

University College, London, 1827-1927.

THE centenary celebrations of University College, London, which were inaugurated by Their Majesties the King and Queen on Thursday, June 23, continued day by day until the end of the ensuing week. To-day, July 2, they are to come to a joyous conclusion with a dance in the Great Hall, a building recently acquired and reconstructed by the College and dedicated as a war and centenary memorial on June 24 by H.R.H. Prince Arthur of Connaught. The celebrations have been on a scale befitting their august patronage, and the programme of receptions, divine services, concerts, lectures, and demonstrations arranged for the delectation of the visitors, shows that the College was determined to rise to the height of this opportunity. Specially noteworthy have been the lectures, more than forty in number, including many by such well-known authorities as Sir Flinders Petrie, Profs. J. Norman Collie, M. J. M. Hill, A. V. Hill, and Daniel Jones, and Sir Frederic Kenyon. These, and numerous demonstrations and exhibitions of great interest, were freely open to the public.

The circumstances in which University College came into being are vividly recalled in the brilliant oration pronounced by the Provost, Sir Gregory Foster, on Mar. 25, 1926, before the Union Society of the College at a gathering organised by it to commemorate the names of founders and other illustrious members. The founders' names selected for mention on that occasion were Dr. George Birkbeck and Isaac Lyon Goldsmid. The former, who also founded, in 1823, the Birkbeck Institute, now enrolled as Birkbeck College among the Schools of the University, was engaged about that time in association with Henry Brougham, afterwards Lord Brougham, in a campaign for promoting the education of the people, a campaign which led to the foundation of the famous Mechanics' Institutions. Goldsmid was a leader in the efforts that were being made in favour of religious toleration. Both movements were important factors in producing an atmosphere favourable to the reception of a scheme for a metropolitan university.

Many other distinguished men had, for several years before the laying of the foundation-stone of University College in April 1827, been canvassing the merits of such a scheme. Among them were the poet Thomas Campbell, George Grote, Joseph Hume, the Marquess of Lansdowne, Zachary Macaulay, James Mill, the Duke of Norfolk, and William Tooke. Francis Place, the "radical tailor of Charing Cross," also interested himself in the matter. It was Thomas Campbell who first put the project on paper. Fired with enthusiasm for the idea incorporated in the constitution of the then newly founded University of Berlin of devotion exclusively to the interests of science and learning without bias towards any particular creed or school of thought, he wrote a letter to Lord Brougham, which was published in the *Times* of Feb. 9, 1825, advocating a "proposal for a

metropolitan university . . . for effectively and multifariously teaching, examining, exercising, and rewarding with honours in the liberal arts and sciences" youths of from fifteen or sixteen to twenty or more years of age whom their parents could not afford to send to Oxford or Cambridge. This letter, despite disparaging editorial comments, led directly to the foundation of the University College. The movement was borne forward on a wave of generous enthusiasm for the advancement of learning and revolt against the dominance of academic particularism, privilege, protection, and repression.

To the wisdom and foresight of the founders Lord Balfour paid a remarkable tribute in his speech at the dedication ceremony in the Great Hall on June 24 last. Their work stands out, he said, as being little short, if short at all, of the boldest genius. "How many were there . . . who saw the great part science was going to play in civilisation? Very few. But they foresaw it, and while foreseeing it . . . they did not ignore or minimise the humanities."

It is precisely this judicious appreciation of the place of science in university education, coupled with a fine record of achievements in the fields of scientific research, that constitutes the most cogent argument for our gratitude and further support. We are reminded that its chemical laboratory, opened in the College in 1828, was one of the earliest places in England where chemistry was systematically taught. In that department Sir William Ramsay, following a line of distinguished predecessors—Edward Turner, Thomas Graham, A. W. Williamson—did fundamental work on the gases argon, neon, and helium, and from it went forth many a young chemist trained by him and eager to follow in his footsteps. Biology, like chemistry, was almost unknown as a subject of university study until University College began teaching it, and systematic medical education based upon scientific principles, carried out in a hospital built for medical purposes, was equally a novelty. Prof. Sharpey introduced the teaching of histology as a branch of physiology, and two of his pupils, Sir Michael Foster and Sir John Burden Sanderson, carried his methods to Cambridge and Oxford. The department for "Engineering and the Application of Mechanical Means to the Arts," which figures in the first programme of studies, did not immediately materialise, but later on a chair of engineering was instituted which was held successively by Profs. Vignoles, Hodgkinson, Fleeming Jenkin, and Alexander Kennedy. Here, too, the College blazed a trail that has been followed by the other universities.

