



ADMIRAL SIR HERBERT RICHMOND

ADMIRAL SIR HERBERT RICHMOND

1871-1946

ADMIRAL SIR HERBERT WILLIAM RICHMOND (K.C.B., 1926) was the son of Sir William Richmond, K.C.B., R.A., and Clara Jane Richards. Born on 15 September 1871, he entered the Navy before he was fourteen and went to sea in 1887.

Not only was his father a distinguished artist, but his grandfather, George Richmond, was even more celebrated, chiefly for his portrait heads of eminent Victorians. 'There were few men of eminence in the middle of the century [says the *Dictionary of National Biography*] who did not sit to him and many of the portraits were engraved.' Most of us are familiar with his work on the walls of London clubs or in country houses up and down England. Moreover George Richmond was himself the son of Thomas Richmond, a well-known painter of miniatures.

Admiral Herbert Richmond was therefore the descendant of three generations of artists, and was brought up in a home entirely devoted to art. He himself had strong artistic instincts and powers; they were his recreation throughout his life, and they might have been professionally developed. Yet he went into the Navy with which he had no family connexion, but towards which as a boy he felt a strong inclination deriving from his own personal character and temperament. In considering the sailor and the historian, we must not forget the artistic side of his family tradition and of his own talents, for it surely had something to do with his fine scholarship and his gift of clear and attractive writing, which helped him to become a great naval historian.

His father and mother married in 1867 and spent the next three years abroad, chiefly in Italy. I remember, years ago, seeing in a little old *pension* at Assisi, long since closed, the walls that had been frescoed by William Richmond during his residence.

Soon after their return to England Herbert was born. He grew up in an atmosphere favourable to childhood with a mass of brothers and one sister, to whom he was devoted, and with whom he kept in close touch as long as they all lived. He adored his mother whose gentle serenity was combined with much shrewdness and wit, and he was proud as well as fond of his gifted

and charming if rather difficult father. Their home was an old house in Hammersmith which stood in the midst of hayfields, and was a great resort of artist friends. It was also tenanted by a ghost, a weeping, sighing lady, who was seen or heard so often by one or another of the family that most of them seemed to have believed in her reality.

Fraternal recollections of Herbert in his childhood were those of his cheerfulness, courage, and love of enterprise; climbing on the ruins of Corfe Castle and breaking his arm; 'deeply affectionate but fond of fighting'. Just the boy to turn into a sailor! But the decisive incident that drew him to the sea occurred when he was nine or ten years old. 'He was unwell', writes his brother E. T. Richmond,

so he and I to keep him company were packed off to Eastney near Portsmouth, where we were lodged in the cottage of a Mr. Barham, who had formerly served with the Marines in the Crimean War. He was the brother of our old nurse. One day Mr. Barham took him to Portsmouth. I did not go. But he told me later that he then saw a sight which ultimately settled his career: a boatload of bluejackets coming ashore under the command of a small midshipman, alert and authoritative, clothed in the glory of a uniform and armed with a dirk. 'That', he told Mr. Barham, 'is what I should like to be.' A few days later we were on a height from which we could see some men-of-war in Portsmouth harbour. 'There sir', said Mr. Barham, 'is your future ship.'

It must have been soon after this that he was sent with his elder brother to St. Mark's School near Windsor. He was not happy there. The complexities of Greek, