

8. The suspension of the power to grant medical degrees until such time as the Senate of the new University shall have satisfied the Lord President of the Council that an agreement has been reached with the Royal Colleges and the chief London Medical Schools as to the terms on which medical degrees shall be granted.

9. Providing, on the repeal of the Acts of Incorporation of University and King's Colleges which would accompany the granting of the new Charter, special regulations for the control of certain portions of the endowments or of certain branches of the College teaching, which it may not seem possible or advisable at present to hand over without special conditions to the management of the new Senate. For example, the Department of Divinity at King's College.

10. Paying due regard to the pecuniary interests of existing teachers (many of whom depend entirely upon students' fees) in the appointment of future University professors or readers.

11. Offering those professors of the existing Colleges, who might be willing to surrender the title of College professor, that of University reader, but not creating the occupants of chairs in any of the existing Colleges *ipso facto* professors in the new University.

In this mere sketch I have said nothing as to how faculties and boards of study might be constituted or as to how the University should grant degrees, for these seem to me "academical" problems, *i.e.* problems to be thrashed out by the University itself when it is once incorporated. Objection will be taken to much of the above by many individuals, but I believe it foreshadows the direction in which the *only scheme at present under discussion* must be modified if it is to lead to the ultimate establishment of a great teaching University in London, and not to a mere organization of teachers for examination purposes.

KARL PEARSON.

It seems to me that the force of the arguments of Profs. Lankester and Ramsay in last week's NATURE (May 28, pp. 76, 78), so far as they harmonize with each other, would have to be admitted, if the main object of a University were to foster that premature specialism, which, under the scholarship system, has already wrought great mischief to real education in this country, or to increase as far as possible the number of clever but half-educated specialists, with which a close acquaintance with any of the great scientific societies makes one only too familiar. The example of this has been well set by at least one of the great metropolitan day-schools. The fatal weakness of the arguments referred to is that they ignore, as no University ought to do, the claims of general education. If the advancement of scientific research is really desired by University and King's Colleges, all they have to do is to institute on their own account a diploma of the nature of the Associateship of the Royal School of Mines or College of Science, and make the training for it so good and thorough that the possessors of such a diploma shall be such a *desideratum* in those "commercial" quarters to which Prof. Ramsay appeals as a sort of final authority, that they shall drive such creatures as B.Sc.'s out of the field. Special brain-power, highly developed, is no doubt a splendid thing in its way, and recognition of it in the field of science is fully provided for in the B.Sc. honours, and in the ultimate D.Sc. degree; but, in considering the terms on which a *degree* should be given, general education and culture cannot be left out of account. In Germany something of the sort is guaranteed by the examinations which have to be passed on leaving the gymnasium (or high school) before students proceed to the University to specialize; in England it has been found necessary to institute the matriculation examination. That need, however, is no longer so imperative as it was; and for my own part I see no real objection to the "leaving certificate" of the Oxford and Cambridge Examining Board being accepted in lieu thereof; for I speak of what I know, when I say that this carries with it a guarantee of as much education and culture as the Matriculation Examination does, and often a great deal more. I would only stipulate that it should include one modern language and one branch of science.

Prof. Ramsay has over-ridden his horse, by the emphatic preference he gives to a German degree. He is a comparatively young man; but some of us (who are not yet quite senile) can remember the time when the facilities for obtaining the German Ph.D. degree were such (they are such to this day in America) that the degree became a by-word and a reproach, and still

carries with it suspicions altogether disadvantageous to those who have taken the genuine degree in Germany. This is surely a warning against the multiplication of small Universities in this country. Again, if the time-honoured Universities of Oxford and Cambridge are not proof against the temptation to swell the contents of the University chest by accepting fees for the silken degree of M.A., which in the eyes of the *vulgus* is supposed to represent higher intellectual attainments than the B.A., can we expect greater virtue in a small and brand-new University struggling to "make both ends meet"? Were any further illustration required of the way things would be likely to drift with small and independent degree-granting corporations, we might find it in the readiness with which the authorities of King's College threw over Latin two years ago in the mercantile department of their school (then in a state of depression), at the mere bidding of the Chambers of Commerce, although its retention had been advocated by two leading scientific men. The really inspiring motive of this agitation is, I think, astutely kept in the background.

Wellington College, Berks, June 1.

A. IRVING.

ONE of the taunts most frequently levelled at the London University—or "Burlington Gardens," to use Prof. Lankester's favourite expression—by certain professors of University College and other advocates of a "teaching University in and for London" is, that the present University is a "mere examining board." The University has, it is true, a Brown Professor of Physiology and Pathology, who delivers annually a course of lectures relating to the studies and researches carried on at the Brown Institution. But this professorship is an exception, though the University, by accepting the Brown Trust, showed clearly enough that it did not recognize any obligation to abstain from appointing University Professors and Lecturers. We have been previously told that there was a "tacit understanding" at the foundation of the University that this should not be done. But Prof. Ray Lankester goes far beyond the assertion of a "tacit understanding." He talks of "pledges" given by the founders of the University being "falsified," and "most solemn obligations" violated—terrible crimes, which, however, have been committed already by the appointment of the Brown Professor. But how such "obligations" and "pledges," or even a "tacit understanding," could ever have existed, I fail altogether to see, for it was the expressed intention of the founders of the University that its powers and privileges should be the same as those of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge. Testimony as to this pledge may be found in the evidence given before the recent Commission. The late Dr. Carpenter's view of this matter was stated by Mr. Dickens in his communication to NATURE. Convocation has, years ago, voted in favour of the establishment of University Professorships and Lectureships, though I do not in the least believe that the graduates would sanction any proposal involving that the University should prepare candidates for its examinations, or compete with the ordinary work of the Professors in University College and other similar institutions. Whether research is or is not carried on successfully at University College is a matter on which I express no opinion. But, however this may be, it should be remembered that the students of this College have become only a small fraction of the candidates for London degrees. It would be, it seems to me, in the public interest that the University should make provision for the encouragement and reward of those among the great majority of its members who show a capacity for research and a power to extend the boundaries of knowledge. That the University has only one solitary Professor is due, I believe, in great measure to the narrowminded and unwise jealousy of University College, and to the fear lest some endowments should chance to be diverted to the University.

Prof. Lankester abandons altogether the scheme set forth in the Draft Charter of the "Albert University of London." This Charter proposed the establishment of a University whose range of activity should extend over colleges or other institutions in an area with a diameter of thirty miles. Prof. Lankester's ideal University, which would still be federal, is to consist only of University and King's Colleges. These institutions have not as yet shown any disposition to amalgamate the one with the other, and such a disposition is not likely to arise. They are, in fact, founded on distinct principles. The motto of the one, if I recollect rightly, is *Cuncti ad sint* and of the other *Sancte et sapienter*. Some time ago I heard of a Society of University