

## Draft Statutes for the University of London.

WE published on July 10, 1926, a leading article on the reconstitution of the University of London. The position at that time was that the Government had redeemed its pledge to introduce legislation "to make further provision for the University of London" by introducing a Bill in the House of Lords, and this Bill had been accorded its second reading on the motion of the Earl of Balfour. On Nov. 19, the Bill received its second reading in the House of Commons on the motion of Lord Eustace Percy, president of the Board of Education, in a conciliatory and closely-reasoned speech. Dr. Graham Little, the member for the University, led the opposition in a vigorous speech, urging that any necessary changes in the constitution of the University should be made by those having internal knowledge of its work and aspirations. "It is in the interests of freedom," he said in his peroration, "the freedom of the University and the freedom of the students, especially of external students, that I beg the House to reject the Bill." Capt. Fairfax, who seconded the rejection, was supported by Sir Richard Barnett; but most of the speakers, including Mr. Trevelyan, Mr. Withers, Sir Alfred Hopkinson, Mr. Lees Smith, Mr. Hilton Young, accepted the main principles of the Bill, which passed its second reading without a division. The proceedings in Standing Committee on Dec. 2 produced two important Government amendments, the first safeguarding the interests of theological colleges whose position is differentiated from that of other colleges in their not receiving financial support from the Government; and the second, in the form of new clause—a concession implementing the Government's declaration that there was no desire or intention to establish State control of the University—authorising recommendations to His Majesty in Council from persons or bodies representative of the University regarding the appointment of the crown members of the council of the University. The Bill received the Royal Assent on Dec. 15, and its short title is "University of London Act, 1926."

The chief purpose of the Act, in accord with precedents recently adopted for Oxford and Cambridge, and followed also for London in the earlier re-constitution under the Act of 1898, is to appoint commissioners to draft new statutes for the University. Mr. Justice Tomlin is chairman, and the other commissioners are Sir Amherst Selby-Bigge, Sir Cyril Cobb, Sir Josiah Stamp, Sir Cooper Perry, Dr. A. D. Lindsay, Miss Bertha Phillpotts, and Prof. T. P. Nunn. Sir Henry Sharp has been appointed secretary. The duty of the commissioners is to make statutes for the University "in general accordance with the recommendations" of the Departmental Committee of the Board of Education, appointed by Mr. Trevelyan in 1924 "subject to any modifications which may appear to them to be expedient." The first draft of the proposed statutes has been published by the commissioners, who invite representations thereon pursuant of sub-section (2) of section 4 of the Act.

Under section 21 of the draft statutes, a "Council of the University" is to be appointed of 16 members with power "to determine finally any question of finance arising out of the administration of the University or the execution of its policy, or in the execution of any trust requiring execution by the University." Its members are the chancellor, vice-chancellor, and chairman of convocation *ex officio*, six members of the senate appointed by the senate, four by His Majesty in Council, two by the London County Council, and one co-opted member.

Under clause 39, the senate is to consist of 50 (or possibly 51) members, namely, the chancellor, the vice-chancellor, the chairman of convocation, and the principal *ex officio*, 16 by convocation to be elected by the graduates according to faculties, 16 by the faculties composed of teachers of the University, 11 by colleges and medical schools, and 4 co-opted members. The colleges which are to be granted direct representation are: University, King's, Bedford, Birkbeck, East London, Imperial, London School of Economics, Royal Holloway, and Westfield (the last two have been added to the list published in the report of the Departmental Committee), and two representatives of the general medical schools to be elected by a meeting of the deans of such schools. The senate is to be "the supreme governing and executive body of the University in all academic matters." The vice-chancellor need not on election be a member of the senate, and if he is not, the total membership of the senate will be increased to 51.

There are to be five standing committees of the senate, namely, the academic board, the board for external students, the collegiate board, the university extension and tutorial classes board, the matriculation and schools examination board. The academic board is to include, in addition to the 16 faculty members of the senate, 9 other persons appointed by the senate. The principal is to be chairman of the collegiate board, to be composed of college principals and to be responsible largely for the co-ordination of the teaching work of the University. No important change has been introduced into the organisation of faculties and boards of studies, but the regulations governing the admission of schools to the University are to be made more stringent. New schools, other than theological colleges, will be prohibited from applying for or receiving any money from any public body otherwise than through the council of the University, and will not be allowed, except with the consent of the council, to appeal publicly for money or accept any benefaction to which any onerous condition is attached.

Under the existing statutes based on the Act of 1898 the senate is "the supreme governing and executive body of the University." Apart from the powers to be assigned under the new statutes to the council, the senate under the new statutes (Draft Statute 48) "may delegate or authorise the delegation of any of their powers to any standing committee of the senate or to any subordinate committee or body."

The appointed area for the admission of new schools is the administrative County of London, including the County of the City of London. But teachers of the University may be recognised in institutions situated in this area or in Middlesex, Surrey, Kent, Sussex, Essex, or Hertfordshire. Also the senate may admit as a school of the University any public educational institution situate outside the County of London which is wholly or mainly devoted to the pursuit of some branch of University study, which cannot, in the opinion of the senate, be adequately pursued in any institution within the London area or for which no recognised teacher or adequate body of recognised teachers is available in the larger area for such recognition (Draft Statute 106).

Under clause 134, a new power is to be given to the senate to "revoke any degree, diploma, certificate, or distinction conferred by the University, and all privileges connected therewith, if the holder shall have been convicted in a court of law of felony or of

any misdemeanour which, in the opinion of the senate, by reason of its immoral, scandalous, or disgraceful nature, renders him unfit to hold any such degree, diploma, certificate, or distinction"; and on good cause shown to restore the same degree, diploma, certificate, or distinction, without further examination.

