

Report of the Senate on the amended draft charter : together with communications from affiliated colleges, from graduates, and from other individuals, relating to the same / University of London.

Contributors

University of London. Senate.
Royal College of Surgeons of England

Publication/Creation

[London] : [publisher not identified], 1857.

Persistent URL

<https://wellcomecollection.org/works/gjvjp3eu>

Provider

Royal College of Surgeons

License and attribution

This material has been provided by This material has been provided by The Royal College of Surgeons of England. The original may be consulted at The Royal College of Surgeons of England. where the originals may be consulted. This work has been identified as being free of known restrictions under copyright law, including all related and neighbouring rights and is being made available under the Creative Commons, Public Domain Mark.

You can copy, modify, distribute and perform the work, even for commercial purposes, without asking permission.



Wellcome Collection
183 Euston Road
London NW1 2BE UK
T +44 (0)20 7611 8722
E library@wellcomecollection.org
<https://wellcomecollection.org>

11450

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON.

CONTENTS.

REPORT OF THE SENATE

ON THE

AMENDED DRAFT CHARTER;

TOGETHER WITH

**COMMUNICATIONS FROM AFFILIATED COLLEGES,
FROM GRADUATES, AND FROM OTHER INDIVI-
DUALS, RELATING TO THE SAME.**

August 1st, 1857.

CONTENTS.

	Page
REPORT OF THE SENATE	3
COMMUNICATIONS FROM	
1. University College (with Inclosure).....	15
2. King's College	29
3. Queen's College, Belfast	31
4. Queen's College, Galway	32
5. St. Cuthbert's College, Ushaw	33
6. Stonyhurst College	33
7. Manchester New College	34
8. Spring Hill College	35
9. The College, Regent's Park.....	36
10. St. Gregory's College, Downside.....	36
11. Baptist College, Bristol	37
12. Presbyterian College, Caermarthen.....	38
13. Queen's College, Birmingham	38
14. Western College, Plymouth.....	39
15. St. Patrick's College, Thurles	39
16. Bedford Grammar Schools	40
17. Trevecca College, Brecon.....	41
18. Springfield College, Ennis	41
19. Queen's College, Liverpool	42
20. Sydenham College, Birmingham.....	43
21. Owens College, Manchester	44
22. The Graduates' Committee	46
23. Memorial of 531 Graduates (with Inclosures).....	49
24. Letter from Dr. Barnes to Registrar	58
25. Memorial of Graduates, Undergraduates, and others.....	58
26. "Observations" by Dr. Barnes	59
27. Letter from Dr. Bucknill to Secretaries of Graduates' Committee.	66
28. Memorial of Dr. Bucknill.....	71
29. "Reasons" of Isaac Todhunter, M.A.....	72
30. Letter from Prof. W. B. Todhunter, M.A., to the Senate.....	75
31. Letter from Prof. C. J. Foster, LL.D., to Registrar (with Inclosure)	75
32. Letter from Dr. Richard Quain to Secretaries of Graduates' Committee	78
33. "Observations" by John Robson, Esq., B.A.	81
34. Letter from Edward Smith, M.D., LL.B., B.A., to Registrar	84

REPORT OF THE SENATE
ON THE
AMENDED DRAFT CHARTER.

THE Senate of the University of London, after carefully considering the Draft of a new Charter forwarded to them by the Secretary of State, have resolved to recommend, among other modifications of the existing Charters, a discontinuance of the restriction which confines admissibility to examination for the Degree of B.A. to the Students of Institutions specially appointed and named beforehand. They have accordingly introduced into the Draft-Charter the Clause numbered 36, which provides that they may admit to examination as Candidates for that Degree, on conditions hereafter to be determined, Students not presenting certificates from any such Institution.

Before transmitting this recommendation to the Secretary of State, the Senate allowed a month to elapse for receiving such representations as any of the Colleges or Institutions, Professors, Graduates, Students, or other parties might desire to address to them on the proposed change. Various representations have accordingly been made or forwarded to them.

Of the 38 Institutions, specially authorized to issue such certificates, 18, comprehending the most considerable, have addressed Memorials to the Senate, disapproving of the alteration. The President of the College at Thurles approves of the change. The 19 other Institutions have expressed no opinion.

The Professors also of King's College, London, have transmitted a communication to the Senate, deprecating the change. The Professors of University College, London, have addressed the Council of their own College, setting forth the grounds of their opinion, adverse to Clause 36, in an elaborate Report.

At a meeting of Graduates, convened for the purpose of discussing the question, Resolutions, protesting against the proposed alteration, were adopted by a majority of 84 to 37. Memorials from the Graduates who composed this majority, and from nearly 450 other Graduates who, though not present at the meeting, agree with that majority, are now before the Senate. These documents embody the reasons of the Memorialists in support of their opinion. Professor Foster, of University College, in a letter to the Registrar of the University, agreeing to a great extent in the views of these Memorialists, suggests a modification of Clause 36.

On the other hand, various individual Graduates, among whom are numbered Dr. Barnes, Dr. Bucknill, Dr. Richard Quain, Mr. I. Todhunter, Dr. Edward Smith, Professor W. B. Todhunter, and Mr. J. Robson, have memorialized the Senate, commending the alteration, and trusting that it may be carried into effect—the first four each examining the question in an argumentative paper.

To the same effect is a Memorial addressed to the Senate by 38 Graduates of the University, 60 Lecturers in Medical Schools affiliated to the University, and 31 Undergraduates, praying for a removal of the restriction now in question.

The Senate proceed to review the objections which have been offered against the proposed change—to determine how far these objections are in themselves preponderant, or are founded in accurate views of the legitimate purposes and effective reach of the University of London.

In the document headed “Graduates’ Committee,” a preliminary objection is made to the Senate’s proposing on the present occasion, any such change in the existing Charters as that embodied in Clause 36:—

“The Committee are obliged to call the attention of the Senate to the fact, that the grave question to which the foregoing observations refer has been raised now for the first time at the very close of the ample and protracted discussions which have taken place with respect to the New Charter, and that at the time when it had been supposed by all parties that the bases of the New Charter had been finally agreed upon, and that matters of detail alone remained unsettled, it is now proposed to withdraw from Convocation on the eve of its establishment the question beyond all others affecting most vitally the character of the University and the position of the Graduates. The Committee, on the part of the Graduates whom they represent, feel bound to remonstrate respectfully but firmly against the injustice of such a course.”

It is implied by this objection, that the admission of the Graduates into the Corporation ought to form the one and only novelty in the new Charter, and that, without injustice to them, the Senate cannot suggest any other material alteration in the future constitution of the University. This assumption the Senate cannot admit. They contend that it would have been a dereliction of duty on their part, if, on the rare and important occasion when they are called upon to surrender their existing Charters and accept a new one, they had omitted to review all the provisions of the Charter by the light of past experience. Their advice being asked by the Secretary of State respecting the new Charter, they become in part responsible for its provisions, and especially for a careful reconsideration of the positive restrictions imposed by the existing Charters. They have endeavoured to perform this task with a full sense of the

duties of the University of London towards liberal education generally, and with a resolution to disengage it from the fetters which have hitherto prevented it from an expansion commensurate to its national position and promise.

The Senate proceed to consider the substantive objections which they find advanced against Clause 36. In the language of University College, the proposition 'that collegiate education shall no longer be necessary for candidates for Degrees in Arts and Laws, is one likely to be injurious to the cause of regular and systematic education; not only lowering the value, but altering the very meaning of an English University Degree.' Other Colleges, especially Manchester College (p. 34), urge objections the same in substance, but somewhat differing in phraseology.

What is called Collegiate training, or the Collegiate test, is held forth as an indispensable preliminary to University examination, and as essential to the value of a Degree.

These objections on the part of the Colleges derive all their gravity from assuming, that the change proposed will lower the standard of intellectual proficiency and the measure of positive knowledge now attested by the Degree. The Senate deny with confidence that such will be its effect. They are most anxious to maintain undiminished the intellectual value of the Degree. They are far from wishing to make it attainable at a smaller cost of diligent and effective study than it now requires. Least of all are they disposed to encourage what is called 'cramming,' by students who have omitted or evaded the obligation of continuous study; the importance of which the Senate feel as strongly as the Colleges. Their B.A. Degree now represents two examinations, with an interval of two years' continuous study between them. It would still represent the same, after the change proposed in Clause 36, as it does at present. The only difference would be, that the two years of continuous attendance on Lectures would no longer be required to be performed in a College.

It is however contended by the Colleges, that unless the two years of continuous study be passed under their inspection, there will be no continuous study at all; or at least that the Senate can acquire no assurance that there has been such. The Senate on the contrary believe, that as satisfactory a guarantee for this fact can be obtained elsewhere.

In the first place, it is to be remarked that the thirty-eight Institutions now affiliated constitute but a very small proportion of the educational establishments existing in the country. No one can reasonably maintain, that the numerous other educational institutions, schools, and private tutors, are unfit in the mass to impart effective instruction, or to attest continuous study; and that such virtue or aptitude resides exclusively in the enrolled Colleges. Nevertheless all other educational establishments and teachers are at present disqualified, so far as regards the

University of London. It is this disqualification which the Senate desire to remove, as being both unfair and prejudicial. Without meaning the smallest disrespect to Colleges from whom they have already received meritorious Graduates and hope to receive many more, the Senate discover no such unrivalled pre-eminence or specialty in those bodies, as to justify exclusive dealing with them, and refusal of certificates given by other teachers. However good may be the instruction given in the Colleges, instruction given elsewhere is good also, and ought to be alike presentable at the University of London. The Senate have no wish to dispense with evidence of continuous study, during the two years between Matriculation and the Degree; but they claim the liberty of accepting satisfactory evidence of that fact from other quarters, as well as from a few preappointed Colleges.

Next, the proof of continuous study, as it stands at present, derived exclusively from the certificates of these Colleges, is one the value of which the Senate is unable to measure with certainty.

The practice of the different Colleges in respect to the granting of certificates varies considerably at present, and may vary beyond any assignable limits. King's College gives certificates not merely to those students who attend the daily and regular lectures of its Professors, but also to such as attend simply the evening lectures. Each College determines for itself on this matter. What number of classes must a student attend, in order that he may be entitled to a certificate? What proportion of the entire course must he attend—or will it be sufficient, if he pays fees for the entire course, but attends only seldom? If present in person, has he been present in spirit, with serious attention, and with a genuine desire to learn? Does the Professor satisfy himself, before he grants a certificate, that the student has derived real benefit from attendance; or does he consider that every student, however passive and indolent, has earned his certificate by the mere fact of regularity in the lecture-room? On all these points each College follows its own discretion: on several of them, no peremptory rule could be prescribed: on none of them does the College certificate furnish information. Under the same words, that certificate is consistent with an undefined diversity of practice. Considered as a proof of continuous study, it is essentially inconclusive and fallible. The Senate contend that no case of superior infallibility can be made out on behalf of the College certificates, to justify the refusal of certificates from other educational establishments or other teachers, attesting the same fact of continuous study. From the very nature of this fact, every certificate must necessarily leave much to be presumed. This will be true when the system is thrown open; but it is not less true under the existing system of privilege.

In the arguments urged against Clause 36, it is assumed

that the Senate have ascertained, and possess the means of constantly verifying, the superior educational competence and trustworthiness of the affiliated Colleges. This is altogether a mistake. The Senate possess no direct means of knowing, still less of continually watching, the value of the education which each College confers. They have no acquaintance with the College, except so far as is set forth in its Prospectus, reciting the number of Professors and Students, length of courses, date of establishment, with perhaps some annual Reports, and other matters of public notoriety. But as to the efficient teaching, or interior management of the College, the Senate have no information peculiar to themselves. The Memorial from Manchester New College affirms—‘The power of granting certificates is conferred only on such Academical and Collegiate Institutions as have exhibited *proofs* that their course of study is calculated to prepare candidates for graduation, and that sufficient means of instruction are provided for carrying it into execution.’ Now the ‘proofs’ which the Colleges are here said to have exhibited, as entitling them to affiliation, consist simply in the transmission of their Prospectus or Reports, and in nothing beyond. Individual members of the Senate are connected with some of the Colleges, and have thus personal cognizance of their management; but the Senate collectively have no farther knowledge than that which they derive from the Reports and statements of the Colleges themselves.

The hypothesis, therefore, of confidential knowledge on the part of the Senate, and of proved superiority on that of the Colleges, which is produced to justify exclusive dealing with the Colleges, does not conform to the real facts. And the fallacy of that hypothesis is one serious reason, in the view of the Senate, for discontinuing such exclusive dealing. The present system places them before the public as having done, what they neither have done nor can do—as if they had verified not merely the positive excellence, but the superior comparative excellence, of those few privileged bodies, in compliment to which they forbid certificates from all other quarters.

The fact here indicated—absence of all knowledge of the interior of the Colleges—though most important in its bearing on the present question, is noway discreditable either to the Colleges themselves, or to the Senate. It has however been converted, in some of the arguments of the Graduates, into a reproach against the Senate; as if they were ignorant simply from their own fault and remissness. The question has been asked—‘Why do not the Senate prescribe a system for all the Colleges to follow,—take cognizance of their interior management,—and see that the system prescribed is effectively worked out by the teaching of the Professors? Why do the Senate abnegate that important part of their duties which consists in directing, inspecting, and controlling, the Colleges? Why do they confine themselves to the single function of examination?’

To this the Senate reply, that they take a very different measure both of their duties and of their capabilities. They confine themselves to the function of examination, because that is all which is really under their hands, and all which they have the means of performing well. They are not a teaching body, nor do they pretend either to prescribe or to control the teaching of the Colleges, except in so far as their examinations may indirectly produce such an effect. They have no competent persons at their command for constant and systematic inspection. And if they were to undertake these grave and large schemes of supervision, which the Graduates would impose upon them as duties, they are persuaded that such interference would prove not only unprofitable in its results, but offensive and inconvenient to the Colleges themselves.

In the reasonings both of the Colleges and of the Graduates, respecting the functions and competence of the Senate, Oxford and Cambridge appear to be assumed, either expressly or tacitly, as the models to be closely imitated. Because Oxford and Cambridge exhibit a University having relations only with special and recognized Colleges, the like exclusive Collegiate system is claimed for the University of London also, as if without such a system the University of London would be inferior to the two older Institutions. The dignity and efficiency of the University of London appear to be measured by the closeness of its approximation to Oxford and Cambridge, leaving out merely the feature of intimate connexion with the established Church.

In these views the Senate cannot acquiesce. They conceive that the example of Oxford and Cambridge has exercised a misleading influence on the judgment of the present question. Both at Oxford and Cambridge, the University is a really teaching and supervising body, maintaining discipline over the Colleges, and exercising direct authority over the students: moreover the University and the Colleges are in the closest unity and identity, the functions of the former being alternated among the members of the latter. On all these important points, the position of the University of London is not only different, but contrary. It neither teaches, nor supervises, nor maintains discipline, nor exercises authority over students: its functionaries are in no way connected, except by accident, with any College: nor have its Colleges any local or traditional tie among themselves. It cannot become a new Oxford or Cambridge. It may aspire to rival these two Institutions, but it cannot literally copy them. The Collegiate system at Cambridge and Oxford is a vigorous reality, wherein both University and Colleges co-operate as members of the same living organism: the Collegiate system which was assigned by the then Government of the country to the University of London, is a mere name, without any effective principle of unity or peculiar co-operation of parts; having no other positive attri-

bute, in common with Oxford and Cambridge, except the inauspicious attribute of exclusiveness, without the same justifying reasons as may be pleaded by those two Universities.

Objectors may say, that this admission places the University of London in a state of confessed inferiority to Oxford and Cambridge. Even though the proposition were true, nothing would be gained by denying or disguising the real state of the fact, or by affecting to copy where we can produce nothing better than a deceitful show of resemblance. But the Senate are far from admitting the inferiority here indicated. That which is different from Oxford and Cambridge is not necessarily inferior. The main and capital test of comparison which the Senate recognise, is, the intellectual value of their Degree—the standard of mental proficiency and learning which it represents. Judging by this test, the Senate are not afraid to declare that the University of London is fully on a par with Oxford and Cambridge: and (so far as in them lies) it shall remain so. The fact of such equality is honourable to the Colleges and their teaching. But subject to that main test, and with a scrupulous care to keep the standard of learning undiminished, the national efficiency of the University of London will also be measured by the number of students whom it graduates. During the first nineteen years of its existence, only about 1050 different persons have graduated at this University in the three Faculties of Arts, Law, and Medicine, collectively; that is, on the average, about 55 per annum. To exalt its efficiency in this respect, even above the level of Oxford and Cambridge, the Senate claim to be released from those restrictions which have hitherto confined the Degree to the pupils of Colleges specially named. Repudiating all idea of multiplying new enlistments by degrading the standard of admissibility, they wish to invite diligent and accomplished students from all places of education and all tutors indiscriminately. It is for the University of London to proclaim the comprehensive principle, that while testing by strict examination the amount of acquired knowledge, and requiring reasonable evidence of antecedent continuous study, it will no more tie down the deserving student to a few privileged Colleges than to a particular religious creed.

In two of the Memorials from the Colleges, allusion is made to certain proceedings now contemplated by Oxford and Cambridge, for the purpose of admitting to examination students not educated in any of their Colleges. It is understood that these Universities propose to examine extra-Collegiate students, and to confer upon such as pass a certain mark of recognition—yet distinct from the ordinary Degree taken by the Collegiate student, and bearing a different title,—such as Associate of Arts, instead of Bachelor of Arts. The Baptist College at Bristol, among others, recommends that this example shall be followed by the University of London: that

students not coming from the privileged Colleges shall be admitted to examination and shall receive a title of recognition; but that they shall not be entitled Graduates, nor become members of Convocation.

The Senate are opposed to any such distinction of rank or title as is here suggested. However suitable it may be at Oxford and Cambridge, it is nowise defensible under the circumstances of the University of London. It is recommended only by that analogy which the Senate have already deprecated as unfounded and illusory—that the University of London with its affiliated Colleges is, or may be rendered, a real counterpart of the composite organism made up of University and Colleges at Oxford and Cambridge.

The authorities of Oxford and Cambridge may see a material distinction between a resident student who has submitted himself for a long period to their teaching, supervision, and discipline—and another student who has acquired all his knowledge without the walls of the University. But the Senate of the University of London can recognize no distinction between two students, the one of whom has passed the two years after Matriculation in one of the thirty-eight favoured Colleges, while the other has passed the same period of time at Harrow, at the Charterhouse, in a respectable private school, with a tutor, or under an erudite parent. Neither of the two have been subject to any teaching, supervision, or discipline, from the University of London: both are alike worthy, on passing an equally creditable examination, of such recognition as that University can bestow. It would be unfair to stamp either of them with a mark of inferiority.

To the same line of argument belongs the point conceded in the Memorial of the Graduates,—that exclusive dealing with the affiliated Colleges is the normal condition of the University of London, but that the Senate may exercise a dispensing power, in exceptional cases; so as to admit individual non-collegiate students to graduation (p. 47). This is a view of the case which the Senate cannot recognize as either equitable or politic. They are anxious to invite students from the thirty-eight Colleges, and students from other quarters, equally and indiscriminately, under the same conditions of certified previous study and final examination. They cannot acknowledge the propriety of receiving the body of Collegiate students at their great gate as the legitimate comers, and a few non-collegiate students at a separate door, by way of exception and favour. The error against which they protest is, the transplantation of an exclusive Collegiate system from Oxford and Cambridge, where it is an ancient, vigorous, and flourishing reality, to the University of London, where it is and ever must be barren for good, and efficacious only in rendering that University inaccessible to the larger portion of British educated youth. This error is noway corrected, and very little softened, by the con-

sent of the Graduates to admit as exceptions a few individual non-collegiate students.

Professor Foster suggests (p. 76) the addition of certain words to Clause 36, providing that students not coming from the affiliated Colleges may be admitted to the Bachelor's Degree, yet only after passing through certain progressive examinations. This might lead to the inference, that these progressive examinations should stand in place of the College certificate : that they should not be imposed upon students who bring a certificate from one of the affiliated Colleges, but merely upon students educated elsewhere. Such a proposition would be tainted with the same vice of distinctive treatment and implied College-superiority which the University ought to discountenance in every shape. Progressive examinations, as a means of verifying and securing continuous study, appear to the Senate deserving of careful consideration. But if the Senate should ever find it practicable and advisable to establish progressive examinations, they can see no reason why such examinations should not apply alike to students Collegiate, and students non-Collegiate.

In the elaborate communication from the Professors of University College, attached to the memorial from the Council of that College, much is said about the value of the College Test and of Collegiate education generally. That a well-conducted College is a most effective and admirable instrument of education, the Senate readily admit. They are persuaded that under the most open scheme of admissibility, a great proportion of their Graduates, and many of their best Graduates, will always come from Colleges. But when upon these premisses an inference is raised, that no other form of education except the Collegiate, and that too confined to a few enrolled establishments, is to be recognized as conferring admissibility to a Degree—the Senate must record their decided dissent. They are anxious to make sure of a certain measure of intellectual acquirement and a certain continuity of study, as conditions preliminary to graduation : but they are equally anxious to leave to students themselves or to their parents and guardians full liberty of choice, as to the places where such instruction shall be obtained, or the persons by whom it shall be imparted. Many parents prefer private teaching as a system : some even disapprove, on conscientious grounds, of all schemes which bring together youthful students in large numbers : others are willing to defray the cost of a full measure of education for their sons, but entertain decided preferences for some particular school or teacher. By these, and by many other reasons, a majority of the well-educated youth of England will always be kept out of the Colleges affiliated to the University of London. Yet upon what principle of justice or policy are students so circumstanced to be debarred from graduating at the University? To admit them all, provided only they fulfil the

required intellectual exigencies, is the true way of discharging that great and paramount duty which the University owes to the general cause of liberal education.

