

By 'clerk' I meant that modern French sense of *clerc*: 'intellectual', which has become established in English: see the latest Supplement to the *Oxford English Dictionary*: 'treason of the clerks' = *trahison des clercs*, 'title of Julien Benda's work *La Trahison des Clercs* (1927), used to denote a compromise of intellectual integrity'. As *The Oxford Companion to French Literature* puts it: 'Nowadays intellectuals have betrayed their own kind; they have descended into the arena and allowed their convictions to be swayed by national, social, and political passions.'

This is what I meant, and I hope the reader will allow me to make the point, despite the Dean's introduction of that turbulent priest and upstart clerk Thomas Becket, writs of *mandamus*, the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England, and the concept of *auctoritas*.

## Response: II

DICK CHAMPION

I admire the Dean's courage in attempting, as she has sportingly put it, simultaneous comment on a football and a cricket match. I would go further and call the games rugby and cricket, where even the shape of the ball varies markedly. I also appreciate her concentration on the test match at the expense of the game on the village green; fundamental changes in university government must take priority over the mundane problems caused by psychology's lack of clear identity. It therefore follows, however, that I cannot respond with any fire but only brief comment.

I think my aim was somewhat the opposite of that seen by the Dean, for I was concerned with problems posed to faculty structure by the need to accommodate a heterogeneous or vaguely defined subject. I tried to let history speak for itself without making a case or apologia, let alone of the classical kind. To appeal to graduates and their employers for a definition of psychology that might give it a clear identity would invite even greater confusion. While not expecting to contribute much, I am happy to discuss the 'values inherent in an Arts degree' if we include the extent to which they can be promoted in the teaching of psychology.

At least I am confident that there are clear and explicit differences in theory between the concepts of a humanity and a science. If we could agree on these then perhaps we would all the better recognise that a fair

number of topics (such as psychology, anthropology, sociology, economics, geography, and philosophy) straddle both categories. The burning question then might be whether to leave them that way or try to split them to make for greater tidiness in university administration. The example of Psychology at Sydney, if not the weight of custom and commonsense, suggests to me that they are best left alone.