

---

University Of London

Source: *The British Medical Journal*, Vol. 1, No. 698 (May 16, 1874), pp. 661-662

Published by: BMJ

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/25238639>

Accessed: 13-08-2021 05:27 UTC

---

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

*BMJ* is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The British Medical Journal*

## UNIVERSITY OF LONDON.

THE annual meeting of convocation was held on Tuesday last, Dr. STORRAR presiding. He stated that, in January last, the following motion had been proposed by Mr. A. P. Hensman, B.A., and seconded by Mr. G. Serrell, M.A., "That, in the opinion of Convocation, it is desirable that women should be permitted to take degrees in the University of London". Upon the motion of Mr. Hutton and Dr. Sibson, the consideration of the question had been adjourned from that meeting, and the Annual Committee had, as requested, placed the question first on the agenda paper.

Mr. FITCH commenced the debate by reviewing the objections made to the motion at the previous meeting. As regarded the entry of women into the profession, the degrees were simply certificates of proficiency, not licenses to practise. [The CHAIRMAN corrected this statement in so far as the degrees in medicine was concerned.] Again, it was said that, if degrees were given to women, all sorts of evils would be brought about, as the objects and aims in life of the two sexes were so divergent, but the very same arguments had been used when the Supplementary Charter was discussed some years ago, before women were admitted to any examination in the University. Forty or fifty thoughtful women had taken advantage of that charter, but none of the predicted evils had come to pass; women had not yet been made into men. The University had made distinctions which should not exist in the examination of the two sexes. Italian and botany were introduced into the curriculum for women; but no special certificate of proficiency had ever been gained by women in either of these subjects. The women who had shone at the examinations already held had always taken up the subjects of ordinary education of men. Men would rebel, if told to restrict their education to a few beaten tracks; and women should have equally liberty in the matter. There was absolutely no difference in the papers set for men and women respectively; the standard of examination had not been lowered to suit the assumed inferior capacity of women. The world knew the value of the University degrees; it was, therefore, fair to place it in the power of women to obtain such advantages as belonged to the degrees. Not many women, he thought, would ever gain them. He did not think women would be less efficient at, or would forsake, ordinary domestic duties because they had degrees in that University. He quoted Mr. Grote, that many women had attained the highest positions in learning and scientific culture, notably Mrs. Somerville. Every woman should be allowed to choose for herself her own course in life. If amongst the types she should choose that upon which examinations are held at the University, she should be welcome to her well-won degree. The education of women needed to be more systematic and thorough. Oxford and Cambridge were now examining girls' schools all over the land, applying the very same standard of severity for boys and girls, for which cause their examinations were most popular. Should the University of London be behind in the good work? No; they must ask the Senate to obtain alterations in the Charter, so that women might be admitted to any examination at which they desired to present themselves. Petitions in favour of the motion had already been presented to the Senate, signed amongst others by twenty-seven women who had already passed the established examination for women. Why should they be kept back from higher honours? Undoubtedly, there was a necessity for physical as well as mental culture; perhaps, also, competitive examinations as far as women were concerned might be modified. The demand now made, however, was based on the ground of justice and generosity, and could not be long delayed.

Mr. GOLDSMID, M.P., opposed the motion. Women's education wanted improving, but that might be done without granting them degrees. The sexes should be kept separate, and their education should be distinct, their aims in life being different. Women were superior to men in many respects; but they would lose by having men's training and by competing with men.

Mr. ELLIOTT said the motion would allow exceptional women to take degrees, if they desired to do so; why not? Why should not men and women be examined together?

Mr. A. CREAK proposed, as an amendment, that women should be admitted to the examinations in arts, not in anything else, and that successful candidates should receive, not degrees, but certificates of having passed.

Dr. SANSOM seconded the amendment.

Mr. CONWAY regarded the opening up of degrees to women as a powerful means of ending the heartless frivolity prevalent in the sex after leaving school and before entrance in the married state. Besides,

the whole education of the country would be put on a higher level, if women were better educated.