The Matriculation Examinations taken at the University, from 1838 to 1856 inclusive, afford a mode, however incomplete, of making a comparative estimate of the attainments of the students who come, on that occasion, from the affiliated Colleges and of the students who come from other quarters. Both classes are admitted to these Examinations without distinction; and of those who pass, some of each class voluntarily present themselves to be further examined, for Matriculation with Honours.

In the above-stated period of 19 years, 2481 students belonging to the two classes collectively, passed the Matriculation Examination; of whom 1571, or 63 per cent., proceeded from affiliated Colleges, and 910, or 37 per cent., from other quarters*.

In the same period, at the subsequent Matriculation Examinations for Honours, 480 cases occurred in which Honours were awarded, in 322 of which the student proceeded from an affiliated College, and in 158, that is, in $\frac{1}{3}$ rd of the cases, from other quarters†. This proportion affords reasonable ground for believing that if, on passing the Matriculation Examination, the students of both classes were admitted as Under-graduates of the University, the non-Collegiate students would, at the commencement of the Under-graduate's career, be not inferior in abilities or acquirements to the Collegiate students.

These non-Collegiate students, who have matriculated with honours, are by the existing Charters debarred from afterwards approaching the Degree, unless they choose to quit those teachers under whose tuition they have gathered the first-fruits of University distinction, and then migrate into one of the privileged Institutions. Such restriction has the effect of driving away many promising aspirants, likely to do the greatest honour to the Degree.

The Senate will only refer to the arguments, contained in the letters of Messrs. Bucknill, Barnes, Todhunter, and Quain, in favour of enlarged admissibility to the Degree. They have been principally anxious to consider the objections urged from the opposite view of the case, and they are glad to have seen these objections urged by highly competent advocates, so as to make sure that nothing material has been omitted.

After a full review of the whole discussion, the Senate adhere, with undiminished confidence, to the 36th Clause as it now stands in the Draft-Charter. They will transmit the Draft-Charter, with that Clause contained in it, to the Secretary of State; and they will at the same time transmit for his perusal

* See Table I. (p. 13).

† See Table II. (p. 14).

both the present Report, and all the documents before them, on both sides of the question. If he shall adopt their recommendation, they will make it one of their early duties, under the New Charter, to provide proper conditions of admissibility to the Degree. While discarding exclusive preferences, and inviting from all quarters students properly educated—they will seek to guard scrupulously against any degradation of the intellectual standard which the Degree now represents.

TABLE I. (referred to in p. 12.)

This Table contains a statement of the number of Students who Matriculated in each year from 1838 to 1856 inclusive; showing how many proceeded from affiliated Colleges and how many from other quarters, and the per-centage of each class of Students.

Year.	Number of Students from			Per-centage of Students from		
	Affiliated Colleges.	Other quarters.	Total.	Affiliated Colleges.	Other quarters.	Total.
1838.	22	0	22	100	0	100
1839.	24	6	30	80	20	100
1840.	67	2	69	97	3	100
1841.	56	8	64	87	13	100
1842.	61	5	66	93	7	100
1843.	64	16	80	80	20	100
1844.	64	15	79	80	20	100
1845.	74	29	103	72	28	100
1846.	72	27	99	73	27	100
1847.	102	49	151	67	33	100
1848.	104	57	161	64	36	100
1849.	100	66	166	60	40	100
1850.	111	79	190	57	43	100
1851.	119	95	214	55	45	100
1852.	115	91	206	55	45	100
1853.	118	83	201	58	42	100
1854.	115	84	199	58	42	100
1855.	82	90	172	47	53	100
1856.	101	108	209	48	52	100

TABLE II. (referred to in p. 12.)

This Table contains the details of the Matriculation Honours awarded in each year from 1838 to 1856 inclusive; showing how many of these Honours were awarded to Students proceeding from affiliated Colleges, and how many to Students proceeding from other quarters; and the per-centage of Honours obtained by each class of Students.

Year.	In Mathematics and Nat. Phil., from		In Chemistry, from		In Botany, from		In Zoology, from		In Classics, from		Total, from		Grand Totals.	Per-centage, from		
	Affiliated Institutions.	Other quarters.	Affiliated Institutions.	Other quarters.	Affiliated Institutions.	Other quarters.	Affiliated Institutions.	Other quarters.	Affiliated Institutions.	Other quarters.	Affiliated Institutions.	Other quarters.		Affiliated Institutions.	Other quarters.	Total.
1838.	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	13	0	13	100	0	100
1839.	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	8	0	8	100	0	100
1840.	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	7	0	7	100	0	100
1841.	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	10	0	10	100	0	100
1842.	3	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	9	1	10	90	10	100
1843.	3	0	2	1	0	0	1	0	5	0	10	2	12	83	17	100
1844.	4	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	15	1	16	92	8	100
1845.	4	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	8	1	18	4	22	82	18	100
1846.	7	3	7	3	0	0	0	0	8	1	23	6	29	78	22	100
1847.	11	1	6	1	0	0	1	1	2	0	21	3	24	87	13	100
1848.	6	3	1	4	0	0	0	0	5	4	12	11	23	52	48	100
1849.	5	6	4	3	0	0	3	1	4	0	18	10	28	64	36	100
1850.	8	4	5	5	1	1	1	4	8	1	21	15	36	58	42	100
1851.	7	3	7	2	1	2	3	0	7	3	25	10	35	71	29	100
1852.	10	2	3	4	1	1	0	1	8	3	22	11	33	66	34	100
1853.	6	6	7	7	0	2	2	0	7	5	22	20	42	52	48	100
1854.	8	1	6	8	3	2	0	2	6	7	23	20	43	53	47	100
1855.	8	8	5	8	2	2	1	1	5	7	21	25	46	45	55	100
1856.	9	6	3	11	1	1	1	2	5	5	19	25	44	43	57	100

COMMUNICATIONS

FROM AFFILIATED COLLEGES, FROM GRADUATES,
AND FROM OTHER INDIVIDUALS,

RELATING TO THE
AMENDED DRAFT CHARTER.

1. *University College.*

“ University College, London,
30th June, 1857.

“ DEAR SIR,—I am directed by the Council of the College to acquaint you, for the information of the Senate of the University of London, that at a Special General Meeting of Members of the College on Wednesday the 10th June, 1857, convened ‘ for the purpose of considering what steps, if any, ought to be taken with reference to certain apprehended alterations in the constitution of the University of London intended to dispense with the necessity of Candidates for Degrees in Arts and Laws having been educated in an Institution affiliated to the University ’—

“ It was resolved,

“ ‘ That this meeting, regarding with great satisfaction the intention of the Government to grant to the University of London a New Charter which will incorporate the Graduates, but understanding that the Senate propose that Collegiate education shall no longer be necessary for Candidates for Degrees in Arts and Laws, desires to express its disapproval of the proposed change, as one likely to be injurious to the cause of regular and systematic education, and as not only lowering the value, but altering the very meaning, of an English University Degree.

“ ‘ That University College having been pointed out in 1835, by the Address of the House of Commons to the Crown, as the future University of London, and having cheerfully waived its claims to that high dignity, in order to promote the public welfare, has a peculiar right to object to a change which will destroy the essential character of that University Constitution, on the faith of which it consented to surrender its position.

“ ‘ That the Council of University College be requested to communicate with the Senate of the University of London, and with the Home Office, and to take such steps as will, in their opinion, give the greatest weight to the views of the meeting, as expressed in the above resolutions.’

“ I am directed also to inform the Senate of the University, that at a Session of the Council of the College, held on Satur-

day the 27th June instant, the Draft of the proposed New Charter of the University communicated by the Senate, the Resolutions of the General Meetings of Members of the College above set forth, and a printed paper, dated 19th June, 1857, entitled an 'Address to the Council of University College, London, from the Senate of the College, on the New Charter proposed for the University of London,' were considered by the Council of the College, and Resolutions passed as follows:—

“ ‘That the Council having heard the Address of the Senate to them of the 19th of this instant June, will proceed forthwith to carry into effect the requests contained in the Resolutions passed by the Members of the College at their Special General Meeting on the 10th June last, to communicate with the Senate of the University of London, and the Home Office, on the subject of the Charter which it is proposed to grant to the University.

“ ‘That while the Council would willingly concur in any well-considered scheme by which Certificates of Proficiency might be granted to persons not educated in the affiliated Colleges, they cannot approve of the proposed New Charter.

“ ‘That in the 36th Clause of the proposed New Charter, the Council are unable to find any security against the admission of persons as Candidates for Degrees, who may have passed through no regular training, and may have pursued no course of systematic and continuous study.’

“ I am directed further to communicate to the Senate of the University the 'Address to the Council from the Senate of the College' above referred to, and I accordingly transmit a copy of that document, with a request that you will have the goodness to lay it before the Senate of the University.

“ I am,

“ Dear Sir,

“ Yours faithfully,

“ CHAS C. ATKINSON,

“ Secretary.”

“ Dr. Carpenter,
Registrar,
University of London.

[Inclosure.]

“ *Address to the Council of University College, London, from the Senate of the College, on the New Charter proposed for the University of London. June 1857.*

THE Senate of the University of London has introduced into the Draft of a New Charter, which has been submitted to it, a clause (clause 36) which will enable the University to grant Degrees in Arts and Laws to other Candidates besides those who produce the Certificate, hitherto required, of having studied during two years at one of the Colleges, or other Institutions, from which the University is authorized to receive Certificates.

The power thus sought is not to be confounded with the power which the University already possesses (by the Supplemental Charter of the Thirteenth of Victoria) of holding Examinations and granting Certificates of Proficiency in various branches of knowledge. It is not merely a power of granting Certificates of Proficiency in particular subjects, but a power of conferring upon Candidates who have not received an Academic education, those Academical Degrees which hitherto have been conferred only upon College Students. The Senate of the University seeks a general power to admit all persons to be Candidates for Degrees in Arts and Laws, who shall comply with regulations to be from time to time made by the Senate.

As the Senate of the University has not declared the reasons which have induced it to seek this power, we can only argue by probable inference, or in dependence upon private information or common report, with regard to the motives of the individual members of the Senate who advocate the change, and to the extent to which they wish to carry it in practice. If they had in view only some special cases, in which a solitary Student, without the opportunity of obtaining the many and great benefits of academical education, has so cultivated and disciplined his mental faculties, as to be in no respect inferior to those who have enjoyed greater advantages; and if, upon the hypothesis that such cases are exceptional, they wished to bring them within the range of the honours of the University; there would be no question of principle between us and them; and we should wish only to see the new power secured from abuse. But we have good reason to believe that they do not look merely to exceptional cases, but that they wish to throw open the Examinations of the University, without restriction, to all persons who think themselves qualified to pass them; that, in fact, they consider that a candidate who has not passed through the training of a college is as good as a candidate who has, if he can only pass the Examination of the University. They consider that the limitation, which makes it necessary that a candidate for a Degree should present a Certificate of two years' Studentship in a College, gives an exclusive privilege to the Colleges, which is not justified by sound reason, and is unfair and oppressive to non-academic Students: and they talk of what they are pleased to call Free Trade in Education, and declare that it requires that the Degrees of the University should be attainable by all persons who can pass a certain prescribed examination.

To these opinions, and the policy founded upon them, we are deliberately opposed. But we wish to premise distinctly, that our opposition does not proceed from any consideration of the interest of the Colleges in the question, or the interest of our own College in particular. We oppose the change, because we believe that the principles from which it proceeds are unsound; because we believe that it would lower the standard of the Degree and of the studies which lead to it, and encourage mistaken notions as to the objects of liberal education; because we believe that it would lower the character and impair the utility of the University itself; and especially, because it would make it impossible for the University to

fulfil one of the two great duties which it was created by the Crown to perform.

The argument of the promoters of the change rests upon two assumptions:—one, that Academical Degrees ought to be considered only as Certificates that a Student has passed an Examination, or Examinations: and this assumption rests upon another, that examination is a sufficient test for ascertaining what good a Student has got out of the process of education. We believe that in both assumptions there is a mistake.

The view thus taken of Academical Degrees is at variance with the understanding which has uniformly prevailed in the learned society of Europe, from the first foundation of Universities to the present day*. Wherever the Degrees of Bachelor of Arts and Master of Arts, and similar Academic titles, have been known, they have always implied a regular course of training and discipline in a learned body. This is in reality what society at large chiefly regards in them; and it is comparatively incurious with respect to the particular examinations after which the Degrees are conferred. Nor is this at all unreasonable. Many persons can form a sound judgment of the effect likely to be produced upon a young man's mind by a regular course of training, and by intercourse with intelligent teachers, and with a large number of other young men engaged in similar pursuits and submitted to the same influence, who cannot judge at all of the value of a particular examination. Academical Degrees have hitherto been believed to imply Academical training. The world will continue to believe that this is the proper meaning of them. If a class of Graduates is created who have not received an Academic education, either the world will be deceived, and the new graduates will enjoy a consideration to which they have no right; or else, when the difference comes to be understood, the Degree will be regarded with that suspicion with which society never fails to look upon titles assumed without warrant; and the genuine Academic Graduates of the University will be confounded in this depreciation of its honours.

The University of Oxford, which is now organizing a system for examining Students who are not members of the University, and for giving them testimonials and conferring distinctions upon the most deserving, is careful to provide that they shall not be confounded with its Graduates. It is proposed to call them Associates in Arts; and some members of Congregation object even to this title, as approaching too nearly to the designations of Degrees.

We have indicated the causes which make an Academical education really valuable, and justify society in attaching importance to it; but it will be well to exhibit them more fully. There is a presumption that the Student of a College has been led into an orderly and systematic course of study, and been kept in it. He will be likely therefore to know something at least of the relations of various

* Except, as we are informed, that the University of France since 1848 has examined Candidates for Degrees in Arts without reference to the place or method of their education.

branches of knowledge; and he will have had various faculties of his own mind exercised and trained. A self-taught student is generally guided only by his own liking for particular studies; and is likely to exercise those of his faculties which are strongest, and not to exercise those which most need exercise and development. Again, it is difficult to estimate too highly the benefit to a young Student of being brought into communication with teachers of wide knowledge, superior intellect, and enlarged views. The most powerful kind of action upon the mind is intercourse with a living mind. The complaint is as old as Plato and Socrates, but not the less true, that a dead book can answer no questions, can give no explanations, cannot adapt its teaching to the particular learner. The sympathy which is excited between an intelligent learner and an intelligent teacher, and the activity generated by that sympathy, are most important elements in education. Many a student from an ordinary private school has found new worlds of thought opened to him in the lecture-rooms of a well-appointed College, to which, however great his desire of knowledge, he would have been very slow in working his way, and probably never would have reached them at all, if he had been encouraged to think that assiduous private reading was all that was necessary to place him on a level with other Students. Quite as great to a young man is the benefit to be derived from association with other young men engaged in the same pursuit of knowledge. The intellect is stimulated by the sympathy which exists among fellow-students. Ideas are suggested, thoughts are exchanged; and objects of study are kept before the mind by being made subjects of conversation in social intercourse. One of the causes why men in later life seldom study so efficiently as in their younger days, is that study then becomes a solitary labour, and men shake off their learned thoughts when they go out into the world and society. The moral benefit also is great, which young men in a College gain from familiarly measuring themselves with their contemporaries, and learning to know their own place, their own intellectual strength and weakness. A single Examination is not enough to teach this. But the repeated examinations, the daily work of the lecture-room, the ordinary conversation of Students, and the many movements of their internal republic, these at least give a young Student an opportunity of knowing both himself and others. The infirmities which most frequently beset self-taught students, are a disposition to estimate too highly their own attainments and powers; a self-satisfied adherence to their own views; and a want of aptitude to enter into the views and feelings of other men. The power of placing one's self in another man's point of view, and so of contemplating a subject in different lights, and the consequent toleration of difference of opinion, and the wholesome consciousness of the possibility of error in one's self; these are among the most precious fruits of real education; and these are much more likely to be attained in social education than in solitary self-culture.

It is obvious that an Examination cannot be a test of this kind of

moral benefit, which a Student ought to derive from education, and which there is a presumption that Collegiate Students do derive in some measure, more or less. But an Examination is a very imperfect test even of the intellectual results of education. It will be remembered that we are not speaking now of a *viva voce* Examination, of which an individual Student is the subject, and in which, when the examiner has hit upon either the weak or the strong points of the Candidate, he can follow up the indication. We are speaking of Examinations conducted by printed papers given to a large number of Students at once, and to be answered in writing in a few hours. Such examinations in history, or literature, or science, tend by their very nature to be examinations in facts. The examiner frames precise questions, to which the Students can give exact answers, answers which can be readily compared and estimated one against another, or with the standard answer in the mind of the examiner. Such examinations ascertain some amount of knowledge of facts; but they afford very imperfect indications of the habits of thought by which the knowledge has been attained. In them, readiness in producing the results of instruction will avail more than mental power which is slow in working. It is true, that in Examinations for Honours, in which an examiner is not limited to the easier parts of his subject, a skilful examiner can do much to ascertain whether a Student has a sound knowledge of principles, whether he can take a comprehensive view of the relation of different parts of a subject, whether he has really thought of it, or whether he has merely exercised his memory upon a certain amount of knowledge. But an examiner, to do this well, must himself exercise no little thought and skill; and it by no means follows necessarily, that a more difficult examination will be a better criterion than an easier one, of the mental habits of the Students. But the Examination of the University for the Degree of B.A. is professedly and designedly a Pass Examination; that is, an Examination intended to determine whether the Candidates have attained a certain *minimum* of knowledge in particular subjects. Even that part of the Examination which is called an Examination in the Greek and Latin languages, is not really an Examination in the languages. It is an Examination only in certain small portions of the works of particular authors, which are prescribed more than a year beforehand; and which may be got up by a diligent student, with a good memory, with a very imperfect knowledge of the language in general, and little or no knowledge of its literature. The range of other parts of the Examination is limited by the very nature of the case; and it is limited more than it otherwise need be by the number and variety of the subjects which the University has thought fit to include in the Examination. The number of different subjects makes it difficult to insist upon more than a very moderate proficiency in each. At any rate, the Examiners are compelled to be content with such a knowledge of most of the subjects, even if they require more in one or two branches of the Examination. The multiplication of subjects acts much more efficiently and certainly in lowering the

standard in each than in securing a competent knowledge of all. For such an Examination Students can prepare themselves specially, and many Students will do so. What we mean is this: instead of honestly endeavouring to attain some knowledge of a subject, irrespective of the particular Examination, and then out of the fullness of their knowledge answering the questions proposed to them; they will guess beforehand what the Examination is likely to be, and will be guided by previous Examinations, and will speculate on the known habits of the individual Examiner; and their own instinct, or more probably the hints of an experienced and judicious friend, will guide them just to those bits of a subject on which precise questions can be most readily framed: in short, in common parlance, they will *cram* and be *crammed*. A few idle Students will do no more than this for the whole Examination. Many will do it for some branches, who have worked honestly for others; or will eke out a moderate share of honest work with a supplement of *cram*. But the Examiner, on the other hand, in such a summary Examination as is required for a Pass (an Examination which, by its very nature, is a negative test rather than a positive one, designed to convict ignorance rather than to prove learning), has a great difficulty in distinguishing the appearance from the reality; the knowledge which has been got up for the occasion, and will speedily be forgotten, from that which has been taken in deliberately, and (if we may use the metaphor) digested and assimilated, and converted into nutriment for the mind. Extreme instances may be detected; but in general, so long as the questions are answered, the Examiner will not venture to refuse the marks.

The Pass Examination, therefore, is not a trustworthy and satisfactory test even of the knowledge possessed by the Candidates; and still less of their mental discipline. It may give security against gross ignorance; it may raise a presumption in favour of those who pass it; but, taken simply by itself, it does not prove much. But those Students who have gone through the instruction and training of a well-appointed and well-ordered College, have at least been subjected to some amount of intellectual discipline, and have at least had the opportunity of learning much to which the Examination does not extend. The Degree is now a certificate to the world of two separate facts; of a collegiate education, and of passing an examination. If the proposed change is carried into practice, it will be a certificate only of the latter; and we think that we have shown that the latter fact does not imply all that is contained in the former.

If the Examinations are thrown open in the manner contemplated, it is certain that the Degrees will be sought, not only by genuine Students, or lovers of knowledge, but by very many in whom the love of knowledge will be subordinate to the desire for the social distinction of a Degree. This class of Candidates will be naturally disposed to prepare themselves for the Examination in the easiest manner. But this will not be the whole extent of the mischief done. A College Student, whom idleness, or the real oppression of multifarious

work, tempts to take the compendious method of preparation, knows perfectly well all the time, that the knowledge thus got up for the occasion is not to be compared in kind with the knowledge of his diligent fellow-student, which has been acquired by thorough labour, and is stored up in the mind ready for use at all times. He may laugh at his friend, and laugh at the examiners, when they come out side by side in the same Division of the List of Graduates: he is, however, quite conscious of the difference between the appearance and the reality of knowledge. But the tendency of the proposed measure will undoubtedly be to lead non-academic Students to think that the Examination of the University is a sufficient proof of their attainments. They will at all events believe that the Senate of the University so considers it; and they will be likely so to consider it themselves. They will conclude, therefore, that the course of preparation which enables them to pass the Examination is a sufficient education; and if they succeed, they will not be conscious of deficiency. Similar effects will be produced even more certainly upon the parents and guardians of Students. Many will argue, that the University itself has announced that a collegiate education is unnecessary; that all that the University has to give may be got without it; and so will be disposed to deny to their sons and wards the advantages which they might otherwise have allowed them. We believe that the Examinations for Honours will in course of time furnish an accumulation of evidence of the advantages of Academical education; but we do not trust to an ordinary Pass Examination for showing on which side the advantage lies. Our proposition is, that there are benefits in an academical education which an examination for graduation does not test; and that therefore a Degree in Arts ought to remain, as it has always hitherto been, a certificate of the mode of education as well as of the examination.