Special college examinations, both at the intermediate and final stages, are authorised by draft statute 137.

A list of schools of the University "immediately prior to the appointed day" is printed as a schedule. The office of the commissioners is 5 Clement's Inn, W.C.2.

### The Gibraltar Skull.

AT a meeting of the Royal Anthropological Institute held on Tuesday, Nov. 1, Mr. H. J. E. Peake, president, in the chair, Miss Dorothy Garrod described the excavations at the Devil's Tower, Gibraltar, in which she had discovered the skull now known to be a relic of Neanderthal man. Mr. L. H. Dudley Buxton gave a description of the skull, and Prof. G. Elliot Smith described the endocranial cast, from which it has been possible to observe the main features of the conformation of the brain.

Miss Garrod gave an account of the excavations in the spring of 1926 in the cave, which was first observed by the Abbé Breuil during the War when excavation was impossible. The portion of the skull first discovered was found embedded in hard travertine, from which it was blasted with dynamite. The fragments were near one another but not contiguous. In the autumn, excavations were resumed, and the cave and talus were cleared down to bed rock, where further fragments of the skull, including part of the lower mandible, were discovered. The associated remains of fauna indicated that the skull was of Pleistocene age. The differences in the species represented here and those from other sites of the same period are attributed to the warmer climate. They are characteristic of the Spanish Pleistocene age. All the implements discovered in the different strata were of Upper Mousterian type. The cave had apparently been used as a place of habitation, but probably only at certain seasons of the year.

Mr. Buxton said the human remains discovered by Miss Garrod in her excavations include the following bones of a human skull: the frontal, the left parietal, the right half of the maxilla, the right temporal, the greater part of the lower mandible, and four milk teeth, two molars being still in their places in the upper and lower jaws respectively, unfortunately not on the same side.

Although there are certain gaps which make reconstruction a matter of considerable difficulty, there is no reasonable doubt that the bones belong to the same individual, as many of the pieces fit together, and those which do not, that is, the temporal and the parietal, can be shown to belong to the same skull by duplicating the bones, so that a left temporal is made to fill up the gap on one side and a right parietal the gap on the other.

Apart from other details, the age is best indicated by the teeth. The first permanent molars were never erupted, but were nearly ready to erupt. It is therefore reasonable to put the age at between the fifth and sixth years, as the permanent molars erupt in the latter year. This is merely an indication, as we have no evidence that the teeth of Neanderthal man erupted exactly at the same time as those of modern man. It seems probable from the size and general characters that the sex was male, and that the La Quina child was therefore female.

Although, no doubt owing to the age of the specimen, the brow ridges have not yet attained that development which is so marked a feature in Neanderthal man, the remains certainly belong to a member of that branch of the human family. Apart from details the most striking characters are the low flattened

form of the vault and the form of the massive jaw. The teeth when viewed by X-rays show the 'taurodont' appearance, both in the deciduous and unerupted permanent teeth, which is not the least of the characteristic features of Neanderthal man.

Prof. Elliot Smith said Miss Garrod has made it clear that the fossilised skull fragments found by her can be referred with certainty to the Upper Mousterian phase of culture; and Mr. Dudley Buxton has shown that they formed a part of a five-year-old child who conformed to the Neanderthal type. Hence it is a matter of some interest to discover in the endocranial cast features that sharply differentiate it from those of all other known representatives of the Neanderthal species. There is a fullness of the prefrontal and parietal areas such as is unknown except in *Homo sapiens*. Yet the general form of the cast conforms to the Neanderthal type.

The question naturally arises whether this apparently exceptional development of the brain may not be due to some pathological condition, such as hydrocephalus, causing a general expansion of the cerebral hemispheres. While the possibility of hydrocephalus cannot be wholly excluded, there are reasons for regarding such an explanation of the condition as improbable. The excavations upon the inner table of the cranium that correspond to the convolutions are exceptionally distinct for a young child's skull, and the ridges that separate them are too salient to be reconciled with an hypothesis of hydrocephalus.

Hence it appears that the unexpected form can be accepted as definite evidence of an altogether exceptional development of the prefrontal and parietal areas for a member of the Neanderthal species. In Neanderthal man the most obtrusive feature of the endocranial cast, as Anthony and Boule have emphasised, is the small size of the prefrontal area. But the series of Neanderthal crania that are now available for study reveal a considerable range of variation in the size of the frontal territory. Admitting that the Devil's Tower skull differs from the rest in an exceptional expansion of those areas of the brain which confer upon *Homo sapiens* his most distinctive attribute, it must not be assumed that the Gibraltar child represents a link between the two species. It is definitely Neanderthaloid and must have acquired its peculiar cerebral characters independently of *Homo sapiens* by convergent development. Nor must the condition be regarded as a normal precocity of the Neanderthal child that afterwards atrophies. The child's skull found at La Quina in 1921 by Dr. Henri Martin conforms in every respect to the adult Neanderthal type. Particular emphasis is laid in Dr. Martin's and Prof. Anthony's reports upon the defective development of the frontal region.

The peculiar form of the Devil's Tower skull is, however, influenced to some extent by the age of the child, for it presents a certain analogy to the peculiarities often found in the five-year-old child of *Homo sapiens*. The chief interest of the endocranial cast of the Devil's Tower skull is the demonstration it affords that Neanderthal man reveals indications of possibilities in cerebral development formerly supposed to be the exclusive privilege of *Homo sapiens*.