Mr. ROBBERDS and Mr. MILLER supported the motion; the latter especially dwelling upon the fitness of women for the obstetrical branch of medical art.

Dr. QUAIN asked the last speaker whether he and other clergymen who advocated women doctors were prepared to see their pulpits besieged by an army of Amazons. Medical men were perfectly ready to welcome the ladies, but they had too great a regard for the sex, knowing the evil effects of hard study upon women's minds and health. This was a question of placing men and women in the position of competing one against the other. The degrees of the University of London represented the highest type of education for men; was that type suitable for women? Suppose a woman entered the medical profession, married, and had a child, would she visit a case of scarlet fever? She must either expose her child to infection, or neglect her patient. Again, if asked to attend a lady-patient at her confinement next November, she might be compelled to decline, because at that time she might be requiring attendance herself. How could a refined lady continue her attendance at the dissecting-room without being prejudicially affected thereby? or, if a lawyer, how could she return to her home from the filthy purlieus of the Divorce Court or Old Bailey? Women's mission was higher—to make home happy and to educate and train their children.

Mr. A. MACKENNALL said that the highest education of men and women was self-development; it afforded enjoyment of the highest kind to its happy possessors; why, then, debar women from its pleasures? The degree had advantages of its own supplementary to the certificate.

Dr. MERYON gave two instances of young ladies, who became paralysed from overwork.

Dr. SIBSON said that women required a high education, but one suited to their sphere in life; raise that as much as possible. The proper balance of education, physical as well as mental, was required; no part should be overworked. Properly conducted education conducted to health of mind and body; if women worked for degrees as men did, they would fall and suffer in the competition. Could a vote in that room alter suddenly the traditions of centuries? Should the University provide for general wants, or for a few exceptional masculine women? He thought there was an absolute needlessness of the University allowing women to be examined for degrees.

Others spoke amid cries of "Divide, divide".

Mr. HENSMAN, in reply, said the matter had, on the whole, been treated seriously; and that, if his proposition was passed, human nature would remain much as it is at present. The opponents of his motion had answered one another in most of the objections they had urged. Many women were single, and never entered the state of matrimony. They also formed a large part of the teaching power of this country; why, then, deprive them of the degree after they have passed the necessary examination? No profession was thereby opened to the sex.

The CHAIRMAN said one female practitioner was on the register.

Mr. HENSMAN was glad to hear it. If women were capable of taking the degrees, was there any justice in preventing them from doing so? If the house passed the resolution, they would be doing justice to women and honour to themselves.

The amendment was at once negatived; and the original motion carried amid loud cheers by a majority of 83 to 65.

The report of the Annual Committee was then presented and received.

Mr. COZENS HARDY, for Mr. SHAEN, moved, "That, while cordially concurring in the object of the Medical Acts Amendment (University of London) Act, Convocation requests the Chairman to express to the Senate their hope that, for the future, no similar action may be taken without the previous consent of Convocation." The one important function of Convocation was, that no new charter, or alteration in the charter, could be made without their consent; and, therefore, they must press this right, lest a radical change in the University should be at any time made without their consent.

Dr. FAGGE, in seconding the resolution, observed that each of the bodies affected by the conjoint scheme had had to give up something; they would each lose, that the general public might gain. Still, that was no reason why the members of Convocation should abandon their undoubted privileges.

The CHAIRMAN observed that what had been done was a mere matter of inadvertence; every one concerned had overlooked the fact that the privileges of Convocation had been encroached upon.

After a few remarks from Mr. R. M. FOWLER, the motion was carried unanimously. It was carried unanimously that the proposals of the Legal Education Association be referred to the Annual Committee.

It was decided to hold a meeting of Convocation in January next. Mr. Robson was appointed Clerk of Convocation for the ensuing year.

It was resolved, "That the present representation of Convocation on the Senate is not satisfactory, and that it be referred to the Annual Committee to see what change shall be introduced, in the event of a supplemental charter being obtained."