The Senate of the University of London attaches more importance to Examinations than really belongs to them, and thinks too little of the process of education. This is a natural consequence of the one-sided and imperfect view which the Senate seems to have taken of the duties of the University. It is true that the University differs so far from all other Universities, that the teachers of the pupils are not members of its governing body, nor are they even represented upon it. One effect of this peculiarity seems to be, that the Senate, having nothing to do with teaching, lacks some knowledge which practical experience in teaching would have given. But the particular consequence to which we wish now to direct attention is this; that the Senate has manifestly come to look upon itself as a machine constructed solely for prescribing and conducting Examinations. This is the one sole function which the University performs vigorously, and it seems to exist for nothing else. But in thus limiting its action, it does in fact abdicate and ignore a most important part of its functions and duties. Though the University does not teach, and the Members of the Senate do not teach, yet the University was created in order to guide the teaching bodies as

well as to examine pupils. The Charter of the University, as it was originally granted, and as it was renewed in the first year of the present reign, contains the following clause:—

“And whereas it is expedient to extend the benefits of Colleges and Establishments already instituted, or which may be hereafter instituted for the promotion of Literature, Science, and Art, whether incorporated or not, by connecting them for such purposes with the University created by this our Royal Charter: We do hereby further will and ordain, That all persons shall be admitted as Candidates for the respective Degrees of Bachelor of Arts, Master of Arts, Bachelor of Laws, or Doctor of Laws, to be conferred by the said University of London, on presenting to the said Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor, and Fellows, a Certificate from any of the Institutions hereinafter mentioned, to the effect that such Candidate has completed the Course of Instruction, which the said Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor, and Fellows by regulation in that behalf shall determine.”

By this clause it is distinctly prescribed, as one of the offices of the University, that it should determine by regulation the Course of Instruction, the completion of which the College was to certify. But this function it has never attempted to perform; and in its zeal for examinations it has so lost sight of the prior duty, that it proposes now to do away with the necessity for Certificates and Courses of Instruction altogether.

We understand that the advocates for the proposed extension of the powers of the University seek to justify their innovation, on the one hand, by the argument that several institutions, which do not and cannot give a real collegiate education, have been admitted into connexion with the University, and that therefore it will make little practical difference if Candidates are admitted without any collegiate certificate at all; and on the other hand, by the plea that several of the Colleges, even some which have the means of giving a complete and efficient education, are so lax with regard to the conditions on which they grant their Certificates of Studentship, that the college certificate is practically worthless.

We believe it to be quite true that some institutions have been admitted into connexion with the University which ought not to have been admitted: but although individual advocates of the proposed change may use this as an argument, we cannot believe that the University, as a body, would allege its own negligence in the performance of one of its most important duties, as a ground for a change in its constitution; and still less, that such a line of argument would find favour in the eyes of the Secretary of State for the Home Department. The Institutions which have been authorized under the Sign Manual to grant Certificates of Studentship have been Institutions recommended by the Senate of the University; and it was the duty of the Senate to require satisfactory evidence of their efficiency. However, if it be true that the privilege of granting certificates has been conceded incautiously, it is quite in the power of the University to remedy the evil. The Senate has

not, indeed, hitherto possessed the same power with regard to the Institutions which grant Certificates of Studentship for Degrees in Arts, which it possesses with regard to Schools of Medicine. It has not presented reports from time to time to the Secretary of State, recommending that any Institution be struck out of the list. It is a very proper amendment of the Charter that such power should be given to the Senate; and we are glad to see that a clause of the proposed Charter will enable the Senate, with the consent of the Secretary of State, "from time to time to alter, vary, and amend the list "of Institutions in connexion with the said University." But the Senate, as we have shown, has always possessed the power of determining for every College the course of instruction which the Candidate who produces a certificate must have completed; and the exercise of this power, which would certainly prevent the second of the abuses indicated above, would also go far to remedy the evil incident to the admission of inefficient Institutions, or to the decay of an Institution previously efficient. If an Institution could not truly certify that its pupils had completed such a course of instruction as the University considered necessary, its privilege of granting certificates would remain in abeyance until its means of education had been so improved as to satisfy the requirements of the University.

With regard to the laxity of the Colleges, we have no desire to apologize for any Institution which has observed the letter of the regulations of the University, but has departed from their spirit; and still less for any Institution which has actually given false certificates. But we would observe, that it appears to us that the University itself has omitted to perform an important duty, and is to blame in the first instance for any laxity which may have crept into the practice of the Colleges. The Senate has never determined any Course of Instruction, as it was called upon to do by its Charters. It has contented itself with requiring Candidates to produce certificates from the authorities of one of the affiliated Institutions,—(1) of having been a Student during Two Years at one of such Institutions, and (2) of Good Conduct; and it has thrown upon the several Colleges the office of determining, each for itself, what constitutes Two Years' Studentship. The Crown distinctly imposed upon the University two duties: first, the duty of regulating the education of the Candidates for its Degrees; and secondly, the duty of examining them at the close of the period of their education. But the University has shrunk from the performance of the first duty, except so far as it was done indirectly in discharging the second duty; and now it seeks to be relieved from the obligation altogether.

It is true, that, on account of the great differences in the magnitude and constitution of the Colleges and other Establishments connected with the University, the University could not prescribe one uniform course of study to be followed in every College. But it was quite possible for the University, after propounding the subjects of its Examinations, to require each College separately to state what means it possessed of preparing Students to pass those Exami-

nations, and upon what conditions it proposed to grant its Certificates of Studentship. The University might have considered whether these conditions were sufficient; and if they were not sufficient, have required them to be amended: and then, when the conditions of Studentship in each College were settled, the certificate of the College ought to have stated distinctly that the Candidate had fulfilled those conditions; and if a College gave false certificates, the University would have been justified in refusing to receive certificates from that body, and in referring the matter to the Secretary of State.

We are quite ready to acknowledge that the University has acted wisely in not interfering in the detail of Collegiate Instruction; but interference to the extent which we have sketched out was not only within the province of the University, but was manifestly one of the chief duties which its Founders expected it to perform.

The University is yet but a young institution. Its errors have not attained to that venerable antiquity which is a bar to correction. There is no reason why mistakes should not be corrected, and omissions repaired, as soon as they are pointed out: and we believe that if the University were even now to adopt such a course as we have indicated, it would not only raise its own character, but would confer a great benefit upon the Colleges themselves. Some it might stimulate to augment their means of instruction; and some, in which the means of instruction are ample, would derive advantage from the action of an authority which would make the studies of their pupils more methodical and systematic.

The example of the University of Dublin has been cited as a justification of the proposal for granting Degrees simply upon Examination, irrespective of attendance upon any public or collegiate course of instruction. The example is hardly a case in point. Trinity College, Dublin, allows Terms to be kept by Students passing Examinations in the Subjects of the Lectures of the Term, as well as by residence and attendance on the lectures. Resident and non-resident Undergraduates are examined together. It is not easy for a stranger to make out from the Dublin Calendar the actual working of the complicated regulations of the College; but it appears that an Undergraduate who proposes to keep his terms only by Examinations, must pass at least seven progressive Examinations before he is admitted to the final Examination for his Degree at the close of his fourth year; and if he is a Member of the United Church of England and Ireland, he has four Examinations more upon the subjects of what are called the Catechetical Lectures, that is, upon Scriptural and Theological Subjects. It is plain, therefore, that the non-resident Undergraduate is regularly guided in his private studies by the public teaching of the College, and compelled to follow the same course as closely as he possibly can. It is to be observed also, that it is very usual for Students, who avail themselves of the licence to keep some of their Terms by Examination only, to reside and attend Lectures during some part of their Undergraduateship: and all Undergraduates are equally

Members of the College, and must be entered under some one of the Junior Fellows as a Tutor; and non-residents consult their Tutors as to their course of reading, and have the benefit of his direction.

We are strongly of opinion, that for the sake of maintaining the character of the Graduates and the character of the University, and of dealing honestly with society, it is expedient to confer Academical Degrees only upon those who have received an Academical education, and that pains should be taken to correct abuses, and to ascertain that the Candidates who present College Certificates have really gone through the training of a College. The University has the power, and proposes to retain the power under the New Charter, of granting Certificates of Proficiency; and these, rather than Academic Degrees, are the fitting distinction to offer to non-academic Students. If the University of London at the present time should offer its Degrees for the competition of self-taught Students, or Students educated at private schools, it would have the undignified appearance of seeming to be outbidding the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, which propose to examine such Students, and to grant them testimonials and titles of honour, but not to confound them with their ordinary Graduates.

It is to be observed that it is only for the Degrees in Arts and Law that the University proposes to invite the competition of Candidates who have not received some kind of public education. For Medical Degrees it will still require education in a recognized Medical School. We can well understand, that there are considerations of prudence which would prevent the hardest innovator from proposing a change, which would inevitably lower the reputation of the Medical Degrees of the University. But we would suggest, that although in the case of Degrees in Arts there is not the same risk as there would be in Medicine, of collision with other authorities and with the jealousy of a whole profession, yet that the proposed change will be a rash experiment upon public opinion; and it is upon public opinion alone that the value of the Degrees of the University depends.

We have premised that we do not oppose the change on account of any peculiar interest of the Colleges. There is one point, however, in which the Colleges are interested, which we cannot refrain from mentioning. Under the present system, the power of withholding the Certificates of Good Conduct and of Attendance upon Lectures is an instrument of discipline which can be brought to bear upon disorderly or irregular Students; and there can be no doubt that the knowledge that such a power exists operates as a wholesome preventive check. But if the New Charter be granted in its present form, this instrument will be taken out of the hands of the Colleges. Even if College Students still present Certificates (which seems to be intended), it will be scarcely possible to prevent a Student, who may be doubtful whether he would receive a Certificate if he asked for it, from disguising the fact of his attendance at a College, and presenting himself for Examination as a Non-Aca-

demic Candidate. Even expulsion from a College will lose much of its significance and terror.

We have argued the question hitherto upon general grounds; and we have considered the proposed change with relation to society at large, and to the particular class whom it is designed to benefit, and to the University itself; and we think that we have shown that there are strong reasons which ought to lead the Senate to reconsider their determination. But now that we have established our position upon the broad ground of general policy, and have shown that it is no private interest for which we are contending, but that the privilege of the Colleges (if so it must be called) is bound up with the cause of sound education, and with the efficiency and reputation of the University itself, we may fairly enter upon another line of argument, which is addressed not to the Senate of the University, but to the responsible advisers of Her Majesty; and we will proceed to show, that the introduction of the proposed clause into the Charter of the University of London, with the approval of the Crown, would be a distinct departure from the understanding between this College and the Government of the day, at the time when the University of London was first established.

In March or April 1835 the House of Commons presented an Address to his late Majesty, "beseeching him to grant his Royal Charter of Incorporation to the University of London" (by which name was then meant the body which is now called University College), "as approved in the year 1831 by the then Law Officers of the Crown, and containing no other restriction than against conferring Degrees in Divinity and in Medicine." His Majesty in his answer assured his faithful Commons, that he would call upon the Privy Council for a report, "in order that His Majesty might be enabled to judge what might be the best mode of carrying into effect the wishes of his faithful Commons in respect of a grant of a Charter to the University of London, and what might be the conditions with which such a grant ought to be accompanied." The Privy Council eventually prayed to be discharged from making any report, and the matter was left entirely in the hands of the Government.

It is clear, then, that a Charter in some form was promised by the Crown to the body then called the University of London, but now University College; and it is a most reasonable interpretation, that this promise extended to a Charter which would enable it to confer Degrees in Arts.

When, therefore, the Government proposed, in place of bestowing such a Charter upon our College, to establish and incorporate by Charter a new University, which should have power to confer Degrees in Arts, Medicine, and Law, not only upon Students from our College, but also from King's College, which was named with us in the first Charter of the University, and from other Institutions, "established for the purposes of education," which should be from time to time included; it was felt by the Members of the Government, that it was necessary in good faith that the consent of our

College should be obtained to the proposed arrangement. The proposition of the Government was the subject of a conference between a Deputation of Members of the Council and Professors, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and the Home Secretary, Mr. Spring Rice (now Lord Monteagle), and Lord John Russell. The outline of the scheme was formally communicated to the Council by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, in a letter dated 19th August 1835. Several interviews followed between Deputations of the Council and the above-named Ministers; and at last, in November 1835, a series of questions upon various matters of detail was submitted to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, to which he gave a full answer in writing. It is therefore clear that it was considered essential, that our College should accept the Government scheme as satisfying the expectations which had been held out to it; and that so far the arrangement was of the nature of a compact. The scheme was considered and approved both by the Senate and by the Council; and was finally accepted by the Proprietors, as the supreme authority of the College, in connexion with the subsidiary Charter by which we were incorporated as a College under our present name.

We have therefore a right to look to the terms of this treaty; and it is manifest that it was assumed throughout on both sides, that Academical Degrees would be conferred by the University of London only on Students who had gone through a regular course of study in a College, or similar institution, sufficiently provided with teachers and with other means of instruction. The consent of the Senate, of the Council, and of the Proprietors, was given upon this assumption. If it had been suggested at that time, that the petition of our College for a Charter, and the Address of the House of Commons in support of the petition, and the promise of the Crown to grant a Charter to our College, were to be satisfied by the creation of a body which should confer Academical Degrees, merely as the result of an Examination, and quite independently of Collegiate education, it is certain that every one of our governing bodies would have entertained the scheme with very different feelings from those with which they accepted the actual proposal of the Government.

How completely it was assumed that Collegiate education would be necessary, and in what point of view in particular it was considered necessary by the Government at that time, will appear plainly from the twelfth and last of the series of questions submitted by our Council to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and from his answer to it in his letter dated November 22nd, 1835.

The twelfth question was, "Is it proposed that the privilege of sending Candidates for Degrees to the University may be conferred on Institutions for education not situated in London or its vicinity?" The answer was, "It will be most desirable, according to my views, that wherever Collegiate or other Institutions are found to exist, whether in London or elsewhere, *if such establishments afford to the public adequate security for good education,* they should be included within the system previously created for the metropolis."

It is manifest that Lord Monteaule thought the Examination of the University would not be of itself a sufficient test of a good education, but that security for good education was to be sought in the good constitution of the teaching bodies.

This is the position which we still maintain; and we think that our Council may with great propriety represent respectfully to the advisers of the Crown, that the system founded upon this most reasonable basis was the subject of express agreement and mutual concession between our College and the Government.

In conclusion, we express our earnest hope that the Council of this College will, by remonstrance with the Senate of the University of London, and, if necessary, by petition, through the Secretary of State, oppose the introduction into the Charter of the University of any clause such as the one now proposed, the natural effect of which must be to injure existing Colleges, to discourage the foundation of new ones, to lower the standard of the degrees, to supersede continuous and systematic study by crude preparation for an examination, and to withdraw Students from that "regular and liberal course of education" which the University was established to promote.

19 June, 1857.

H. C. ROBINSON,
Vice-President.

2. *King's College.*

"The Council of King's College having had their attention directed to the Draft of a New Charter for the University of London, do not consider it within their province to interfere in any way with regulations laid down by the Senate for the management of that University.

"They are desirous, however, to have it distinctly understood, that their silence in regard to the proposed admission of other than members of the affiliated Colleges as Candidates for Degrees is not to be construed into approval thereof, or as implying assent to the change of constitution contemplated.

"Sealed with the Corporate Seal of the Governors and Proprietors of King's College, London, this 23rd day of June, 1857.

"Witness, J. W. CUNNINGHAM,
"Secretary."

"King's College, London,
May 15, 1857.

"MY LORDS AND GENTLEMEN,—Although I have not the honour of being a member of your University, I trust I shall not be looked upon as intruding improperly into your affairs, if, as Principal of King's College, London, I express in earnest

but respectful [terms] my entire disapproval of the proposed alteration in your Charter, wholly abolishing the Collegiate system, so far as it affects the Colleges now affiliated. I believe it to be unjust towards the Colleges, prejudicial to the interests of education, and, if I may say so without offence, derogatory to the character of your University. I beg permission on these grounds to enter my decided protest against the proposed Clause in the new Charter, which is to empower the Senate to admit all persons to be Candidates for Degrees in Arts and Law, on a mere examination without any evidence of previous training.

“It is a more agreeable duty to offer my congratulations to the University of London at large on the great improvement contemplated in the new Charter for giving reality to the action of Convocation.

“I have the honour to be,

“My Lords and Gentlemen,

“Your obedient humble servant,

“*The Senate of the
University of London.*”

“R. W. JELF, D.D.,

“*Principal.*”

“We the undersigned, Professors and Lecturers of King's College, London, deeply regretting to learn that the Senate of the University of London contemplates abandoning the Collegiate system, desire to express our opinion that mere Examinations, without evidence that a regular curriculum of study has been followed, are a very insufficient test of education, and we trust that the Senate will be induced to reconsider its decision on this point.

“R. W. BROWNE, M.A., Ph.D., Professor of Classical Literature.

THOMAS G. HALL, M.A., Professor of Mathematics.

E. H. PLUMPTRE, M.A., Chaplain, and Professor of Pastoral Theology.

WILLIAM A. GUY, Professor of Forensic Medicine, King's College, and Dean of the Medical Department.

ARTHUR HENFREY, F.R.S., L.S., Prof. of Botany, King's College, London.

WM. ALLEN MILLER, M.D., V.P.R.S., Prof. of Chemistry.

CHAS. L. BLOXAM, Prof. of Practical Chemistry.

J. J. STEWART PEROWNE, B.D., Lecturer in Divinity and Hebrew.

M. BIGGS, M.A., Lecturer in Divinity.

RICHARD PARTRIDGE, F.R.S., Professor of Anatomy in King's College, London.

ALEX. M'CAUL, D.D., Professor of Hebrew and Divinity.

THOMAS ASTLEY COCK, M.A., Lecturer on Mathematics.

CHARLES ELSEE, B.A., Classical Lecturer.
 R. HORTON SMITH, B.A., Classical Lecturer.
 THOS. RYMER JONES, Prof. of Comp. Anat. in
 King's Coll., London.
 GEORGE JOHNSON, M.D., Professor of Materia Me-
 dica and Therapeutics in King's College.
 J. S. BREWER, M.A., Prof. of English Literature,
 King's College, London.
 CHARLES H. PEARSON, M.A., Prof. of Modern His-
 tory, King's College, London.
 RICHARD C. TRENCH, D.D., Professor of Divinity,
 King's College.
 G. BUDD, M.D., Professor of Medicine, King's Coll.
 LIONEL S. BEALE, Professor of Physiology, King's
 College, London."

3. *Queen's College, Belfast.*

"Queen's College, Belfast,
 23rd June, 1857.

"SIR,—In reply to your communication of the 10th instant, containing a copy of the amended Draft Charter of the University of London, we beg leave to state, that having carefully perused that document, we consider its provisions to be generally favourable to the encouragement of learning, with the exception of the 36th Clause, which contemplates the possible admission to University Degrees of persons not educated in any Institution connected with a University. We are of opinion that attendance on a systematic course of Collegiate instruction ought to form, as it has hitherto done, an essential part of University education, and that no system of Pass Examination for Degrees could be devised, which would allow such Collegiate instruction to be safely dispensed with.

"In the University of Dublin, it is true, Degrees may be obtained without residence, on passing a certain number of Examinations, in each year of the Undergraduate course; but, at the same time, it ought to be known that a large proportion of the Students of that University have always been resident, and subject to a strict course of College discipline and instruction. It will also be found, on reference to the Report of the Dublin University Commission, that even this limited amount of non-residence is deemed objectionable by some of the most distinguished members of that University; and the recent changes that have been made in the Undergraduate course have been evidently framed with the view of encouraging residence, and attendance on College lectures.

"In the Queen's Colleges in Ireland, Students in Arts are required to attend at least two of the three terms into which the Session is divided; and the Undergraduate course extends

over three years. In the Belfast College a comparatively small number of these students avail themselves even of this limited permission, and these are generally among the least meritorious students of the College.

“For these reasons, while recognizing the importance of allowing full liberty of action to the Senate, we are of opinion that it ought not to be invested with powers which could not be exercised without serious injury to the highest interests of academic learning throughout the United Kingdom.

“P. SHULDHAM HENRY, *President.*

“THOMAS ANDREWS, *Vice-President.*

“H. CARLILL, *Professor of Anatomy and Physiology.*”

4. *Queen's College, Galway.*

“At a Meeting of the Council of the Queen's College, Galway, held on the 13th of June, a Committee, consisting of the Vice-President, Professors Bayley, A.M., Moffett, LL.D., Blood, A.B., and Wm. Lupton, Esq., A.M., the Registrar, was appointed to deliberate upon the proposed New Charter for the University of London, and to report upon it, in order that their views might be transmitted by the President to the Senate of the University of London.