In short, the College is justified in claiming that it has played no small part in that progress of science to which is largely due the great transformation in the religious, the political, the social, and educational aspects of our national life which has taken place in the past hundred years. Nor should we forget that the College was a pioneer in

giving the advantages of higher education to women, in establishing a complete university school of fine art, and in introducing the teaching of librarianship and phonetics.

As the circles of its influence have widened and the fame of its teaching has spread, the College has attracted more and more students, including many from far distant lands. In the past twenty-five years this growth has been rapid—from 1098 to 3228. Though the fees have been raised the increase in the fee income is but a fraction of the increase of expenditure entailed, and the College must look for fresh sources of revenue. The Centenary Appeal asks for £520,000, including £235,000 for endowment of chairs, of which seventeen are at present without endowment, and seventeen others are inadequately endowed. Up to June 18 the appeal had brought subscriptions

amounting to £117,440, including £43,000 contributed by past and present students, and a grant of £25,000 by the Rockefeller Foundation for endowment of the Department of Pharmacology, while on June 23, the first day of the celebrations, appeared an announcement in the *Times* of a further gift of £93,178 from the same Foundation, supplementary to the gift of 1921, for the Departments of Anatomy and Physiology.

Of good omen for the future of the College is the purchase by the University of London of eleven and a half acres of land in its immediate vicinity. This momentous transaction, made possible by a gift of £400,000 from the Rockefeller Foundation and a Government grant of £125,000, synchronises auspiciously with the centenary celebrations, and suggests vistas of further progress for the College not less glorious than that already achieved.

News and Views.

THERE would appear to be good ground for believing that another sensational archaeological discovery has suffered the fate of many of its kind in the past and has failed to stand the test of examination by experts. The remarkable character of the finds at Glözel, in which objects of neolithic culture akin to the Ægean, inscriptions on clay tablets, and engravings of animals on pebbles were found in association, aroused no little scepticism at the time of their discovery; but Dr. Salomon Reinach was convinced of their authenticity and, relying upon their evidence, put forward the theory that a degenerate Magdalenian culture had lasted so late as 4000-3500 B.C., with the consequence that the Magdalenian must be placed so low as 5000 B.C. The resemblance of the script on the tablets to that alleged to have been found in a Portuguese dolmen in 1894 was immediately apparent. It has been stated that a confession of forgery has appeared in Belgium, but confirmation of this is not yet to hand. In the issue of *Antiquity* for June, Mr. Crawford gives in some detail the results of an examination of the objects themselves, and subjects the circumstances of the find to a critical scrutiny based upon a personal inspection of the ground. He is persuaded that the objects in question are forgeries. His case is convincing; all the more so in that his opinion coincides with that of the Abbé Breuil.

In connexion with the centenary celebrations of University College, London, it will be remembered that George Grote, the distinguished historian and publicist, was in special measure the early friend and counsellor of the College. He was holding office as president at the date of his death in 1871. It is worthy of recall that on July 7, 1863, eight years before Grote died, he communicated the following wishes: "I desire that after my decease my cranium shall be opened by the Professor of Anatomy in University College, London, or by some other competent anatomist. I desire that my brain shall be carefully weighed and examined, and that

the weight thereof shall be communicated to Prof. Bain, together with any other peculiarities which may be found, especially whether the cerebellum is deficient as compared with the cerebrum." After the historian's decease, Prof. Sharpey, finding that Bain desired to be relieved from participation in the foregoing directions, entrusted the autopsy to Prof. John Marshall, who published a description of the brain (with photographic illustrations) in the *Journal of Anatomy and Physiology* (vol. 27, 1893). It would be of interest to learn in whose keeping the brain remains. It is not at University College.

THE Electricity (Supply) Act, 1926, has raised the hopes of consumers for getting a cheaper supply of electricity in the immediate future. The Act gives facilities for shutting down all uneconomical generating stations and erecting and equipping modern works equipped with the best generating plant available. The immediate problems in connexion with transmission and distribution are the obtaining of way leaves and the most economic methods of erecting overhead lines. Once it is conceded that no landowner should have an absolute veto to prevent transmission lines passing over his property, it is highly desirable that the present method of obtaining way leaves should be simplified. It is true that the Post Office is in a specially favoured position and has almost absolute powers to prevent its telegraphs and telephones being interfered with either by leakage or induction from power-lines, but it has never used its powers unreasonably. Hitherto, electrical development in Great Britain has been based on coal conservation, but the heavy costs of the transmission lines makes it probable that 'capital' conservation is equally important. We think that by far the most promising method of reducing costs is to utilise to the utmost all the plant in the station. To have the great bulk of the machinery lying idle for most of the day is most uneconomical. Some method of storage must be used and each machine run to its full capacity. Periods of light load are a loss to every