be forthcoming at Kent. To that extent David Ingram was right.

¹⁸ One such prominent departee was the Shakespeare scholar Reginald Foakes, the first Professor of English, who left to join the faculty at the University of California at Los Angeles. Foakes, normally a modest and self-effacing man, made clear, to all

who would listen in the Senior Common Room of Rutherford College, his indignation at being summoned by the Vice-Chancellor to discuss the terms of a possible early retirement, as a cost-cutting exercise. All senior staff were called to such meetings. Since the terms involved a substantial “golden handshake”, financed by the government, as long as one withdrew from the United Kingdom higher education sector, taken with this pressure on the part of one’s own institution it was not surprising that others decided that this was the time to leave.

¹⁹ In August 2017 she will be succeeded by Professor Karen Cox, currently Deputy Vice-Chancellor of the University of Nottingham.

²⁰ *Kent Alumni Magazine*, Winter 2016, pp. 6-7.

²¹ Nearly all the lectures are published as books by Faber and Faber, including such famous ones as Seamus Heaney’s *The Government of the Tongue*, George Steiner’s *In Bluebeard’s Castle*, and Julia Kristeva’s *Strangers to Each Other*. Anthony Burgess’s lectures were memorable for his performances on the piano, to illustrate his lectures on Poetry and Music.

²² One should also mention here the Keynes Seminar launched by the first Master of Keynes, Robert Spence, and continued by his longtime successor, Derek Crabtree. It was intended as a smaller-scale social science parallel to the humanistic Eliot Lectures. Though never as central as the Eliot lectures, they were responsible for bringing a good number of famous economists to the university, including Roy Harrod, Joan Robinson, and Nicholas Kaldor; on Keynes’s cultural contribution, there was also a notable presentation by his younger brother, the polymath Sir Geoffrey Keynes. The latter’s contribution is included in Derek Crabtree (longtime Master of Keynes College) and A. P. Thirlwall (eds.), *Keynes and the Bloomsbury Group: The Fourth Keynes Seminar 1978* (London, Macmillan, 1980); see, for another example of the Keynes Seminar, Crabtree and Thirlwall (eds.), *Keynes and the Role of the State: The Tenth Keynes Seminar Held at the University of Kent at Canterbury, 1991* (London, Palgrave Macmillan, 1993).

²³ Fitton, *Hidden History*, 16.

²⁴ On the Centre and its work, see Colin Seymour-Ure, *A Sense of Permanence: Essays on the Art of the Cartoon*. Canterbury, Centre for the Study of Cartoons and Caricature, 1997; see also Fitton, *Hidden History*, 63-65.

²⁵ The University of Kent at Medway, the largest extension since the University's foundation, was launched in 2001 at the site of MidKent College; in 2005 it moved to a new campus at the old Chatham dockyards. For its purpose and development, see Fitton, *Hidden History*, 81-3.