“The Committee met upon Saturday the 20th of June, and at an adjourned meeting held upon Monday the 22nd June, the following Report was agreed upon:—

““This Committee, having before it the proposed Draft Charter for the University of London, and having carefully considered the 36th Clause, is unanimously of opinion that the changes therein contained will, if carried into effect, prove detrimental to the cause of Systematic education; such changes being, it is believed, inconsistent with the nature of the system of University Education which has hitherto prevailed in this country, and calculated to alter the very meaning of a University Degree. For these and other reasons the Committee desires to express the strongest dissent from that clause, and ventures to hope that it may not finally be adopted.

“At the same time, however, the Committee is of opinion that the provisions contained in the 41st Clause, for the purpose of enabling the Senate of the University of London to grant Certificates of Proficiency in several departments of knowledge, are most salutary, and calculated to provide for the extension of Middle Class Education.”

“Queen's College, Galway,
22nd June, 1857.”

5. *St. Cuthbert's College, Ushaw.*

"We, the President and Professors of St. Cuthbert's College, Ushaw, are of opinion that the abandonment of the Collegiate system in the New Charter of the London University will totally change the nature and impair the value of the University Degree, and therefore hope that the Senate may be induced to reconsider its decision upon this clause of the Charter.

"CHARLES NEWSHAM, D.D., *President.*
 FRANCIS WILKINSON, B.A., *Vice-President.*
 JAMES CHADWICK, *Prof.*
 JOHN GILLOW, *Prof.*
 HENRY MARSLAND, *Prof.*
 THOMAS TATLOCK, *Prof.*
 PHILIP VAVASOUR, *Prof.*
 JOSEPH MENNALL, *Prof.*
 WILLIAM WRENNALL, B.A., *Prof.*
 THOMAS CROSKELL, *Prof.*
 CHARLES GILLOW, *Prof.*"

"St. Cuthbert's College, Durham,
 July 3rd, 1857."

6. *Stonyhurst College.*

"July 9th.

"MY DEAR SIR,—We have attentively considered the proposed Charter, which you kindly forwarded, and as we are interested in the success of the University, would wish to lay before the Senate one or two observations which suggest themselves, but which will probably have already come under their consideration.

"I. The extended facility of graduating afforded by the new Charter, if it draw to the University a larger number of Candidates, may also exert an influence on the examinations; as Examiners might feel inclined to lower the standard rather than reject many Candidates. Is sufficient security provided against this danger?

"II. With regard to the 33rd clause of the new Charter, is it expedient to fix the term during which Examiners may hold office? Might it not be left to the discretion of the Senate to avail themselves of the services of Examiners who discharge their duties to the satisfaction of all concerned, if they see sufficient reason for so doing?

"III. If it be determined that Examiners shall not hold office longer than four years, as each new appointment may introduce some variation in the style of the examinations, are any measures proposed to secure such an amount of uniformity as candidates have a right to look for?

"I shall be much obliged, dear Sir, if you will kindly lay these remarks before the Senate.

"Your obedient servant,

"P. GALLWEY."

"*To the Registrar
of the University of London.*"

7. *Manchester New College.*

"*To the Senate of the University of London.*"

"We, the undersigned, being the Principal, Professors, and Visitor of Manchester New College, one of the Academical Institutions affiliated to the University of London, desire to lay before the Senate of that University the grounds of our objections to a proposed part of the New Charter.

"Under the present Charter, a Candidate for the Degree of B.A. is required to present a Certificate of Two Years' continued study (with good conduct) at some Institution affiliated to this University. The power of granting this Certificate is conferred only on such Academical and Collegiate Institutions as have exhibited proofs that their course of study is calculated to prepare candidates for graduation, and that sufficient means of instruction are provided for carrying it into execution. Two objects are thus secured: the examination being the test of the amount of knowledge which the candidate possesses; the period of two years being an evidence that he has pursued 'a regular and liberal course of education,' to encourage which, was, according to the preamble of the Charter, the object of the foundation of the University.

"We have been informed that by the proposed Charter the condition of two years' study in an affiliated Institution will be withdrawn, and that in future any one will be able to obtain the Degree of B.A. who can satisfy the Examiners that he possesses a certain amount of knowledge, however or wherever acquired.

"We regard this change as likely to lower greatly in general estimation the Degrees granted by the University of London. They will cease to be a proof that two years have been spent by the Graduate in 'a regular and liberal course of education.' In the judgement of those who understand the true purpose of academical education, they will have less value than those of other Universities, conferred after a prescribed period of study which has been passed either within their precincts or under their superintendence and control. This voluntary depreciation of the honours of the University appears to us not to be in accordance with the promise given at its foundation, that it should not be placed in a disadvantageous position, relatively to older establishments, beyond what was inseparable from its character as a new and unendowed Institution.

“While, for these reasons, we earnestly request that the sanction of the Senate may be withheld from the clause in question, we would express our entire approbation of the proposal to admit, by the New Charter, the Graduates of the University to a participation in the functions of the Senate. We believe that such a measure will have a very beneficial effect in maintaining harmony and good understanding between the affiliated Colleges and the governing body of the University, which, as hitherto constituted, has not possessed adequate means of informing itself of the wants and wishes of these Institutions.

“JOHN KENRICK, *Visitor*.

“JOHN JAMES TAYLER, *Principal*.

“JAMES MARTINEAU, *Professor*.

“G. VANCE SMITH, *Professor*.”

8. *Spring Hill College, Birmingham.*

“Spring Hill College, Birmingham,
June 22, 1857.

“*To the Right Honourable the Chancellor, the Vice-Chancellor,
and the Senate of the University of London.*

“Having been favoured, in accordance with a Resolution of the Senate of June 4th, with a copy of the Draft Charter of the University of London, the Board of Education of Spring Hill College beg to thank the Senate for the opportunity afforded them of expressing their views of the proposed New Charter, so far at least as regards the privileges enjoyed by the affiliated Colleges.

“It does appear to this Board that the thirty-sixth section of the Draft will interfere not merely with the privileges of the Colleges, which this Board would not wish to maintain at the sacrifice of real service to the community, but with the purposes for which institutions of the kind have been set on foot, and have been affiliated; inasmuch as they believe that as valuable a part of the benefit of Collegiate education is found in the more comprehensive and regular training, and in many of the traditional and other social influences which Colleges afford, as in the attainments actually made.

“And while this Board would unfeignedly rejoice in encouragement afforded to general culture by the grant of some suitable testimonial to Scholarship, they cannot but hope that inducements to seek the higher advantages of a regular College course, where such is practicable, will be not at all diminished.

“J. A. JAMES, *Chairman of the Board
of Education*.

“THOMAS R. BARKER, *Heb. and Class.
Tutor*.

“HENRY ROGERS, *Philosophical Tutor*.”

9. *Baptist College, Regent's Park.*

" College, Regent's Park,
June 2nd, 1857.

" To the Rt. Hon. the Chancellor, the Vice-Chancellor, and the Senate of the University of London.

" Having been informed that in the New Charter of the University of London it is proposed to empower the Senate to grant Degrees without requiring Candidates to have passed through any regular Collegiate Course of Instruction, the Committee of the College, Regent's Park, beg to address the Senate in relation to that proposal, and respectfully protest against it, as likely, if effected, to injure the University, and to inflict a serious discouragement on the cause of sound learning.

" To give Degrees on Examination to all who seek them seems a liberal policy, and no doubt it has something at first sight to commend it. But in the judgment of this Committee, such a plan will be unjust to those affiliated Colleges which have arranged at a considerable cost to take Students through the course now prescribed, will loosen the ties that bind Students to existing Institutions, and tend to subvert discipline,—will promote irregular and desultory study, and will by its influence do more in lessening the number of Candidates for Degrees, than will be compensated by accessions from the wider field to which the University will thereby be opened.

" In short, the proposed change will lower the character of the University, deteriorate the education now given in affiliated Colleges, and in the end diminish the number of Graduates. The Committee therefore trust that this intended provision of the New Charter will be withdrawn.

" Signed on behalf of the Committee by

" JOSEPH GURNEY, *Chairman.*

" JOSEPH ANGUS, *President.*"

10. *St. Gregory's College, Downside.*

" St. Gregory's College, Downside,
June 18th, 1857.

" SIR,—I have to thank you for the copy of the proposed New Charter for the University of London, concerning which you informed me that it was intended, before finally recommending it, to ascertain the opinion of the affiliated Colleges.

" I have just held a meeting of the Professors of our College, and we have unanimously agreed in expressing great regret at the matter of § 36, which seems to be a kind of contradiction to what is contained in § 34. For what privilege is there in being affiliated to the University, and why should it be necessary for members of the affiliated Colleges to show a

certificate of their membership, if any person who is not a member of a privileged College has the same advantage?

“This proposal of withdrawing the College test we cannot help viewing as a proposal to destroy the very idea of a University, and as opposed to the great principle of Education. Encouragement is hereby given to self-instruction, which is not education; and those who take their Degrees at the London University may always be suspected of being self-taught, superficially informed, but uneducated persons.

“We are devotedly attached to the Collegiate System. We have had experience enough to know its merits; and we feel assured that the contrast presented between those who have had a College education, and those who have picked up their stock of knowledge in a less systematic manner, is so much in favour of the former, that to offer any encouragement to the contrary method is really injuring the cause which the proposed alteration in the Charter probably intends to benefit.

“We are uniting with the body of Graduates in memorializing the Senate of the University and the Home Office against the change; and we trust that we may have influence enough to avert the evil.

“I have the honour to remain,

“Sir,

“Yours very faithfully,

“JAMES SWEENEY, B.A.,

“President of St. Gregory's, Downside.”

“*Wm. B. Carpenter, Esq.*”

11. *Baptist College, Bristol.*

“At a meeting of the Tutors and Committee of the Bristol Baptist College, held in the Lecture Room on Wednesday Evening, July 1st, 1857, the Rev. Thomas S. Crisp, President, in the Chair,

“It was resolved unanimously,

“That this Committee regards with great satisfaction the intention of Her Majesty's Government to grant to the University of London a New Charter, by which the Graduates are admitted as a constituent part of the body corporate of the University.

“That with regard to the 36th Clause of the proposed Charter, which declares ‘that persons not educated in any of the Institutions connected with the said University shall be admitted as Candidates for Matriculation, and for the respective Degrees of Bachelor, Master and Doctor, to be conferred by the said University of London, on such conditions as the said Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor and Fellows, by regulations in that behalf, shall from time to time determine,’ this Committee is of opinion that such De-

degrees should be, in some way, distinguished from Degrees conferred on those who have passed through a Collegiate course; and farther, that such Graduates should not be admitted as Members of Convocation simply on the ground of having taken any such Degree.

“That a copy of the foregoing resolutions be transmitted to the Registrar of the University, in order to their being laid before the Senate.

(Signed) “THOS. S. CRISP, *President.*”

“Baptist College, Bristol
July 3rd, 1857.”

12. *Presbyterian College, Caermarthen.*

“*To the Senate of the University of London.*”

“We, the undersigned, beg most respectfully to memorialize the Senate of the University of London with respect to Clause 36 in their amended Charter; and to express our strong disapproval of the proposed change.

“We firmly believe that to dispense with a regular course of Collegiate Education as a necessary element in the qualifications for Degrees in Arts and Laws, would not only be injurious to the cause of regular and systematic Education, but would lessen the value of an English University Degree.

“We may be permitted to add, that had the proposal been of a kindred character with that entertained by the Authorities of the University of Oxford to grant such a Degree as A.A., it would have met with our entire approval.

“DAVID LLOYD, LL.D., *Principal.*

“THOMAS NICHOLAS, *Tutor in Divinity and Mental and Moral Philosophy.*

“WM. DAVIES, Ph.D., *Math. Tutor.*”

“Presbyterian College,
Carmarthen, June 16th, 1857.”

13. *Queen's College, Birmingham.*

“At a Meeting of the Council of the Queen's College, Birmingham, held on the 1st of July, 1857,

“The Rev. CHANCELLOR LAW, Vice-Principal, in the Chair,

“A copy of the amended Draft Charter of the University of London was read and considered, and the opinion of the Professors at a previous Meeting of their body was received; when it was resolved to adopt the following Memorial:—

“That the Council finding in the proposed new Charter of the University of London, that persons not educated in any of the Institutions connected with the said University

shall be admitted as Candidates for Matriculation, and to the respective Degrees of Bachelor, Master and Doctor, express their disapproval, considering that mere Examinations without evidence that a regular curriculum of study has been followed, are a very insufficient test of education, and they trust that the Senate will be induced to reconsider its decision on this point.

“ Given under the College Seal this first day of July,
1857.

“ WILLIAM SANDS COX, F.R.S.,
“ *Dean of the Faculty.*”

14. *Western College, Plymouth.*

“ *To the Right Honourable the Chancellor, the Vice-Chancellor,
and the Senate of the London University.*

“ Having understood that it is proposed in the New Charter of the London University, now under consideration, to insert a clause rendering *a regular Collegiate course of Study unnecessary* to Candidates for Degrees in Arts and Laws, the Committee of the Western College, Plymouth, desire to address the Senate in relation to that clause, and respectfully to protest against so serious a change being made in the constitution of the University without the concurrence of the Graduates in Convocation assembled.

“ Signed by order of the Committee,

“ DAVID DERRY, *Chairman.*

“ JOHN M. CHARLTON, M.A.,
President.”

“ Western College,
June 25th, 1857.”

15. *St. Patrick's College, Thurles.*

“ St. Patrick's College, Thurles,
June 24th, 1857.

“ SIR,—I have read the papers so kindly forwarded to me by you from the London University. Their substance is—that it is intended to grant the University a New Charter, which is thought objectionable, as it does not require Collegiate education in those who may present themselves as Candidates for Degrees in any department of knowledge, an only exception being made in the Medical Degree. I was thinking to give a general adhesion to your views, which must be well formed in all that regards the honour and welfare of the University. This I continue to do, while I submit my own views on the matter to your correction, and the superior judgment of the

Graduates of the London University. At this distance, and with the knowledge I possess, I judge there should be no Collegiate character required by any University to qualify one for its Degrees. Knowledge, however acquired, should be the test and qualification to Honours in Science and Arts. It is only a few that can, with ease, devote themselves to a formal and systematic following of Collegiate education. The wealthy alone can afford it. The poor student can only endure it. An University, then, in my mind, should nurse and foster talent in all, by placing its honours and distinctions to be the prize of mind and judgment regardless of the mode of development or formation. This it was in practice, at first, when youth was sheltered and educated with the sole view of learning and its diffusion. As this benevolence of the early patrons of knowledge is impracticable in these days of progress and diffusiveness, I should wish that no restriction, in speculation or practice, be put on knowledge; that its acknowledgment and value be limited by its absence, and not by the shade or colour of its presence. As the University of London was founded on broad popular grounds, what I deem meet in all, I judge peculiarly befitting the London University;—that what all Universities confer on distinguished men of every nation with delight, may not be refused or denied any one of this great Empire, should it be sought by a proof of due acquirement in knowledge. This liberality can neither injure the quality of a Degree, provided the test to the participation of the honours be even and trying, nor the endurance and success of Collegiate training, as society will always supply numbers that can never be otherwise educated or trained.

“Such being my private views on the subject of the papers which I have the honour to have received from the University of London, I beg leave to submit them, through you, to the notice of your Society, with an assurance of my reliance on the high motives which influence it in defence of the interests, welfare, and honour of the University of London.

“I have the honour to be,

“Sir,

“Your obedient servant,

“EDMOND RYAN, *President.*”

“*W. B. Carpenter, Esq., M.D.*”

16. *Bedford Grammar School.*

“Bedford Charity Office,

The Schools, Bedford, July 2nd, 1857.

“SIR,—I am directed by the Trustees of the Harpur Charity to correct the description of the Bedford Schools termed in your Amended Draft Charter as the ‘Bedford Grammar School’ as the ‘Bedford Harpur Schools:’ this is necessary, as there are other schools besides the Grammar School that

belong to this Charity, and which have had pupils who have already graduated at your University.

“The Trustees have no other suggestion to make.

“I have the honour to be,

“Sir,

“Your obedient servant,

“W. W. KILPIN,

“Mayor.”

“W. B. Carpenter, Esq., M.D.,
&c. &c. &c.”

17. *Trevecca College.*

“*To the Senate of the University of London.*”

“The humble Memorial of the Committee of Trevecca College, in reference to the proposed New Charter for the University, sheweth that,—

“Whereas your Memorialists have received a copy of the ‘Amended Draft Charter,’ as settled by the Senate, and their Resolutions respecting it; and while they would testify their grateful satisfaction at the high privilege and honour of being affiliated to the ‘University of London,’ which has already operated beneficially upon their Institution; your Memorialists would humbly but earnestly beg to express their disapproval of, and request the Senate not to adopt, *Clause 36*, which gives power to admit candidates to examination for the Arts’ Degrees without any College Certificate;—as being a change which they regard as likely to be injurious to the cause of regular and systematic education; and, by abandoning the present *Collegiate character* of the University in admitting persons to Degrees in Arts and Laws, who have never undergone any Collegiate training, to lower the value of a University Degree.

“Signed on behalf of the Committee,

“DAVID CHARLES,

“*President.*”

18. *Springfield College, Ennis.*

“Springfield College, Ennis,
June 28th, 1857.

“I have read the ‘Amended Draft Charter as adopted by the Senate’ of the London University, forwarded to me by the Registrar, and in reference to which I beg leave to submit the following remarks:—

“It appears to me that the 36th Section, by which it is ordained that Degrees may be conferred on those who have not been educated in any of the affiliated Institutions, is objectionable on many grounds. I am of opinion that it would tend to overthrow the Collegiate system of education, and thereby inflict a serious injury on society.

"It is quite unnecessary for me to draw attention to the many advantages of the regular Collegiate system of education over the 'cramming system,' which the 'Amended Charter' (if adopted in its entirety) is likely to bring into general operation.

"I am again of opinion that the contemplated change will bring a London University Degree into disrepute. If the 36th Section were left out, I am sure the Charter would be received by all in a spirit of thankfulness.

" P. FITZSIMON, *Principal.*"

" *To the Senate of the
London University.*"

19. *Queen's College, Liverpool.*

"At a Meeting of the Senate of Queen's College; Liverpool, held July 7th, 1857,

"The Resolution of the Senate of the University of London, contained in Dr. Carpenter's letter of the 10th ultimo, together with the Draft Charter to which such Resolution refers, having been read and considered,

"It was unanimously resolved, that the following be respectfully addressed to the Senate of the University, viz. :—

"The Senate of Queen's College, while painfully alive to the disadvantages arising from the few inducements hitherto held out in this country to the study of Literature and Science, view with satisfaction the increasing attention given of late by the public to this important subject; and from the gratifying fact of the Senate of the University of London having come forward in such a cause, they hope much may be done towards raising the general character of Education in our native land to a par with the position it occupies in any of the Continental States.

"They view, however, with extreme regret, that in the manifesto put forth by the influential body above referred to, the superior value of Collegiate or University education seems to have been overlooked, and a measure contemplated which must necessarily strengthen that character of exclusiveness attaching to the older Universities of this kingdom, which the public were given to understand was, if not to be removed, at least to be very considerably modified, by the establishment of the London University.

"The Senate of Queen's College need scarcely remind the distinguished body whom they have the honour of addressing, that self-instruction, however meritorious, however deserving of encouragement and of being rewarded by a Literary or Scientific status, cannot have any pretensions to a comparison with University education, neither can it expect, still less be entitled to, those Literary or Scientific distinctions that are associated with the latter system.

“The Senate of Queen’s College must not be supposed to underrate the importance of knowledge acquired from books or from private instruction. In their opinion, however, education can only be carried out, so as to realize the greatest advantage for the student, and for that society of which he is a member, by regular Collegiate or University training, by the mutual intercourse between mind and mind,—by the comparison and balancing of conflicting opinions,—but, above all, by a reference to, and interchange of thought with, the *living teacher*,—in whose hands books, as a record of facts and truths, become invaluable instruments, and the powerful means of diffusing an amount of knowledge, which, apart from his assistance and guidance, they cannot of themselves yield.

“While then the Senate of Queen’s College wish to see additional efforts made to promote University education, and to raise its character, rather than any attempts calculated to impair its efficiency or attractiveness, they would suggest that a distinct title be conferred upon those who, by private industry and perseverance, have attained results deserving of an honourable notice.

“Signed on behalf of the Senate,

“HENRY GRIFFITHS,

“*Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Laws.*

“ASTRUP CARISS, *Secretary.*”

“Queen’s College, Liverpool,
July 8th, 1857.”

20. “*The Memorial of the Principal and Lecturers of Sydenham College**, Birmingham,

“Sheweth,—

“That your Memorialists learn from the Draft Charter lately adopted by the Senate of the University of London, that it shall be no longer necessary to require from Candidates for Degrees in Arts and Laws certificates of Studentship at a College affiliated to the University.

“That your Memorialists learn with deep concern that a change in the constitution of the University is thus contemplated, which, in their opinion, will affect the very meaning of a Degree, and lower its value in public estimation, and will operate as a serious discouragement of that ‘regular and liberal education,’ to promote which is declared to be the object of the University.

“That such a change will tend seriously to interfere with the maintenance of College discipline.

“That while your Memorialists rejoice to see in the scheme of the Oxford Middle-Class Examinations evidences of a desire on the part of the ancient Universities to meet the increasing

* This College is one of the Institutions from which the University receives Certificates in Medicine, but it is not affiliated for Arts and Laws.

educational demands of the age, and to extend the sphere of their influence and their usefulness, and would cordially welcome the establishment of any similar system in the University of London, they see in the Oxford scheme a strong additional argument against the plan now proposed by the Senate, which, in their opinion, would tend to destroy the distinction carefully preserved by Oxford between Academic and non-Academic honours, and to place the London Degree in the same category with the distinction of the Oxford Associates of Arts, which is professedly inferior to the academical Degree.