The proposition, "That information as to the number of marks awarded by the Examiners should be given to successful candidates for the higher degrees," was negatively upon a show of hands.

Mr. HUTTON proposed "That this House earnestly requests the Senate not to allow painful experiments on living animals, when not intended to be medical or curative, to be in any case carried on in the physiological laboratory of the Brown Institution: 1. Because such experiments are so far from being sanctioned by the late Mr. Brown's Will, that he distinctly directed that 'kindness to the animals committed to the charge' of the Superintendent should be 'a general principle of the Brown Institution'; 2. Because such experiments, wherever their subjects are 'domestic animals', are in all probability in contravention of the second section of the 12th and 13th Victoria, cap. 92; 3. Because the connection of this University with experiments of the vivisectional kind would be detrimental to its honourable position, and an outrage on the principles of a large class of its graduates." He said he brought no charges against the director of the Brown Institution or any other gentleman. It was a fact that vivisectional experiments had been made, and the Senate was in favour of them. He based his proposition on three grounds. 1. Such experiments constituted very likely a breach of trust. Mr. Brown founded the hospital out of the kindness of his heart to the lower animals; he certainly never contemplated that fever or other diseases should be produced in them. And, since such experiments could not tell us exactly what the effects of like operations upon mankind would be, would it not be better to create at once a subdivision of the slave trade, or take the criminal classes of the community, in order to provide subjects? The physiological experiments on them would be far more exact. The motives for performing the experiments of which he complained might be philanthropic; they certainly were not benevolent. 2. These experiments were very likely, he thought, to be a breach of the law. It would not be difficult for anyone who knew the race of lawyers to get an opinion against the legality of the acts now permitted at the Institution; whilst anyone who knew the race of judges knew that it was a "toss up" as to how the question might be decided if brought before a Court. Truly, it might be said that the experiments were done for the purpose of ultimately benefiting human beings; but that was not the question. The Act 12 and 13 Victoria, cap. 92, stated that one should not torture . . . animals; now torture did not involve a question of motive; but the punishment for any act of torture was a fine not exceeding £5. He believed that no physiologist had ever been prosecuted under the Act; but still anyone giving pain to an animal amounting to torture, whether for the good of human nature or not, was liable to a fine of £5. 3. The University was catholic; it covered all religious and all moral opinions; but, by permitting these experiments, they committed themselves to the narrow principle of vivisection. It was monstrous that the opinions of a large minority of the members of the University should be outraged in that way for the sake of the scientific results to be gained therefrom. Those who had experimented might be noble-minded and upright; but they must for the future be prevented from such acts.

The CHAIRMAN read a letter from Dr. Sanderson, who said that the laboratory was not used for physiological inquiries, simply for investigations into the nature and treatment of disease. It was necessary for such investigation to induce the disease and to perform small experiments, such as the abstraction of a little blood, etc. This must be done. As much care was taken of the diseased animals sent there as if they were human beings.

Mr. HERSHELL opposed the motion. He said that, if passed, it would be a vote of censure on the Senate; but the Senate had not so acted as to lose the confidence of that House. What experiments did Mr. Hutton intend to prevent? He ought to have been more explicit. What reasons had Mr. Hutton given for knowing what had been done, and what was going to be done, at the Institution? He criticised severely the three reasons upon which the proposition was based. As regards the first, that was a very serious statement; because, if anything had been done constituting a breach of trust, the Institution might be removed from the control of the University. Now Mr. Brown said, in one paragraph of his Will, that the Senate might purchase diseased or wounded animals or their carcasses "for the purposes of science". He, therefore, wished for the promotion of science, and was more benevolent and philanthropic than Mr. Hutton gave him credit for. They were asked to affirm that so and so was, in all probability, the law; now either it was or it was not the law. Clearly and unquestionably such acts as Mr. Hutton hinted at were not contrary to the law. The experiments of Dr. Brown-Séguard, mentioned by Mr. Hutton, were in the