“Your Memorialists therefore respectfully pray that the above-mentioned provisions of the Draft Charter may be withdrawn.

“BELL FLETCHER, M.D., Principal and Lecturer on Medicine, Physician to the Birmingham General Hospital.

FRANCIS ELKINGTON, M.D., Lecturer on Midwifery, &c., and Consulting Accoucheur to the Lying-in Hospital.

ALFRED BAKER, F.R.C.S., Lecturer on Surgery, and Surgeon to the Birmingham General Hospital.

FROWD JONES, M.R.C.S.E., Lecturer on Anatomy.

FREDERIC WESTCOTT, A.L.S., Lecturer on Botany.

JAMES RUSSELL, M.D., Lecturer on General Pathology.

V. W. BLAKE, F.R.C.S., Lecturer on Midwifery, and Surgeon to the Lying-in Hospital.

JOHN WHITE KEYWORTH, M.D., Lecturer on Physiology.

WM. C. ORFORD, Lecturer on For. Med., and Medical Officer to the Birmingham and Midland Counties Lying-in Hospital.

GEORGE ELKINGTON, M.R.C.S., Lecturer on Anatomy, and Surgeon to the General Institution for the Blind.

DAVID JOHNSON, M.R.C.S., Lecturer on Anatomy.”

21. *Owens College, Manchester.**

“*To the Senate of the University of London.*”

“June 25th, 1857.

“We, the undersigned Professors in Owens College, Manchester, desire to express the great satisfaction with which we

* This Memorial was not received until after the Senate had determined upon its Report.

had learnt that it was the intention of the Senate of the University of London to apply to the Crown for a new Charter incorporating the Graduates into the University; believing that the incorporation, besides fulfilling the reasonable expectations of the Graduates, held out a promise of great advantages both to the University and to the affiliated Colleges, from the more intimate connexion which could not fail to follow.

“We observe however with great regret, that in the draft of a new Charter which has been courteously forwarded to us by the Senate, though the clauses (34 and 35) enumerating the Colleges already affiliated, and providing for the affiliation of new Colleges, are retained, the spirit of the original constitution of the University is entirely changed by the introduction of clause 36, which empowers the Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor, and Fellows to admit, on conditions which are not indicated, as Candidates for Degrees in Arts and Laws, persons not educated in any of the Institutions connected with the University.

“We are bound to declare our deliberate and unanimous opinion to be opposed to this change, as tending to discountenance ‘a regular and liberal course of education’ (clause 2), as altering the value and meaning of the Degrees affected, and as disappointing our expectations of advantages to be derived, under the new Charter, both to the system of education pursued in the Colleges, and to the mode of examination pursued by the University.

“We would further point out that, in our opinion, whatever evils have attended on the Collegiate system, as hitherto followed by the University, are due to the imperfect development of the principle, and may be readily removed by the power to be conferred (under clause 35) of ‘from time to time altering, varying, and amending the list of Institutions in connexion with the said University. And that the end probably contemplated in the introduction of the new clause—that of ‘promoting useful knowledge’ (clause 2), may be fully attained by granting certificates of proficiency in sundry branches of knowledge, as proposed in clause 41, or even by conferring a diploma, with a distinct designation, on some such plan as that recently adopted by the University of Oxford.

[Signed] “A. J. SCOTT.
J. G. GREENWOOD.
ARCH. SANDEMAN.
F. FRANKLAND.
W. C. WILLIAMSON.
RICH^d COPLEY CHRISTIE.”

22. *Graduates' Committee.*

"To the Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor, and Fellows of the University of London.

"The Graduates' Committee have attentively considered the Amended Draft Charter, adopted by the Senate on the 4th June, 1857, a copy of which has been transmitted to them by the Registrar, and they avail themselves of the opportunity which the Senate has given them to submit to the Senate the views of the Graduates thereupon.

"By the 36th Clause it is proposed to admit as Candidates for the respective Degrees of Bachelor, Master, and Doctor, on such conditions as the Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor and Fellows, by regulations in that behalf, shall from time to time determine, persons not educated in any of the Institutions connected with the University.

"By the 37th Clause it is proposed, 'for the improvement of Medical Education,' that no persons shall be admitted as Candidates for the respective Degrees of Bachelor of Medicine or Doctor of Medicine, unless they shall satisfy the said Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor and Fellows that such persons have, in any one or more of the Institutions or Schools to be approved by the Senate, and the Secretary of State, completed the course of instruction which the Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor and Fellows by regulation in that behalf shall determine.

"The effect of these two clauses is the same as if the 36th had been made to refer in express terms to the case of Degrees in Arts and Laws only.

"Against this change in the constitution of the University, the Graduates' Committee feel it their duty respectfully, but most earnestly, to protest. In their opinion it would not only alter the meaning, but would lower the character of the Degrees, would operate as a direct discouragement to that 'pursuit of a regular and liberal course of education,' to the encouragement of which the 2nd Clause of the Draft Charter expressly alludes, and would be an act of injustice to the Graduates at large, as well as to some of the Colleges.

"The Committee beg further to represent, that whatever reasons exist for making a course of systematic study indispensable to the attainment of a Degree in Medicine, apply with still greater force to Degrees in Arts. The nature of Medical Studies is such, that it would be all but impossible so to prosecute them, as to succeed in passing the Examinations of the University without regular and satisfactory training, while in the case of Degrees in Arts it would be a hopeless task to seek to ascertain by any small number of Examinations, such as alone could be practicable in the University of London, the possession of that moderate, but sound, proficiency in a variety of subjects belonging to Literature and Elementary Science, which the Degree of B.A. ought to attest.

“The Committee nevertheless wish to be understood, that they can conceive of individual and exceptional cases, in which, on cause shown, the requirement of a College Certificate might be waived, without serious prejudice. They beg to remind the Senate that they introduced a suggestion to this effect into their Scheme, submitted in the year 1849, and from the spirit of that suggestion they have no desire to depart.

“The Committee have understood that much weight has been attached to the argument, that Institutions have been affiliated to the University of London which have no title to the rank or character of Colleges, and that therefore its Collegiate system is no longer worth preserving. While they are unfortunately unable to deny that there are some Institutions in this position, they would remind the Senate that those Institutions are as yet so few, and that the number of Graduates who have proceeded from them is so insignificant, that the Collegiate character of the University has not hitherto been materially impaired from this cause. They feel, therefore, that while such affiliations suggest the necessity of scrutinizing more closely for the future the nature of the Institutions applying to the Secretary of State for letters of affiliation, they cannot with justice or propriety be appealed to as affording grounds for the abandonment of the Collegiate constitution of the University.

“The Committee observe that Clause 34 reaffiliates *nomina-tim* the Colleges at present affiliated, and that Clause 35 provides the machinery for future affiliations ; but if it was really intended thereby to convey a recognition of the Collegiate principle as the normal principle of the University, the Committee must regard these provisions as wholly inadequate for the purpose, inasmuch as under Clause 36 Candidates will be receivable without College Certificates.

“The Committee are obliged to call the attention of the Senate to the fact, that the grave question to which the foregoing observations refer has been raised now for the first time at the very close of the ample and protracted discussions which have taken place with respect to the New Charter ; and that at the time when it had been supposed by all parties that the bases of the New Charter had been finally agreed upon, and that matters of detail alone remained unsettled, it is now proposed to withdraw from Convocation on the eve of its establishment the question beyond all others affecting most vitally the character of the University and the position of the Graduates. The Committee, on the part of the Graduates whom they represent, feel bound to remonstrate respectfully but firmly against the injustice of such a course.

“The Committee have to state, for the information of the Senate, that they have taken special care to ascertain the views of the Graduates in general with respect to this important subject. At the recent Annual Meeting of the Graduates, held in the Freemasons' Hall on the 5th May last, a Resolution was

carried, on a division of 84 to 37, expressive of the 'disapproval and alarm' entertained by the Meeting of 'the contemplated renunciation by the Senate of the principle of Collegiate Education in Arts and Laws,' and of their opinion that such a measure was 'a serious blow to regular and systematic education, and calculated to lower the value of London Degrees.'

"The Committee cannot but feel that the present moment is one at which the proposal which they are discussing is peculiarly unfortunate. The University of Oxford has already established, and the University of Cambridge is understood to be about to establish, a system under which non-Collegiate persons shall be admitted to examination, and shall receive marks of distinction of an appropriate nature, but perfectly different from the academic titles which are felt to belong only to academically educated persons. To any similar plan on the part of the University of London, the Committee, as representing what they believe to be the views of the Graduates, would be far from offering any objection. But they would remind the Senate that the most serious exception which has been taken to the projected title of A.A., is that it bears too close a resemblance to the wholly different distinction of the B.A. Degree, and it appears to be very doubtful whether the University of Cambridge will not insist upon a title less liable to be confounded with the superior title. The Senate of the University of London proposes to inaugurate a system closely analogous to that of the Oxford Middle-Class Examinations, and to mark the successful non-Collegiate Candidates (very nearly the same class as the Oxford A.A.'s) by the academic title of B.A.

"It is known to the Committee that some of the external supporters of the proposed change argue in its favour that the University of London must not expect, and ought not to attempt to stand in a position of equality in any respect with the ancient Universities. Could such a theory be admitted, it appears to the Committee that the ancient and recognized academic titles ought to be altogether abandoned for new and more appropriate distinctions. But they trust that a view so fatal to the honour and position of their University, and so utterly at variance with the letter and with the spirit of the assurances given at its establishment, is one that will never be entertained by the body to whom the interests of the University are entrusted by the Crown.

"The Committee observe with great satisfaction that the Senate have inserted in the Amended Draft Charter fresh and large powers of revising from time to time the list of affiliated Colleges, and they tender to the Senate their respectful acknowledgements for having thus urged upon the Crown a most important improvement on the existing Charter. They beg to call the attention of the Senate to what is no doubt an oversight in the wording of the Draft, namely that the import-

ant power of amending the list of connected Institutions 'by striking out or by adding' is not expressly reserved with respect to the General Colleges, as it is with respect to the Medical Institutions; and they trust that with regard to the former, powers of revision fully as ample as those which concern the latter may be reserved to the Senate."

"Graduates' Committee Room,
8 Bedford Row,
June 1857."

23. *Memorial of 531 Graduates.*

"To the Chancellor, the Vice-Chancellor, and Fellows of the University of London.

"The Memorial of the undersigned Graduates of the University,

"Sheweth,—

"That the undersigned beg respectfully to express the deep regret with which they have learned that it is proposed to insert in the Charter now under consideration provisions rendering it unnecessary for the Senate to require from Candidates for Degrees in Arts and Laws Certificates of their having completed a Course of Instruction at any College or Institution connected with the University.

"That in the opinion of the undersigned such a modification of the Charter would effect a most important and detrimental change in the constitution of the University to which they belong, would alter the meaning and lower the character of the University Degrees, and be injurious to the pursuit of that 'regular and liberal education,' for the encouragement of which the Charter itself declares that the University was founded.

"That at all events a change so seriously affecting the significance of London Degrees ought not in the opinion of the undersigned to be made, except with the assent of the Graduates in Convocation assembled.

"The undersigned therefore humbly pray that the new Charter may be allowed to pass in such a form as will be consistent with the opinions expressed in the Memorial.

"[Signed by—Doctors of Laws 2
Masters of Arts 46
Doctors of Medicine 64
Bachelors of Laws 41
Bachelors of Medicine 57
Bachelors of Arts 321

[*Inclosed with the foregoing Memorial.*]

" 4 New Square, Lincoln's Inn, W.C.,
15th July, 1857.

" SIR,—I beg to transmit to you the Memorial of the Graduates corrected, and as far as possible with a complete list of signatures.

" Not including two names for which I am unable to find vouchers, and which I have distinguished by a note of interrogation (although I have no doubt that authority to append them was given), there are now 531 signatures in all, or according to the Degrees,

LL.D.	2
M.A.	46
M.D.	64
LL.B.	41
M.B.	57
B.A.	321

531

" About 870 copies were sent out, but it is not likely that more than 800 of these can have reached their destination.

" You will find eight names distinguished by asterisks. I believe these to have been appended with reference to the third paragraph only; but even of these, several do not profess to have made up their minds that the former part of the Memorial is such as they would dissent from.

" I would beg to draw attention to the fact that 16 of the 25 University Scholars in Arts, 9 of the 13 University Scholars in Law, 15 of the 32 University Scholars in Medicine, and 42 of the 74 Masters of Arts, have signed the Memorial without qualification.

" I transmit to you the authorities to append signatures which we have received, but I should be obliged by your returning them to me after checking, as they contain addresses and memoranda which we desire to keep.

" I remain, Sir,

" Your very obedient servant,

" T. SMITH OSLER, LL.B.,

" *Hon. Sec.*"

" *W. B. Carpenter, Esq., M.D., F.R.S.,
Registrar.*"

" *Statement of Facts and Arguments, circulated by authority of
the Graduates' Committee.*"

" In order that the real position of this question may be understood, it is necessary to recapitulate very briefly some of the leading facts in the history of the University.

“ In the year 1835, during the short administration of Sir R. Peel, the House of Commons addressed the Crown, praying that a Charter of Incorporation, with power to confer Degrees (such Charter having been actually framed in the year 1831 by the then Law Officers of the Crown), might be granted to University College, London, then called the London University.

“ Soon after the formation of the succeeding Administration, under Lord Melbourne, communications took place between the Council of the College and Mr. Spring Rice (now Lord Monteagle) as representing the Government, which resulted in the acceptance by the College of a Collegiate Charter only, and in the foundation of a University of London, empowered by its Charter to confer, after examination, Degrees in Arts and Laws on persons having a certain qualification.

“ That qualification was the possession of a certificate from University College, or King's College, or such other institution, corporate or incorporated, then or thereafter to be established within the United Kingdom*, as should be authorized in that behalf under the Sign Manual, that the candidate had completed the course of instruction which the Senate of the University should, by regulation, determine.

“ Corresponding powers were given to confer Degrees in Medicine upon candidates producing certificates of the completion of a course of instruction (to be determined by similar regulations) in authorized Schools ; with this important difference, however, that in the case of Medical Institutions, the authority to grant Certificates was to be conferred, *and might from time to time be revoked*, upon the recommendation of the Senate.

“ For the first few years, during which nearly all of the more important non-medical Colleges were affiliated, there is no trace on the minutes of the Senate of any reference to that body respecting the propriety of affiliation. From the year 1845, however, the usual course at the Home Office has been to transmit to the Senate the information and testimonials furnished by Colleges desiring affiliation, and to act on the report made by the Senate.

“ Thirty-eight of these Colleges and Institutions have now been affiliated, without reckoning the Universities of the United Kingdom and of Dublin, whose members are empowered by Supplemental Charter to be candidates for London Degrees.

“ In the year 1848, the Graduates, who then numbered between four and five hundred, began to solicit incorporation, and a voice in University affairs. After a very long struggle, the bases of a new Charter, intended to confer these rights, appeared to be finally settled between the Senate, the Home Office, and the Graduates, in the year 1856. The number of

* This limitation has been since extended by supplemental Charter so as to include the colonies.

the Graduates has, in the meantime, reached to upwards of one thousand.

“One of the chief points for which the Graduates had contended was, that they should have such a position in the University as to enable them to prevent the surrender of an existing, or the acceptance of a new Charter. They felt that they were the persons who must necessarily have the strongest and most sensitive interest in preserving the character of the Degrees; and that it would be most unjust to make sweeping alterations in the University constitution, involving great changes in the very meaning of the Degrees conferred, without the assent of those who had graduated on the faith of an existing system.

“The justice of these arguments has hitherto been acknowledged on all hands, and in the year 1856, the Law Officers of the Crown submitted a Draft Charter to the Senate, retaining in every respect the old constitution of the University, except in so far as was necessary to confer the desired corporate position and powers on the Graduates. The provisions for this object empowered them, henceforward, to nominate a list from which the Crown should select one-fourth of the Senate, and to interpose a veto upon any changes in the chartered constitution of the University; though in all cases where the Senate and the Convocation agreed, such changes might be made with the co-operation of the Crown.

“Towards the end of the year 1856, however, when it was supposed that questions of detail alone remained for discussion, a Select Committee of the Senate resolved on recommending the omission from the new Charter of all mention of general Colleges (even of University and King's Colleges), and the adoption of a form of Charter which should leave the qualifications of Candidates for Degrees in Arts and Laws at the discretion of the Senate. The form of the proposal of the Committee of the Senate was, that persons should be admitted as candidates for other than Medical Degrees, on such conditions as the Senate, by regulations in that behalf, should from time to time determine, subject to the approval of the Secretary of State.

“Enough has transpired respecting the subsequent proceedings of the Senate, to show that a large majority of that body are at present disposed to concur in the views of their Committee, though it is understood that the retention of the right of the present Colleges to grant certificates will not be objected to, provided that the Senate has the power of admitting candidates without any College Certificate.

“It is clear that this apparent concession to the Colleges, though it may remove a legal difficulty from the path of the Senate, makes no difference whatever as to the Collegiate or non-Collegiate character of the University.

“It is remarkable that no change has been proposed with

reference to Medical Degrees, and it is understood that, as respecting these, the Senate fully feel the force of the argument, that a Degree should be evidence of a course of training, as well as of the capacity to pass an examination, and are even sensitively alive to the dangers with which such a change would be fraught, not only to the character and estimation of the London Degrees, but to the welfare of the public at large.

“The proposed change is avowedly intended to transform the University, as regards other than Medical Degrees, into a University of mere examinations; and although, if such a change were allowed to take effect, it might still be possible, by memorializing the Secretary of State, to hinder the passing of any regulations of the Senate, except such as would restore the College system, it is obviously the straightforward course of action to protest against the change *in limine*.

“A resolution passed by more than two-thirds of the votes of the Graduates present at their late Ordinary Annual Meeting (a meeting most numerously attended), having unequivocally condemned the renunciation of the Collegiate principle as a serious blow to regular and systematic education, it becomes the duty of the Committee appointed at that meeting to promulgate the reasons upon which so strong an opinion is founded.

“The previous attainment of the Degree of Bachelor of Arts is the indispensable condition of proceeding to the Degree of Master, and to the Degrees in Laws; and the College certificates are only required on the occasion of becoming candidate for the Bachelor's Degree. The whole question, therefore, relates to the conditions on which candidates for the Degree of B.A. shall be admitted.

“The Degree of B.A. has always been appropriated in England to distinguish the ordinary class of men who have received a general academical education. It is no high honour intended to attest unusual industry, still less to indicate high intellectual pre-eminence. If the examination for this Degree were made so difficult as to exclude all but exceptional men, the whole character of the distinction would be altered, and another name ought to be adopted to show that those who have attained it are something more than what men in general understand as mere Bachelors of Arts. The body of Bachelors of Arts, however, have characteristics quite as definite as those which distinguish the holders of high University honours, among whom the Masters and Doctors of the University of London must be classed. The existence of the Collegiate test (when applied *bonâ fide*) necessarily produces the result that an overwhelming proportion of Bachelors of Arts are men who have devoted the first years of manhood after leaving school, and before engaging in the narrowing pursuits of life (professional or other), to the exclusive pursuit of general literary and scientific culture in educational institutions adapted to their

time of life. The average ages of the candidates in the University of London have in different years varied from twenty-one years to twenty-three years and ten months. Whatever opinions may be entertained as to the relative mental superiority of those so educated, it is undeniable that they form a very marked class. They are emphatically, and as distinguished from all others, the class who have pursued 'a regular and liberal course of education,' and the preamble of the Charter (left untouched by the Senate) states, that *encouragement* for pursuing such course of education is the very object for which the University was founded. It is equally certain that the stamp of a University Degree is universally accepted in England as denoting that the holder belongs to this class. The Degree derives its value and its meaning from a double test—the Examination test and the College test. It is proposed that in future it shall be no attestation of the holder being an academically educated man, or of anything more than that he has passed two or three not very difficult examinations.

“The difference between an examination for Honours, which, in cases of very severe examination, does detect extraordinary proficiency, and the pass examination for the Degree of B.A., must be borne in mind. The perfection to which ‘cramming’ is carried renders it a most difficult problem to ascertain by one or two examinations alone the possession of that moderate but sound proficiency in a variety of subjects belonging to literature and elementary science, which an ordinarily well-educated man ought to possess. Even if it could be so ascertained, many most important practical distinctions between such a man academically educated, and one equally well informed but not academically educated, would still remain. Mere application to books, creditable as it may be, produces a class differing essentially from those who have passed several years of early manhood in a regular course of systematic training in seats of learning, which, by bringing together a number of young and fresh minds, afford influences and advantages which nothing else can supply, and which are not less valuable than the mere opportunities of study.

“It may be unobjectionable, and even highly desirable, to grant certificates implying that the holder has passed a given examination. The Society of Arts is successfully devoting itself to this object. But a University Degree in Arts is a distinction carrying a separate significance of its own, which it is important to preserve, and which the changes now proposed would obliterate.

“In fact, much of the support which the propositions of the Senate (so far as they have been supported) have received, depends upon certain suppositions, as to matters of fact, which it is necessary to examine with some particularity.

“In the first place, it is said that Dublin Degrees stand high, although Collegiate residence is not required, and a large

number of Under-Graduates are actually non-resident. But every wholly non-resident candidate is obliged to come to Dublin twice a year, and pass two severe and progressive examinations per annum for four years. By recent regulations, partial residence is permitted, and the candidate need only pass one examination per annum, if he has spent upwards of two months within the year in close attendance on lectures at Trinity College. As long as he is a candidate, he has to pay an annual fee (not less, it is believed, than fifteen pounds), so that a substantial guarantee for general continuity of study is obtained. The practical result is pretty effectually to secure exclusive and continuous devotion to study, and, indirectly, limits the class of Graduates to men beginning life. But similar safeguards, to anything like the same extent, are out of the question in the University of London. The expense of frequent travelling from all parts of the United Kingdom would deter Students from resorting to a University presenting so few pecuniary or other extrinsic advantages as the University of London; while the University would be wanting in pecuniary resources to support so great a multiplication of examinations. It is believed that no system, really carrying out the Dublin principle, is contemplated by the Senate, or even supposed practicable in the University of London.

“It is also urged that the proposed changes would bring the conditions of candidateship in Arts and Laws nearer to those which obtain in the Faculty of Medicine. This, however, is an entire mistake. In Medicine, the number and the subjects of the courses of Lectures which candidates are to go through are prescribed by regulation, and the schools recognized are all *bonâ fide* establishments for the professional training of adults in special sciences. In point of fact, with respect to the Faculty of Medicine, the Senate have taken considerable care to secure completeness of training, while, as regards the non-medical Colleges, they have from the first abdicated the function of prescribing any course of study. Not only, indeed, have they asked no questions, but they have, when applied to, thrown upon the Colleges, in the most direct manner, the responsibility (or, rather, have accorded the irresponsible license) of granting certificates of studentship at their own discretion.

“Vexatious and minute interference with the Colleges is no doubt to be sedulously avoided; but the renunciation of all supervision has, as might reasonably have been expected, led, in some instances, to carelessness, and even to abuse. These instances are urged as proofs that the College system is a mere delusion. But it does not admit of a doubt that a very moderate increase of vigilance on the part of the University, supported by powers of control similar to those which exist in the case of Medical Schools, would speedily reduce instances of undue laxity to an unimportant amount, if it did not altogether eliminate them. The Graduates have themselves proposed the requisite extension in the powers of the Senate, and consider

it, at all events, unreasonable that the Senate should ask for the entire abolition of the existing system, while they have left the simplest expedients of inquiry and admonition wholly untried, to say nothing of their having permitted the power of prescribing courses of study to fall into abeyance.

“Another impression which extensively prevails is, that the practice of affiliating mere elementary schools, or other institutions, having no Collegiate character, has been carried so far, and will be carried so much further, that the Collegiate system of the University of London is now, or soon will be, reduced to a name. Now, the fact is, that out of the thirty-eight affiliated institutions, the great majority, and those which send almost all the Graduates, are indisputably Colleges fairly within the purview of the Charter. As to some of the very smallest of the theological Colleges, with reference to which some doubts have been expressed, it is to be remembered that the inmates are young men devoted to a learned profession, and for the most part studying for it continuously and in early manhood; and that the education within the same walls of even fifteen or twenty students has a very different effect upon the mind from mere separate education or self-instruction. It is also to be observed, that if education in *any* College for adults is required, the practical effect will be to send the great majority of candidates to the most important Colleges.

“There are, unfortunately, some Institutions, but, fortunately, very few indeed, as to which there can be no doubt that their affiliation was most improper. There can be no delicacy or hesitation in mentioning the worst example (the Bishop Stortford Proprietary School), which was affiliated in 1856, on the strength of Examiners’ testimonials quoted in the Minutes of the Senate, the first of which, dated in 1853, contains the following passage:—‘Latin has taken firm root here, and by this time next year I doubt not that the pupils learning Greek will be able to read the Greek Testament and Xenophon’s Anabasis, and this is no indifferent achievement when boys have so many other things to attend to.’ These high anticipations appear to have been fulfilled, for in 1855 ‘five boys were able to construe and parse Xenophon well;’ ‘two boys were able to do the simpler parts of trigonometry;’ and ‘four other boys were examined in Euclid, of whom three showed a fair knowledge of the subject.’ Such an extraordinary case as this must be taken as a mere announcement by the Senate, that, in anticipation of a total change, they are ready to affiliate any and every school. It is not to be believed that if the continuance of a Collegiate system were once decided upon, the Senate could follow such a precedent. But its existence proves the necessity of instant action on the part of those who desire to preserve the Collegiate system.

“It may safely be asserted that the difficulty of drawing a line as to affiliation may be surmounted with a very little pains and with the help of a moderately strict adherence to the prin-

principle that a burden of clear proof should be thrown on every Institution desiring to connect itself with the University. So lately as 1854, the Senate very properly rejected an application on the simple and intelligible ground, that 'the instruction imparted appeared to be adapted to students not exceeding sixteen years of age.'

"It may also be safely asserted that the cases of improper affiliation have been so few, and the use made of the facilities thereby given has been so infinitesimally small, that the Collegiate character of the London Degree has not as yet been impaired, and that it will be quite easy to retrace the false steps which have recently been taken.

"It will be obvious, whatever may be the extent of agreement with the above observations, that the alteration proposed by the Senate is of a most serious character. Not only is it at least doubtful whether the proposed course ought to be taken at all by the University of London; but it is believed to be matter of universal opinion that the present course of the Senate is one which cannot be acquiesced in. What has always been meant by a University in England is, that it is an aggregate of Colleges and Graduates managing among themselves the affairs common to both. While there were no Graduates, this constitution was, of course, impossible in the University of London; but the affiliated Colleges have not hesitated to interfere, by representations to the Secretary of State, with measures of the Senate of which they have disapproved, and those representations have had practical effect upon the proceedings of the University. The long contest between the Senate and the Graduates has resulted in the concession by the Senate to the Graduates, with the approval of the Secretary of State, of a position involving definitely recognized powers of interference and remonstrance still more important than those which already belong in practice to the Colleges. The Charter now preparing is drawn solely for the purpose of giving legal effect to this settlement. But it is attempted by the Senate, at the last moment, and without any previous notice, to withdraw probably the most important question affecting the University from the possibility of interference on the part of the Colleges or the Graduates, and this solely because it is supposed that the contemplated change is one which they might feel it their duty to oppose. If this is to be allowed, the proposed Charter may almost as well not be granted.

" (Signed on behalf of the Committee),

" CHARLES JAMES FOSTER, M.A., LL.D.,	} <i>Chairmen.</i>
" JOHN STORRAR, M.D.,	
" WILLIAM SHAEN, M.A.,	} <i>Hon. Secs."</i>
" T. SMITH OSLER, LL.B.,	
" ALFRED WILLS, LL.B.,	

" Graduates' Committee Room,
June 1, 1857."

24. *From Robert Barnes, M.D. Lond.*

" 13 Devonshire Square,
4 July, 1857.

" SIR,—A circular having been addressed to every Graduate by the Graduates' Committee requesting signatures to a Memorial protesting against the proposed liberation of the University of London, I felt myself called upon to express the deep conviction I entertain of the necessity for carrying this measure into immediate effect. I have also thought it right to afford others who entertain a like conviction the opportunity of joining in the expression of it. I therefore drew up a form of memorial, which, having been submitted to some Graduates, was favourably received, and has been signed by the gentlemen whose names are given in a list which I have the honour to enclose.

" It is right to observe that no systematic means have been taken to collect the opinions of those who dissent from the Memorial of the Graduates' Committee. Only a very limited number have been applied to.

" As I had become practically acquainted with the injustice which the present restrictions inflicted upon many persons, and with the impediments they opposed to the cultivation of a liberal education amongst students in Medicine, I also submitted the Draft Memorial to the heads of many of the Hospital Schools. The lecturers of several of these having seen the matter in the same light have also signed the Memorial.

" Feeling also that in so fundamental a question it was important to verify and support the propositions advanced in the Memorial by facts and arguments, I have been induced to trouble you with a summary of those which I had derived from an intimate experience of the working of the University, and from the sentiments expressed in the correspondence in which I have been engaged with Graduates.

" I have the honour to be,

" Sir,

" Your obedient servant,

" ROBERT BARNES, M.D.,

" *Late Hon. Sec. to the Graduates' Committee.*"

" *Dr. Carpenter, F.R.S.,*

Registrar University of London."

25. *" The Memorial of the undersigned Graduates and Undergraduates of the University of London, and others,*

" Sheweth,—That the undersigned beg respectfully to express the great satisfaction with which they have learned that the Senate propose to insert in the Charter now under consideration a provision to admit Candidates to Examination for

Degrees in Arts, without the exaction of a Certificate from an affiliated Institution.

“That the undersigned believe that the restrictions hitherto in force have impeded the growth of the University; discouraged Free Education; and operated with especial injustice, by excluding many deserving persons whom religious opinions, residence abroad, limited means, or other circumstances, have prevented from joining an affiliated Institution.

“That the undersigned, further believing that the opening of the University will, by giving free scope to the principle of competition, impart a healthy stimulus to both Collegiate and extra-Collegiate education; and that it will, by widening the basis of the University, materially increase its public usefulness,

“Therefore earnestly pray that the New Charter, abandoning the existing prohibitive system, may be allowed to pass.”

Signed by 38 Graduates (including 21 Doctors of Medicine), by 31 Under-Graduates, and by 60 Lecturers in the Medical Schools of Guy's Hospital, St. Thomas's Hospital, the London Hospital, Liverpool, and York.

“*The Senate of the University of London.*”

26. “*Observations on the Question—Whether it is right and expedient to admit as Candidates for the Degree of B.A. of the University of London, persons who do not bear a Certificate of Study in an Affiliated Institution.*
By ROBERT BARNES, M.D. Lond.

“There is no escape from a solution in the affirmative, if the following propositions be true:—

“1. That a certificate of study in an affiliated institution is not reliable evidence of learning or of good moral training and conduct.

“2. That a well-devised scheme of examinations is alone sufficient evidence,—or at least the only trustworthy evidence, of the fitness of a Candidate for a Degree.

“3. That the exclusion of every one who cannot produce a Certificate, operates with great injustice towards many persons who can show evidence of learning as sound, and of conduct as good, as can be testified by a College certificate.

“4. That the abolition of the present restriction of University honours to College-certificated men would, by enlarging the basis of the University of London, add to its strength, and extend its public usefulness.

“I do not propose to discuss each of these propositions *seriatim*. They are so intimately related, that to illustrate any one is to illustrate all the rest. But I beg to submit, in the

first place, some considerations relative to the value of a Certificate as evidence of learning and moral training.

“A. *The Certificate as evidence of learning.*—It may be objected, *in limine*, that to receive a Certificate even as part evidence that a particular Candidate is qualified for a Degree, involves a delegation by the Senate of its proper function to others. Not only is it improper to delegate any part of this duty to any but the duly appointed and responsible Examiners, but it is especially objectionable to delegate it to the authorities and teachers of the Institution in which a Candidate has been educated.

“To accept a Certificate as evidence of learning is moreover absurd, since it would imply reliance upon evidence which is constantly shifting in its character, and which it is impossible to define or estimate. Thus a Certificate from University College may mean one thing; a Certificate from a secluded theological College may mean another thing; and so on throughout the whole list of affiliated institutions. Indeed, no two Certificates, even from the same institution, can be said to mean the same thing.

“As evidence of *acquisition*, then, the Certificate is so fluctuating a quantity as utterly to baffle attempt at appreciation.

“B. *The Certificate as evidence of moral training and good conduct.*

“In this case also the Certificate means so many different things according to the source, that it is insusceptible of definite interpretation.

“College-training at Oxford and Cambridge, where all the Colleges are aggregated together, making one body, the different parts of which control each other, and where the University authorities exercise an extensive control over the students both *in* and *out* of College, is an intelligible thing, and no doubt a powerful instrument of education. But to attempt to import a similar system into the University of London, where all the conditions differ, presents insurmountable difficulties. The affiliated institutions of the University of London are scattered all over the country; their heterogeneous characters and constitutions defy a central supervision, or the attempt to subject them to an uniform discipline. The attempt would involve an amount of submission on the part of the Colleges which it would be hopeless to expect, and an amount of labour on the part of the Senate which it is not reasonable to expect.

“In some of the Colleges, the Students are non-resident; in these the Professors must form their opinions as to the moral conduct of the Students very much upon trust. In other Colleges, for example, some of the theological Institutions, a peculiar standard for trying this moral conduct may prevail. On the Collegiate theory, these theological Colleges ought to take the lead in producing Candidates of the highest Collegiate merit. But will the Graduates from University College admit this superiority? This difficulty in assigning any definite value

to a Certificate is insuperable. Is it maintained that in it you have some security that the Candidate is a man of good moral character? It is undoubtedly desirable that, as far as it is possible, care should be taken that degrees should not be conferred upon immoral persons. If a Certificate from a recognized place of education could be made satisfactory evidence of character, this might be a reason for accepting it *quoad* character. Beyond this it should have no acceptance. It may be further urged, that to exclude all but those who can produce a College certificate is to give an arbitrary power to the Colleges which might be made an instrument of oppression. For example, a theological College might refuse the Certificate to a student who had not evinced full acquiescence in the doctrines taught by his Professors. Thus the Certificate might be made the means of excluding a man on the ground of his religious opinions, which is directly contrary to the terms and spirit of the University of London. I have strong suspicions that cases of this kind have occurred.

“For a College to urge, as has been done, that the admission of candidates without a Certificate would be detrimental to the maintenance of discipline in the College, is to advance a plea which defeats itself. A College has no right to use the University as an instrument of discipline. Each institution must find its legitimate modes of enforcing order within itself. If a College withhold a Certificate from a student on the ground of breach of discipline, or deficiency of knowledge, it usurps the office of the Senate by deciding that he shall not have a degree.

“The assumption that without College-training there can be no effectual guarantee that a Candidate is sufficiently respectable, *i. e.* of sufficiently high social position, is too manifestly illiberal to need refutation. This is narrowing the question of a candidate's fitness to a test of his parents' pecuniary resources. It is to apply a test of the most invidious and oppressive character, because it has reference, not to the merits of the candidate, but to the accidents of fortune and the conduct of others. It would not be wise to assume that a young man has studied seriously and conducted himself with propriety because his friends have maintained him for two years at a College. But the young man who presents himself for examination in the confidence of knowledge acquired by dint of self-denial and self-reliance, brings the strongest presumptive evidence of intellectual and moral culture.

“It may be said that the value of Certificates as evidence of study and moral conduct, and as a substitute, partial or complete, for examination, has been decided by experience. In exact proportion as Certificates have displaced examination, has the diploma or degree conferred sunk in estimation. At the beginning of this century the University of St. Andrews granted degrees in Medicine without any examination, on the

recommendation or certificate of two physicians of repute. At the present day, Degrees in Philosophy may be obtained on certificates from foreign Universities. These degrees are not worthless because they are conferred on worthless persons, for this is not always the case. They are not valued by the public simply because it is known that Degrees conferred without examination are no evidence of merit. The possessors of such degrees accordingly take care, whenever possible, to suppress the source whence they were derived.

“At present the College of Surgeons is exceedingly stringent in the matter of Certificates, and correspondingly lax in the matter of examinations. By periodical registration of lecture-tickets and certificates of ‘diligent’ study, the Certificate-system is strained to the utmost. It certainly ensures that the Student shall enter to all the classes prescribed; but no one contends that it secures the continuous study, which is the alleged object. No young man who wants to satisfy the profession and the public that he has acquired sound knowledge and skill, is content with the testimony afforded by his hospital-certificates and passing the ordinary examination of the College. He either proceeds to the Fellowship-examination or to the University of London. The confidence reposed in the Fellowship diploma and the University degree is based entirely upon the known efficiency of the examinations.

“But if it be for a moment assumed that College-training and the College certificate offer trustworthy evidence that the candidate has diligently pursued a ‘regular and liberal’ course of education, and that he is of good moral character, it is a manifest fallacy to conclude that satisfactory evidence to the like effect can be obtained *in no other way*.

“Is examination alone a sufficient test of the fitness of a Candidate for a Degree?”

“The testimony of men of great experience as examiners is decisively in the affirmative. It is also certain that there is no other test entitled to credit. The whole difficulty lies in framing such a scheme of examination as will adequately test the assimilated knowledge of the Candidate. It is objected that mere examinations cannot sufficiently distinguish between sound knowledge and the temporary rote-knowledge of ‘cramming.’ Admit this for a moment to be true. The objection applies with equal force to the case of the Collegiate as to that of the non-Collegiate Candidate. ‘Cramming’ is certainly not exclusively an extra-academical pursuit; and it is absurd to maintain that, if examination fail to detect ‘cramming,’ a certificate offers the smallest security against it.

“The fact is, that whilst it is notoriously easy to pass by dint of ‘cramming’ a Board whose test is a compromise between examination and certificates, it is found to be difficult,

if not impossible, to pass by this means a Board which relies upon examination alone.

“ The injustice inflicted upon deserving persons by the limitation of University honours to Certificated men.

“ A fatal objection against the present system is its partiality and inconsistency. It not only excludes the men who have not received an academical education, but also a large number who have enjoyed an academical education in many instances far superior to what can be obtained in many of the now affiliated institutions.

“ Westminster, Eton, Rugby, Shrewsbury, Winchester, Charterhouse, Merchant Tailors’, Addiscombe and other great schools annually send forth young men eminently fitted for University degrees, if not immediately on leaving school, at any rate so well grounded that a little subsequent study would fully qualify them. Many of these young men are absorbed by Oxford and Cambridge. But it cannot be doubted that many others who are unable to proceed to residence in the old Universities, would be glad to take degrees at the University of London if the path were open to them. They are now excluded, not for want of qualification, not for any fault of their own, but because the authorities of the great public schools do not think proper to apply for recognition as affiliated institutions. This exclusion is not less unjust to the students than detrimental to the University, whose interest it is to establish a connexion with the public schools.

“ Again, many young men of British families are educated abroad, not from any fault or choice of their own—for the residence or place of education of a young man seldom depends upon himself. These young men may be brought up in foreign Colleges or Universities, and enjoy means of study that cannot be surpassed in the now affiliated institutions.

“ There is a large class of educated men most deserving of University honours, and to whom a degree would be of essential service, who are also excluded. It may be true that schoolmasters and ushers may not have enjoyed a Collegiate education, but they have had the advantage of a course of training which surpasses all others for precision,—that of teaching others. Many men of this class have passed the Matriculation examination with credit. It is both cruel and absurd to exclude them from taking degrees, in order to maintain the empty theory of Collegiate graduation.

“ The character and influence of the University are impaired by the present restrictions.

“ The influence of the University of London can never be so great as it ought to be until the number of Graduates shall be largely increased. That it fails to take its due share of academic

influence is proved by the facts that it barely adds 70 Graduates a year to its calendar, and that its maximum rate of growth seems to be reached. Under the present system the growth of the University of London is cramped and bounded by the developmental force of the affiliated institutions. Unless these grow, the University cannot grow. Not only is the numerical growth of the University limited by the Colleges, but the tone and character of the University are made dependent upon the same condition. Now, the majority of these institutions are necessarily adapted to the special wants of particular classes and sections of the community. Scarcely one can be said to be truly national in character; twenty, at least, are exclusive sectarian theological schools. Hence the mass of the Graduates represent only narrow sectional interests. The University of London, which avowedly held out to 'all classes and denominations' of Englishmen the prospect of obtaining Academical Degrees 'after examination,' has by the restrictions imposed upon it, and especially by its subjugation by the Colleges, practically excluded in a great measure the largest class of all, that of the Established Church. The presence of this class would be of essential service in tempering the sectarian intolerance which is now preponderant.

"Thus in no proper sense of the word is the University of London metropolitan or national. In this respect it is immeasurably below the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge.

"By bringing the principle of competition into play, the greatest benefit will be conferred upon both Collegiate and non-Collegiate education. Academical institutions have always been largely indebted to extra-academical teaching. Even at Oxford and Cambridge it is private tuition that makes first class-men and wranglers. Private teaching has always been the most efficient training to make public Professors. Besides this, remote from the seats of learning, scattered throughout the country, are many men of great learning, clergymen and others, who devote all, or a part of their time, to private teaching. Under these men some of the most successful Candidates for the old Universities, and for the scientific departments of the public service, are reared. It would be a great advantage to these gentlemen, to their pupils, and to the University, if the present prohibition were removed.

"There is a class of young men whom it is especially desirable to encourage to pursue a liberal education, and to associate with the University of London, namely, Students in Medicine. Under the present regulations, Students who wish to proceed to the Degrees in Medicine, are required to pass the Matriculation Examination. Many would gladly proceed to the degree of B.A. if they were rendered eligible. But this privilege is unaccountably confined to the Medical Students of three affiliated institutions. This privilege has justly caused much dissatisfaction amongst the Professors and Students of

the great hospital-schools. When it is considered that most Medical Students commence their professional studies at the age of eighteen or earlier, and that the body is recruited from all parts of the country, and even from the colonies, it will be seen that attendance during two years in an institution recognized in Arts is, for the majority, impossible. Many, nevertheless, who are reared in the great public schools, might readily qualify themselves for a degree in Arts, by application during the first two years of preliminary medical studies. Again, under the regulations of the College of Surgeons relating to the Fellowship, it is provided that Candidates 'who shall have taken the degree of B.A. in a British University after examination, shall be required to devote five years (instead of six) to the acquirement of professional knowledge.' It is obviously desirable to link the Fellows of the College of Surgeons in association with the University of London by this bond.

"A similar argument will apply to law-students who are preparing for the bar or to become solicitors.