knowledge of Parliament when the Act which had been cited was passed. The whole clause, which spoke of overdriving, torturing, etc., was governed by the word "cruelly", which prefaced the whole sentence; to "cruelly torture" an animal was illegal. According to Dr. Johnson, "cruel" signified "pleased to give pain"; according to Webster, it meant "disposed to give pain to others"; "reckless of the pain given". There might be justification for pain given, as in the experiments in question; when the individual would not come within the letter or spirit of the law, but anyone who cruelly tortured animals was clearly within the purview of the clause, were he donkey-driver or physiologist. He thought Mr. Hutton's view of the law of the question was wrong, and that no judge in Westminster Hall would decide with Mr. Hutton. It was a monstrous proposition that the majority should be asked to give way to the sensitive natures of the minority, because they affirmed that it was a question of principle with them. Everything was a question of principle; people objected to the Income-tax on principle. But they were assured by Dr. Sanderson that no experiments of simple scientific curiosity were done there; only those necessary for the investigation and treatment of disease. Either that was a right thing or a wrong thing to do. If right, it ought to be continued; if wrong, it should be done nowhere. But, further, if it were a right thing, and if it came within the terms of the will, as he thought it did, the directors would be wrong if they did not do it. Was it wrong to give pain to animals, as was daily done when we killed them to support our lives? Clearly not. Neither was it wrong to give pain for the preservation of more valuable lives, as by testing a pestilential disease. It could not be wrong to give pain that thousands of lives might be saved. Mr. Hutton had said that you would get more valuable results from experiments on criminals; and that, if experiment on the lower animals were right, the other experiments might be defended on the same plea. Clearly not, however. We might pole-axe a rabid animal, but might not shoot a man rabid from disease. We might never have a less regard for human life. We clearly might subordinate the lower animals to our use, as by eating them to support our own lives.

Mr. PARKER said Mr. Brown did not give his money to benefit man, but to advance science on behalf of the brute creation. He founded his hospital exclusively for the use of animals; and any experiments for the benefit of man which might have been done had already contravened the intentions of the founder.

A GRADUATE said that the will allowed animals diseased or wounded to be purchased for scientific purposes. That did not allow them to be tortured. Again, was over-driving not torture, even if not cruelly done? Any one over-driving was guilty and liable, whether he did it because it gave him pleasure or not. However, he should vote against Mr. Hutton's motion, because, from the letter which had been read, he believed that Dr. Sanderson thought the provisions of the will to be contrary to such experiments, and seemed determined that no experiments should be performed except those for the real advantage of the animals themselves.

Mr. SOLOMON thought the lawyers would be opposed to Mr. Hutton's view of the matter.

Dr. SANSON and Mr. NESBIT proposed that the meeting should pass to the next business on the paper; but the motion was lost.

Mr. HUTTON then replied. He had purposely abstained from making charges against the learned Superintendent of the Brown Institution. He wished clearly to separate his own motives in the matter from any charge of cruelty against very eminent men. Mr. Brown certainly desired that animals should be bought for scientific purposes; but only on behalf of the animals themselves. He (Mr. Hutton) did, however, know that doctors had such zeal for experiments that he would rather not leave the matter to their discretion. It might be perfectly right that these experiments should be made, but that was far different from saying that the University should permit them to be performed in the Brown Institution.

A division then took place; when the motion was lost by a large majority. Sixteen only voted for, and fifty-nine against it.

The following medical graduates were elected to serve on the Annual Committee for the ensuing year:—M. Baines, M.D.; Marcus Beck, M.S.; E. Clapton, M.D.; C. H. Fagge, M.D.; W. Tilbury Fox, M.D.; W. H. Holman, M.B.; H. Maudsley, M.D.; A. Meadows, M.D.; J. F. Payne, B.Sc.; G. V. Poore, M.D.; and P. H. Pye-Smith, M.D.

The meeting then terminated.

A YOUNG lady, Miss Jacobs of Sappemeer, has passed the examination for a medical degree at Rotterdam with the greatest success. She is the first lady who has achieved the distinction in Holland.