"There is yet another class of young men whom it is the peculiar duty of a University to encourage, those, namely, who, in despite of fortune, are prompted by innate energy of character to pursue a liberal course of education. Such men may be rare, but to exclude one is an act of injustice to society. In its behaviour to the poor Student, the University of London stands in most unfavourable contrast to the older Universities. By eleemosynary foundations, numerous paths to these are kept open for the access of young men who must otherwise have abandoned all aspirations after literary distinction in despair. The University of London has no foundations of this kind, no such alliances with the great public schools, nothing to attract the 'humble and indigent' Student, and thus to knit to itself the sympathies of every class of the community. This is already a source of weakness. It need not widen the breach between itself and the people by spurning from its doors the Student who, without help from Scholarship or College, has earned the right of citizenship in the Republic of Letters.

"This statement has extended perhaps to a wearisome length. But it leaves the argument for freeing the University from College-monopoly far from exhausted. It remains for me to disclaim for myself, and for those gentlemen who have joined me in the accompanying Memorial, the remotest desire to throw discredit upon the affiliated institutions, or to depreciate the value of Collegiate education. But I earnestly protest against the claim set up, that these institutions are entitled to any sort of protection or privilege in the distribution of the degrees of the University of London. Education, at least, should be free, and the path to academical honours open to all. Protection would, in the end, operate injuriously upon the Colleges themselves. At best, protection would benefit only those Colleges in which the instruction is defective. It must be for such

institutions that a scheme of compromise has been suggested, by which it is proposed to admit College Students to Degrees after examinations fewer in number and of less severity than non-Collegiate Candidates. Nothing more fatal to the interests of the good Colleges could be devised. Were it adopted, the non-Collegiate Graduate would be held in greater esteem than the College Graduate. The latter would come to be looked upon in the same light as the ten-years' man of Cambridge, who, in defect of capacity, has, by an appeal *ad misericordiam*, been gratified by an honorary degree. The scheme, however, is impracticable. It is irreconcilable with the competitive character of University examinations. Young men who seek University honours are anxious to bring into light all the knowledge they possess. They want to show, not only absolute knowledge but relative superiority. This they can only do by courting severe examinations. It would be strange, indeed, to see College Students, whose claim for protection is based upon the assumption of superior merit, abandon the great means of academical distinction to the non-Collegiate Candidates.

“The question then clearly admits of no compromise. Knowledge alone must be tested. There is no substitute for it. The University and the public are not concerned to inquire ‘when or where’ it was obtained. Corporations have no patent right in the supply. Unlike mere worldly stores, knowledge can hardly be acquired dishonestly, or without elevating the character of him who has achieved it.

“ROBERT BARNES, *M.D.*”

27. *Letter of Dr. Bucknill to the Secretaries of the Graduates' Committee.*

“*Reply to a Statement of Facts and Arguments against the proposed change, circulated by the Graduates' Committee, and to a Letter requesting the adoption of a Memorial against the change.*

“Exeter, June 24th, 1857.

“SIRS,—I regret that I cannot subscribe to the opinions expressed in your circular respecting the proposed changes in the constitution of the University of London, and consequently that I cannot permit my name to be attached to your Memorial against those changes.

“The arguments you have adduced would possess some force, if the principal affiliated Colleges required the residence of the Students, and imposed upon them any discipline of life and conduct. But applied to institutions whose sole function is that of instruction in science and letters, by means of classes

and lectures, your arguments appear to me fallacious and invalid.

“Whatever may be the effect of ‘bringing together a number of young and fresh minds’ in the collegiate mode of life which exists at Cambridge and Oxford, it is not obvious that a casual association upon the benches of a lecture-room ‘affords advantages which nothing else can supply, and which are not less valuable than the mere opportunities of study.’

“I entirely dissent from your construction of the term ‘regular and liberal education.’ You narrow this term to the significance of an education received in an academy or College, or collection of lecture-rooms. I take it to be an education of all the mental faculties, by means of a wide and liberal range of study, wherever pursued, or however obtained. Academic education has certainly not always been liberal, and its regularity has often been founded upon its restrictions. The education given in many theological Colleges has been thought to be illiberal, and that given in some secular ones has been called irregular. With few exceptions, Colleges are founded upon some limitation or bias of opinion; and the history of Collegiate institutions disproves the assumption that their education alone is ‘regular and liberal.’

“I acknowledge the justice of the distinction you make between the man who possesses ‘a moderate, but sound proficiency, in a variety of subjects belonging to literature and elementary science,’ and the man who has been ‘crammed,’ to pass ‘two or three not very difficult examinations.’ I concur also in your opinion that the former alone is worthy of a University Degree.

“But the assumption that the man of trained mind, and of real knowledge, must necessarily be academically educated, appears to me gratuitous.

“It is, on the contrary, notorious, that while self-educated men are generally well-grounded in their acquirements, ‘cramming’ for examination is the result of a system, which has been satisfied with prescribing a course of mental training, without adopting effective means to ascertain whether that training has been undergone.

“Students believe themselves entitled to a Degree, because they have been through the course prescribed for its attainment; and in some part Examiners have granted the distinction for the same reason. The examination becomes a form which it is possible for negligent Students to pass successfully by means of ‘cramming.’ A system which mistakes the means of mental training for the training itself, affords examinations which cannot distinguish between the superficial tinsel of mnemonics and the solid metal of real knowledge. But searching and profound examinations, like those of the University of London, cannot be undergone successfully unless by men who have assimilated knowledge, and whose intellects have become

vigorous by years of discipline. They render the College test superfluous.

“Of late years, the systematized power of testing the effects of mental training has undergone a remarkable development. Even clinical experience, chemical tact, and anatomical skill, are put to the test of practice in the medical examinations of our own University. To test the mental training of the literary Student is comparatively an easy matter. What amount of ‘cramming’ will enable a man to produce a well-reasoned and well-expressed essay, or a passable copy of Latin or Greek verse? When the old painter presented himself for admission into an academy of strangers, the latter did not ask him—Where have you learnt? but—What can you do? With a piece of chalk he drew upon the wall a perfect circle, and in that simple fact the academy recognized the result of long training, and gladly admitted him among them as a master of their art.

“You suggest, in favour of your Memorial, the ever-powerful motive of self-interest; and it must be acknowledged that any one ‘having graduated on the faith of an existing system’ may feel it a personal loss, and a grievance, if any measures are taken calculated to ‘lower the character of the University degree’ which he bears. Such an argument might have been used by the Graduates of the older Universities against the establishment of the University of London itself. If admitted, it would impede all educational improvement. A Graduate ought to be prouder of the University to which he belongs, when it is such an one as ours, than of the individual distinction which it has attached to himself; and so long as its high character is maintained, he has no right to charge it with breach of faith for adopting measures to increase the number of its Graduates.

“I am convinced that the abolition of the College curriculum will add strength and dignity to the University of London, which will reflect themselves upon every Member, and thus increase the value of every Degree.

“The place which a University deserves to occupy in the estimation of the public, does not depend more upon the severity and honesty of its examinations than upon its success in promoting the extension of education. The abolition of the College test will undoubtedly widen the sphere of the University of London, as an educational institution. It will not only encourage the laborious studies of self-taught men, but it will add a stimulus to the exertions of Students receiving education in institutions which are not, and are not likely to be affiliated; Diocesan training Colleges, for instance. A larger number of Candidates, drawn from a wider range of supply, will increase the usefulness and advance the true honour of the University. It will not increase the facility of obtaining a Degree. If needful, a higher intellectual test can be made to replace the amount

of exclusiveness lost by the abolition of the money payments represented by a curriculum; for it is certain that a higher intellectual test can be maintained by a University drawing its Candidates from a wide field of supply, than by one whose operations are narrowed by jealous or protective restrictions.

“In the present state of medical education and legislation, the Senate have no doubt acted wisely in reserving the medical degrees from the operation of the proposed changes; but I trust they will take the earliest opportunity to reduce the curriculum of medical study also, to the narrowest possible limits. Hospital practice and the study of anatomy may present difficulties; but a sound knowledge of other departments of medical science can certainly be obtained without the aid of affiliated schools.

“It appears to me that the Senate, in proposing to remove restrictions, and to widen the basis of the University in the manner in which you desire me to memorialize, have adopted the only course by which they could preserve the pretensions and maintain the character upon which the liberal University of London was founded. There can be no doubt that its rivalry has been the main lever by means of which the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge have been moved from their time-worn grooves of exclusiveness and routine. They now advance with newly acquired freedom, and threaten to outstrip their rival in the comprehensiveness of the measures they take to increase their usefulness, and to extend their influence.

“I have recently had the pleasure to assist in an important educational movement, which has commenced in this County, for the examination of youths wheresoever or howsoever they have been educated.

“This scheme, devised by the genius, advocated and promoted by the untiring energies of Mr. Acland, has met with the ready approval of both the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge. On Thursday last, the University of Oxford passed the requisite statutes for conferring a new degree of Associate of Arts upon those who succeed in these examinations, and in this manner has adopted in the widest and most liberal extent the very principle which you oppose in that University, whose hitherto undisputed position has been to lead the van of liberal education.

“If the older Universities, with the prestige of antiquity, and the power of wealth, not only offer the inducement of a real collegiate discipline to the candidates for the higher degrees, but invite the alliance and enlist the sympathies of all ambitious scholars striving with difficulties, and of all enterprising schoolmasters throughout the country—while the Graduates of the University of London impede liberal reforms proposed by the Senate—it is easy to foretel the place which in future the old and the new universities will hold in public esteem, together with their probable usefulness and their prosperity.

“The retention of the college test has been advocated on the ground that the prosperity of the Colleges themselves is dependent upon it. It is very possible the Colleges, whose affiliation you refer to as having been ‘most improper,’ and whose intrinsic merits are small, may need to be supported by the kind of protective duty which a college test imposes upon students. But the able men who occupy the Professorial chairs in the larger Colleges will repudiate any apprehension that the college test is needful for their protection or prosperity. Their teaching will continue to be in request by the great majority of students. It will be sought for because it presents the readiest and least costly means of acquiring the required knowledge; and also because it is the habitual and recognized method of study. The learned professions draw their recruits mainly from the middle and trading classes. In a wealthy community like our own, the young men of these classes possess pecuniary means sufficient to lead them to adopt, not the cheapest, but the most facile, agreeable, and successful system of acquiring the knowledge demanded from them.

“This is afforded by well-regulated and appointed Colleges, whose Professorial chairs are occupied by men distinguished in science and letters. Men, therefore, ambitious to obtain degrees, will continue eagerly to avail themselves of the real facilities for study afforded by Colleges which effectually fulfil their duties as educational institutions.

“The great majority of students possess neither the self-denial nor the ability to educate themselves to the prescribed mark by a course of solitary self-instruction. How small a portion of the candidates for any degree conferred by the University of London, could present themselves for examination with any chance of success unless they had received the advantages of *tuition*! Private tuition being more costly, and less facile than public tuition, it follows that the prosperity of the larger and better colleges is placed in no peril from the proposed abolition of the college test. Exceptions no doubt will be found, or the proposed changes would lose their value. Degrees will be claimed by self-denying solitary students, who have laid siege to knowledge in the midst of hardship and privation. If this country can produce many men of this stamp so much the better for the country. As for the university which they join, they will confer more honour upon it than they will derive from it. The heroic stonemason, who has left us the account of his rugged ‘Schools and Schoolmasters,’ would have conferred scientific honour on any university.

“I am truly sorry to differ from so many of my fellow Graduates upon the important question here discussed. I am still more sorry to find so many Graduates differing on such a question from the Senate, and advocating the part they do. I had entertained the hope that the admission of the Graduates to a share in the government of the University of London, would

have promoted the liberal principles upon which it was founded
To find them opposing a measure as wise as it is liberal, upon
avowed principles of self-interest, is not a happy inauguration
of their admission to a share in its government.

“I am, Sirs,

“Your very obedient servant,

“JOHN CHARLES BUCKNILL, M.D. Lond.,
Fellow of Univ. Coll., Lond.

“To W. Shaen, M.A., } Hon. Secretaries of the Com-
T. S. Osler, LL.B., } mittee of Graduates of the
A. Wills, LL.B., } University of London.”

28. *Memorial of Dr. Bucknill.*

“*The Memorial of the undersigned Doctor of Medicine of
the University of London, to the Lords and Gentle-
men the Senate of the University:*

“Sheweth,—

“That your Memorialist has learnt with great satisfaction,
that the proposed new Charter for the University of London
contains a provision for admitting candidates to examination
for degrees in Arts and Laws, without requiring that their
education should have been received in any specified manner,
or in any particular Institutions.

“That he is convinced, that by thus leaving to students
a free choice in the means and place of their education, the Se-
nate has taken the only course consistent with the professions
of liberality upon which the University of London was founded,
and with the full development of its usefulness as an instrument
of educational progress.

“That in the humble opinion of your Memorialist, it will
be a prudent measure to institute one or more examinations in-
termediate between the Matriculation examination and that
for the degree, whereby a steady application to study during
the whole of the intervening period may be secured.

“That it will also be a wise and just measure to confer
upon those Colleges affiliated under the old Charter, which
merit well of the University and of the public, the distinction
and the privilege, that in the case of their students such exa-
mination shall be dispensed with, and the course of study per-
mitted to be of relatively shorter duration.

“That such measures would in no way be unjust to students
pursuing their education without that aid of tuition which is
provided in good Colleges; inasmuch as the collegiate system
does in some degree ensure continued application to study, and
inasmuch as students who do not enjoy the advantages afforded
by the best tuition, need a greater length of time for the ac-

quisition of the requisite amount of knowledge than those who do possess them.

“That to meet the case of students of rare ability, who are not college-taught, it may be well to afford them the same advantages, upon condition of their giving evidence of high proficiency at the Matriculation examination.

“That, in the humble opinion of your Memorialist, these measures will not limit the beneficial operation of the wise and liberal change promoted by the Senate; while they will tend greatly to remove prejudice, conciliate opposition, and preserve a bond of union between the University and its principal affiliated Colleges.

(Signed)

“J. C. BUCKNILL, M.D.”

“Exeter, July 1st, 1857.”

29. “*Reasons in favour of opening the University of London.*
By ISAAC TODHUNTER, M.A.

“Those who advocate restrictions of any kind ought to be prepared to show the necessity or propriety of those restrictions. Now the argument used in the present case appears to be the following:—‘A degree of B.A. is not merely a testimonial that the holder has exhibited certain literary or scientific knowledge, but that he acquired such knowledge in a particular way,—namely, by residence at a College, and it is advisable that no person should receive a testimonial of his attainments unless he can show that he has resided in some College.’ Now, of all oppressions that a man can suffer, I think the hardest are those which he has to endure *for no fault whatever of his own*. In the present case it is obvious that the question, whether a man does or does not enjoy college instruction in his youth is beyond his own control; it depends upon the views of his parents, and generally, finally upon their resources. Thus, in fact, our opponents address a student in such words as these: ‘Your parents were not in the enjoyment of wealth, *therefore* we will not give you such a testimonial of your attainments as may be some reward for your industry and perseverance under difficulties.’

“Something very similar to this was adopted by the old Universities before the recent reforms. They made it necessary that a student, before taking the degree of B.A. should declare himself a member of the Church of England. Now very few young men at the age of twenty-one have had their attention turned to theological controversy; they belong to the same persuasion as their parents, so that the University addressed a nonconformist student in such words as these:—‘Your father had the temerity to differ from the Established Church; therefore we will refuse you our certificate of your attainments.’

“I should, therefore, like to see the restriction removed, be-

cause I think it presses heavily on persons who have not enjoyed the advantage of wealthy parents or friends.

“Our opponents seem to think, however, that a B.A. degree should not be regarded as an evidence of attainment, but merely of the fact that the holder has had good opportunity for acquiring knowledge. I do consider a B.A. Degree an evidence of attainment: I am not deterred by the imputation of favouring ‘cramming’ from expressing my belief that if an examination be tolerably rigorous and comprehensive, it is a very valuable training for a student to prepare himself for it, and very creditable to him to pass through it successfully. And I think a degree of B.A. is valuable, because it stimulates a student; and useful to the community at large, because it warrants to them that the holder is a man of some knowledge and of some training. I do *not* think the community at large require any testimony to the fact that a man’s parents were in easy circumstances, and that he is himself consequently in possession of those advantages of address and manner which are acquired by intercourse with polished society. On such points as these the community, if necessary, can judge without any extraneous assistance.

“As I have had occasion above to condemn the old Universities, I may take now the opportunity of showing how very differently Cambridge acts in one respect to the line proposed by our opponents. Of course our best students here come from the great public schools, such as Rugby, Shrewsbury, &c. Now, if a youth of 18 has spent six or eight years at one of these places, it is obvious that his friends must have been in easy circumstances to support him, and that he himself must have enjoyed the very highest advantages in the matter of intellectual training. Now does the University say, ‘This class of students ought to be cherished alone, and no person shall receive the testimonial of this University unless he has been through a grammar-school training for six or eight years before he comes here?’ Very far from that, we are glad to obtain promising students of any age or from any quarter; and it is notorious that our high mathematical honours are often gained by men who have had few early advantages, and who would scarcely be allowed to compete for our prizes if the theory of our opponents were legitimately developed.

“But again, our opponents seem to attach much importance to what they call the *College system*. They seem to think that the Colleges which are affiliated to the University of London supply something besides instruction which is very valuable, and which would be neglected by the community unless supported by a *protective policy*. This involves numerous points for consideration. In the first place I think the term *College system* is used with some ambiguity. In the old Universities a man is compelled to reside for more than three years within the college walls or under superintendence in adjacent lodgings.

He is also compelled to dine at a common table, to attend chapel service daily, to attend one or two lectures daily, and to conform to regulations about hours and dress and other points. Now here, *College system* may mean something; the men are compelled to live in a certain way, and to associate very much together; for there is scarcely any society at all here but that formed by the members of the University. But the College system at many of the components of the University of London is very different; it means their *attendance at certain lectures for two years*. I think that there is really little here beyond teaching; I mean that there is not much of that influence and discipline which the older Universities profess to afford, and which they also profess to consider very valuable. I need scarcely say that in the *evening classes* at University College and King's College there is extremely little of *College system*; I think the term means only attendance on lectures for 120 hours. I would not wish to disparage these evening classes; very far indeed from that; I look upon them as *most valuable*, and for that reason that they do enable men in unpropitious external circumstances to present themselves for University examinations. My remarks merely tend to show that the University itself and its two leading Colleges do practically admit that instruction alone is what they profess to give, and to test and reward. I imagine that the only parts of the University of London where a *College system* prevails is in some of those *smaller Theological Schools* which our opponents seem rather to disfavour.

"It is, I think, quite unnecessary to attempt to support the Colleges, as places of education, by protective measures. I believe in their value; their station, endowments, and professorial staff will enable them to make the public recognize their value and avail themselves of them. Or, if it could be found that private education, or self-education were more successful in attaining university prizes than college education, the Colleges should be left by their own efforts to recover their pre-eminence.

"I cannot think that any great effect will follow from the step which I advocate. Some few deserving persons will find stimulus and encouragement in the prospect of academical distinction which they could otherwise not have attained. I have assuredly known such cases myself; but, as heretofore, those who have the requisite means will send their sons to Colleges where they will enjoy the advantages of leisure, and of the lectures of able teachers.

"On the whole, then, I consider the proposed measure a natural result of the constitution and proceedings of the University of London; I think it leads to no injurious consequences to the Colleges, while it certainly will be a boon to a class of highly meritorious students.

30. *Letter from Prof. W. B. Todhunter, M.A.*

“ To the Senate of the University of London.

“GENTLEMEN,—Permit me, as a Graduate of the University of London, very respectfully to express my entire concurrence in the proposal to abandon all Collegiate restriction in the case of Candidates for Degrees in Arts.

“I should not have ventured to address you but for the fact that much opposition seems to have been raised against it.

“The proposal seems to me, for several reasons, both just and also calculated to promote the interest of education throughout the whole country.

“It would not become me to express these reasons at length, and I therefore content myself with expressing my entire concurrence, and also my thanks to the Senate for the introduction of this proposition into the proposed new Charter.

“I am, Gentlemen,

“Yours obediently,

“W. B. TODHUNTER, M.A.,

“Fellow of University College, and Professor of Mathematics at Lady Huntingdon's College, Cheshunt.”

“Cheshunt, Herts,
June 27th, 1857.”

31. *Letter from Prof. Charles J. Foster, LL.D.*

“2 Serjeant's Inn, Fleet Street, E.C.,
July 4, 1857.

“MY DEAR SIR,—May I beg you to lay before the Senate a paper, which I have drawn up at the request of several gentlemen who concur with me in thinking that it is possible, by a progressive system of examinations, and without requiring a College certificate, adequately to test the qualifications of a Candidate for a Degree, as one who has *bonâ fide* passed through a regular and liberal course of education.

“The personal views of those whom I represent would, I believe, be met by such a modification of the 36th clause as appears on the other side.

“It would, however, be far more satisfactory to us if the clause in question were altogether expunged from the present Charter. It appears to us indisputable that the present sense of the Graduates generally is opposed to any such change as is effected by it; and we venture to believe that a more advised consideration of the circumstances under which the Charter is now before the Senate, and which we are assured its members would be far from ignoring, will satisfy them that the retention of the 36th clause in the present Charter will give to them grave cause of complaint to the Graduates at large.

“The accompanying paper is intended as a summary statement of the circumstances to which reference is here made.

“I ought to add, that having heard but yesterday that it was necessary papers should be forwarded today, the paper has not been actually seen by any one but myself.

“I am,

“My dear Sir,

“Very faithfully yours,

“CHA^s J. FOSTER.”

“W. B. Carpenter, Esq., M.D.,
Registrar, &c.”

The 36th Clause, with suggested modifications *underlined*.

“That persons not educated in any of the Institutions connected with the said University, shall be admitted as Candidates for Matriculation, and for the respective Degrees of Bachelor, Master, and Doctor, to be conferred by the said University of London, on such conditions, *and after passing through such progressive examinations* as the said Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor and Fellows, by regulations in that behalf, shall from time to time determine, except as hereinbefore or hereinafter provided.”

[*Statement enclosed.*]

“1. The Gower Street Institution, through its Treasurer (Mr. Tooke, M.P. for Truro) carries in the House of Commons an address to His Majesty, praying for a University Charter enabling it to confer Degrees; which His Majesty refers to the Privy Council to carry out.

“A negotiation takes place between the Government and the Institution, by the result of which, upon conditions categorically stated, reduced to writing, printed, and circulated among the members of the Institution, it gives up its claim to be a University, assents to the Incorporation of the University now located at Burlington House, and accepts a College Charter.

“3. Among these terms is one providing for an ‘equality in all respects’ for the London Graduates with those of Oxford and Cambridge—less their religious exclusions.

“An Oxford or Cambridge Degree involves:—

- (1.) Membership of a Parliamentary Constituency.
- (2.) Certain Civil and Professional privileges *extra* the University.
- (3.) A share in the management of its internal affairs: which in each of these Universities is entrusted to its own Graduates exclusively.

“4. The claim of London University to become a Parlia-

mentary Constituency was recognized by Lords Derby and Aberdeen during their respective ministries; was submitted to the House of Commons by Lord John Russell on the part of Lord Palmerston's government, and is, it is conceived, only a question of time.

"The Legislature has in several instances, either by Acts of Parliament specially passed, or by particular sections in general Acts, placed the London Graduates and Under-Graduates on a footing of equality with those of Oxford and Cambridge, in regard to Law, Physic, the Militia, &c. &c.

"As long ago as 1840 the Senate initiated and developed a scheme for the annual resignation of one-sixth of their Body subject to re-election by the Graduates. Difficulties ultimately arose in determining whether the right of election should depend on Graduatorial rank or standing, and the scheme was dropped.

"5. In March 1848—a few months prior to the time at which this scheme, if passed, would have taken effect—the Graduates called attention to it; and the discussions commenced, which led to the proposals of the Graduates' Committee in 1852 and Lord Burlington's letter to the Home Secretary in 1853.

"6. By the first of these the Graduates claimed:—

Incorporation into the University.

Convocation based upon standing.

Nomination of a portion of the Senate.

Intervention (by opinion) on all important matters involving new principles.

Veto on all matters requiring a new Charter.

"7. Lord Burlington's reply stated:—

That the Senate could not assent to the desired Incorporation without the opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown as to its safety.

That they approved of a Convocation based on standing and with power to express opinion.

That they only refrained from recommending the Veto on the ground that, without the Incorporation, it would be inoperative.

That they thought the Secretary of State ought to nominate the Senate, but that he should recognize a Degree as a title to nomination.

"8. The Law Officers advised that the Graduates might be safely incorporated into the University, but that it would be repugnant to the nature of a Corporation to invest them with no functions. The Senate thereupon referred the whole matter to the Government.

"The Home Secretary assented to the representation of the Graduates, that the concession of the only point remaining un-

settled, viz. the nomination of Senators, would meet the point raised by the Law Officers, decided accordingly, and informed the Senate of his decision. In this decision the Senate have acquiesced.

“9. The Draft Charter, as originally submitted to the Senate, was framed to carry out the arrangement thus arrived at.

It incorporates the Graduates into the University.

Institutes a Convocation based on standing; which nominates one-quarter of the Senate, — intervenes by opinion in University affairs, — vetoes all matters requiring a new Charter.

“10. As amended by the 36th Clause, it introduces matter, which, while not pertinent to its own purpose, requires a New Charter; and thus, in relation to this matter, deprives Convocation of its Veto.”

32. *From Richard Quain, Esq., M.D., to the Secretaries of the Graduates' Committee.*

“23 Harley Street,
July 8th, 1857.

“GENTLEMEN,—In compliance with the request contained in your second circular, to let you know whether I could sign the Memorial intended for presentation to the Senate of the University of London and to the Home Secretary, of which you had previously sent me a copy, I beg to say that I cannot sign it, because I believe the statements and conclusions which it contains are not correct. I do not believe that the proposed change against which this Memorial is directed will be ‘detrimental,’ neither that it will ‘alter the meaning and lower the character of the University Degrees.’ I cannot conceive how it will be injurious to the pursuit of a ‘regular and liberal education,’ to frame, as no doubt the Senate are prepared to do, some better test that such a course has been gone through than that afforded by the Certificate system, which has been repeatedly proved to be unworthy of confidence, and which it is now proposed to abolish.

“It strikes me that throughout the discussion on the change contemplated by the Senate, this (the Certificate system) and the Collegiate system have been confounded. The Senate propose to admit to examination for Degrees in Arts and Laws under certain regulations all who present themselves, whether provided with certificates of having attended lectures or not. This conclusion has been arrived at, no doubt, because it has been found that these certificates are of little or no value. They could be obtained by the idle and ill-educated as well as by the industrious and accomplished; by those who had

never entered the walls of a College for the purposes of education, and by those who had conscientiously followed the course required of them. The Senate, no doubt, have learned that many well-educated and able men—men who had been the teachers of those on whom Degrees were being conferred—were prevented from presenting themselves for examination by reason of not possessing these very significant documents. The Senate cannot have failed to see that, though the University has taken a high place amongst educational institutions, it does not fulfil all that was expected at its foundation. There is a consciousness that the number of its Graduates is comparatively few, that its field of usefulness is limited, and that to obtain and hold a position worthy of the present age, there must be given some proof that the enlightened liberality which led to its establishment still exists. I can readily suppose the preceding to be some of the motives which influenced the Senate in adopting* the change under discussion, a change which seems to me to be misinterpreted and to be greatly misunderstood by many to whom your Memorial has been sent for signature. It is said that the Senate propose by the new Charter 'to abolish the Collegiate system.' A thing must exist before it can be abolished. My experience tells me that in the affiliated Colleges the Collegiate system is the exception. The course of instruction differs in these institutions little from that which young men advanced in their studies receive elsewhere from teachers undignified by the title of professors, whilst the residences, so far from being Collegiate, are *extra muros* such as convenience suggests, or circumstances may afford. Thus the Collegiate system, as it exists in the older Universities, whether good or bad, is to be found but in name, in the great majority of the affiliated Colleges. With the system, such as it is, the proposal of the Senate seems to interfere only for good. If the Certificate monopoly be abolished, the Senate must find in the mode of conducting and the character of its examinations a test for the soundness and the completeness of the education of those who seek its Degrees. This can be accomplished without multiplying inconveniently the periods, or complicating the subjects of examination. The test must be such as to render 'cramming' *per se* valueless. There is no fear that such an examination being the ordeal, the character of the Degrees will be lowered. It is true they may be conferred on some, the depth of whose learning exceeds that of the pocket; but are such men likely by their habits to dim the lustre of the prize for which they had struggled even

* "I say adopting; for though the Senate have been accused of making this proposal as a retaliation for the pressure put on them by the Graduates in seeking Convocation—a perfectly identical proposal was made, warmly discussed and supported by myself and several Graduates, in the Graduates' Committee eight years ago."

harder than their fellows*? Certainly not. But further, I am satisfied that education will be improved. 'Certificates' being no longer required, a healthful competition will arise between private tuition, public schools, and the Colleges. A Professor will seek to attract pupils to his class by the value of the information he can afford them, and not by the privilege which he enjoys of being able to grant a certificate. The Colleges possess those commanding advantages, which, properly used, must secure for them their full share of educational privileges;—privileges which will be then established on a far more satisfactory basis than that afforded by the wretched monopoly—the Certificate system. I have, therefore, no hesitation in denying the accuracy of the assertions contained in your Memorial.

“It may be asked, if these views are correct, why withhold the supposed advantages from the Students in the Medical Faculties? The answer is simply, that there exists no good reason why they should be withheld. The Certificate system in Medical teaching afforded, until very recently, many, and even still does afford not a few illustrations, of the most knavish and deceptive practices. To detail these is at this moment unnecessary. It will be sufficient for my argument to say, that it is quite possible for a Student to obtain a certificate of attendance on lectures, from which he had never carried away a single idea. He may have sat on the benches the legitimate number of hours; he may have been asleep, or if awake, even less profitably employed. He may obtain a certificate of Hospital attendance, though his studies there have been literally confined to the practice of 'walking,' as was their former designation. The class of men who thus go through these forms, and who obtain certificates to the fullest extent, cannot present themselves with the least hope of success for the University Degrees. The reason is manifest. The examination of the University, and not the number of certificates which he can produce, is the test of the man's acquirements. In fact, the Senate have already in a great measure applied to the Faculty of Medicine the system which is now objected to in its application to Arts and Law. The University of London requires scarcely one-half the number of certificates demanded by the other Medical examining boards. The result has been such as to encourage the Senate to extend the principle, and to rely altogether on its examination as the test of the student's acquirements.

“Admirable as these examinations are, and superior to those

* “It has been proposed, at a general meeting of the Graduates, to prevent University College hereafter giving, as it has hitherto done, 'Certificates of Studentship' for attendance on the 'Schoolmasters' Classes.' That is to say, that a Professor lecturing and giving a certificate, 'to one of us,' in the forenoon, should be declared incompetent to give a certificate to the man who attended the like lecture in the evening, because that man during the day had been himself a teacher!”

of other boards, I believe them to be so far susceptible of improvement as to be made a perfect test of what a man's attainments are, and whether they have been acquired by patient and continued study in a practical school. Abolish certificates of attendance on Lectures and Hospital Practice; let the examinations be continued at the intervals now established; let them assume in *all* subjects rather more of a practical and a little less of the mere book-knowledge character, and I do not hesitate to express my positive conviction that the reputation of the Degrees will stand even higher than it does at present. With these requirements teaching must keep pace. The prosy, though perhaps much-respected lecturer, who mumblingly reads for an hour daily from his well-thumbed text-book that which could be mastered by the pupil at home in a few minutes, and whose certificate is the sole attraction, must give place to the man competent to teach;—able to give, not a certificate merely, but to impart the knowledge which the student feels he must possess if he intends to take a Medical Degree in the University of London. Satisfied, then, that the proposed change, if fully applied to the examination in Medicine, will work well, I must express an earnest hope that the Senate may not long withhold these advantages from the Faculty in which I have obtained my Degree.

“ I remain,

“ Your obedient servant,

“ RICHARD QUAIN, M.D.,

“ Ex University Medical Scholar.”

“ To Messrs. W. Shaen, M.A.,

T. Smith Osler, LL.B., } *Hon. Secs., &c.*

Alfred Wills, LL.B., }

33. *From John Robson, Esq., B.A.*

“ The University of London was founded, in the words of the Charter, ‘ for the advancement of religion and morality and the promotion of useful knowledge, by holding forth to *all classes of Her Majesty's subjects, without any distinction whatsoever*, an encouragement for pursuing a regular and liberal course of education;’ and these objects, I think, are best secured by admitting to its examinations for Degrees all who present themselves, without any inquiry into the particular processes by which they have acquired the necessary knowledge. Of all possible restrictions, that which would limit the admissible Candidates to those who have attended classes at certain educational institutions, seems to be least in accordance with the principles of the University, and least defensible on general grounds of public utility.

“ It may be assumed that the great majority of those who attend College classes do so, not from any strong individual im-

pulse towards the acquisition of knowledge, but because their parents and guardians send them to such classes, or because their professional objects render it necessary, or at least desirable, for them to receive the instruction there given; and hence it may be safely inferred that the number of those who attend the Colleges would not be affected, to any appreciable extent, by the proposed new regulation of the Senate. It is obvious that, regarded merely as a means of enabling students to pass the University Examinations, the College classes are in every respect superior to merely private study; and that consequently all aspirants to Degrees will certainly, if possible, avail themselves of such means of preparation. Those, then, who will be benefited by the proposed throwing open of the University, will for the most part be, either wholly self-taught men, or those whose education, having been begun in a more systematic manner, has been interrupted by change of circumstances, such as removal of residence, loss of parents and friends, the necessity for engaging in some kind of pursuit to obtain a livelihood, &c. Now surely both these classes of men are precisely those to whom it is desirable to hold out inducements to pursue a systematic course of study, and who richly deserve the rewards of academical distinction, if in spite of all the obstacles to their progress, and of the innumerable temptations to which they are necessarily exposed, they persevere in their efforts to acquire the needful knowledge. Self-taught men are undoubtedly liable to certain defects from which those more fortunately circumstanced are usually free; but who will deny that they must possess many good qualities far more than counterbalancing these faults? The love of knowledge must be strong in them, their will must be vigorous, their self-control and self-denial great, their intellect above the average. And yet, I regret to say it, not a few of the Graduates of the University of London seem to shrink from admitting such men to participate in their Degrees, as if those Degrees were likely to be depreciated in real value, as well as in public esteem, by being conferred upon men whose only fault has been that their social position and circumstances have not been such as to enable them to attend College classes!

“But, our opponents say, the proposal of the Senate subverts the notion hitherto invariably attached to an academical Degree, which has always denoted that the bearer of it is not merely possessed of a certain amount of knowledge, but has gone through a prescribed curriculum of instruction, which implies the bringing to bear upon him of certain moral and intellectual influences, which cannot be gained in any other way. I will not enter into any examination of this point: I will merely say that I believe there is a great deal of exaggeration and misapprehension upon it; but my ground is this: granting that the throwing open of the University should have this effect upon the meaning of its Degrees, it is only

another step in the direction in which it has from the first proceeded; the object steadily kept in view by its founders and supporters having been to make its Degrees marks of intellectual culture and acquisition, apart from every kind of extraneous circumstance, either of religious opinion or of social position; and it is lamentable to find any of its Graduates opposing the complete adoption of this principle, and advocating restrictions at variance with it. It is useless to refer to the practice of the older Universities in support and justification of these restrictions; our principles are in many respects diametrically opposed to those of Cambridge and Oxford; and hence anything that may be proposed by our University cannot be judged by the standard of those whose very antiquity renders them subject to influences from which it should be our pride to be free.

“ There is, however, a very simple plan by which those who attach so much importance to this Collegiate course of training may derive from it all the benefit, in public estimation, which it is capable of affording. In the University Calendar each Graduate's College is stated opposite to his name; and those self-taught men who may hereafter receive Degrees will of course have no such mark of distinction. Thus the two classes of Graduates will be clearly yet uninviciously distinguished; and those who pride themselves upon being members of a College, can always designate themselves accordingly, whenever it is necessary or proper to mention their University Degrees; just as many Graduates of the older Universities state their Colleges along with their academical rank.

“ There is one objection which has some weight, and which it would be desirable to remove;—I mean that men could prepare for the University Examinations by what is called ‘cramming,’ meaning a merely parrot-like getting up by memory of the appointed subjects, without any comprehension of principles. I cannot admit that this never takes place at present; but it must be acknowledged that the required attendance for two years on College classes at least renders it likely that a better mode of preparation will have been pursued. It is undeniable, however, that it must be the fault of the Examiners if ‘cramming’ ever succeeds: nothing can be easier than to detect such unprincipled attempts at deception; still the University ought to avoid, if possible, presenting temptations to so unprofitable an expenditure of time and labour; and I fear that in two, at least, of the subjects of the Arts' Examinations, namely Latin and Greek, the present plan of the University, in announcing two years beforehand the precise Latin and Greek books in which the Candidate both for Matriculation and for the B.A. Degree will be examined, is open to serious objection in this respect. I would suggest therefore that this plan should be abandoned, and that Candidates at both examinations should be liable to be examined in any one or more of

the authors mentioned in the Regulations of the University as set apart for those examinations. This would effectually preclude cramming, while it need not necessarily render passing the examinations more difficult; for of course the Examiners would not expect that *perfect* knowledge of the whole range of authors, which they may and ought to exact of a particular book, selected two years before the examinations.

“JOHN ROBSON.”

34. *From Dr. Edward Smith, M.D., LL.B., B.A., to the Registrar.*

“SIR,—I think that the occasion should not be an ordinary one, on which an individual member of our University presumes to address himself directly to the Senate. In the opinion of some of the Graduates this is such an occasion, and since my Hospital duties will prevent my joining a deputation to the Chancellor on Wednesday next, I hope that the liberty which I now take may be regarded leniently.

“I am amongst the oldest Members of the University, and, in various ways, have much at stake in connexion with its success; and although I do not usually occupy myself with polemics of any kind, I have been much interested with the proposition to open the University to all applicants for Degrees in Arts. My conviction is that the views of the Senate are not only in unison with the principles of the University, but that, if they are fully carried out, they will prove of the greatest advantage to the Institution. As I have stated my reasons in a letter published in the ‘Lancet,’ and as other Graduates have conveyed similar ones to the Senate, I do not think it needful to repeat them. I am, however, desirous to state my conviction of the importance of the present liberal views and projects of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge *in relation to the success of our University*, and my belief that not only is it the duty of our University to place itself in the foreground in this movement, but that if it do not, and the older Universities send Examiners with power to grant a degree throughout the country, the result will be fatal to this University. At present we have gained a reputation for our Degrees, but we are wanting in prestige and numbers, and hence have attained but a very slight hold over the sympathies of the community. To obtain a much larger number of Graduates without lowering the status of the Degrees, is, as it appears to me, an urgent necessity. It cannot be doubted that the proposed movement is likely to add greatly to the influence of the older Universities—not by adding to their high claims as the most renowned seats of learning in the world, but by permitting the families of the humbler classes to be, in some measure, sharers of their honours. If our University should seriously seek to obtain the

same results, it cannot expect to be successful in an equal degree with Oxford and Cambridge, but it may at least retain its present position *relatively* to those Universities, whilst it increases its influence absolutely, and at the same time co-operates in extending the desire for a liberal education. The present moment is, I believe, the most important which our University has witnessed in reference to its own success.

“I venture also to suggest for consideration the propriety of establishing such a degree as that now proposed by Oxford and Cambridge, viz. that of an *Associate in Arts*. There is every reason to believe that it will be extensively conferred by those Universities and will obtain a status in society, and hence our University, with its liberal professions, ought not to disregard it. My suggestion is, that it be substituted for the term ‘Matriculation,’ either wholly or partially; that is, either all who pass the Matriculation Examination shall be A.A., or only those who are placed in the first division, whilst those in the second division shall remain simply matriculated students. I think that a youth who can fairly answer the questions which have been proposed at the present examination, is deserving of such a status as that now proposed; and further, that it is not likely that the Examiners from Oxford and Cambridge will insist upon a greater amount of knowledge for their A.A. Degree. Such a degree should not entitle the holder to be a Member of Convocation.

“It is also worthy of consideration if more frequent examinations would not tend to the increase of the number of applicants. The experience of our Scientific Societies is in the affirmative; and I believe that a quarterly or half-yearly examination for the Matriculation or for the A.A. Degree would add to our numbers.

“I also venture to suggest the propriety of obtaining power to grant a title of some kind to those who pass the proposed examination in special Sciences, since that would be more highly appreciated than a certificate, and would be an attraction to the University.

“I have the honour to be, Sir,

“Your most obedient servant,

“EDWARD SMITH, M.D., LL.B., B.A.”

“63 Grosvenor Street, W.,
July 14, 1857.”

“To Dr. Carpenter, F.R.S.,

&c. &c.

Registrar of the Univ. of Lond.”

and results it cannot expect to be successful in an equal de-
gree with Oxford and Cambridge, but it may at least retain its
present position relatively to those Universities, whilst it in-
creases its influence absolutely, and at the same time co-ope-
rates in extending the desire for liberal education. The pre-
sent moment is, I believe, the most important which our Uni-
versity has witnessed in reference to its own success.

"I venture also to suggest for consideration the propriety of
establishing such a degree as that now proposed by Oxford
and Cambridge, viz. that of an Associate in Arts. There is
every reason to believe that it will be extensively conferred by
those Universities and will obtain a status in society, and hence
our University, with its liberal professions, ought not to disre-
gard it. My suggestion is, that it be substituted for the term
'Matriculation,' either wholly or partially; that is, either all who
pass the Matriculation Examination shall be A.A. or only
those who are placed in the first division, whilst those in the
second division shall remain simply matriculated students. I
think that a youth who can fairly answer the questions which
have been proposed at the present examination, is deserving of
such a status as that now proposed; and further, that it is not
likely that the Examiners from Oxford and Cambridge will in-
sist upon a greater amount of knowledge for their A.A. Degree.
Such a degree should not enable the holder to be a Member of
Convocation.

"It is also worthy of consideration if more frequent exami-
nations would not tend to the increase of the number of appli-
cants. The experience of our Scientific Societies is in the
affirmative; and I believe that a quarterly or half-yearly
examination for the Matriculation or for the A.A. Degree
would add to our number.

"I also venture to suggest the propriety of obtaining power
to grant a title of some kind to those who pass the proposed
examination in special Sciences, since that would be more highly
appreciated than a certificate, and would be an attraction to
the University.

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Edward Smith, M.D., LL.B., B.A."

23 Gordon Street, W.
4th 14 1857

Yr. Obedt. Servant, E. S. S.

Secretary of the Univ. of London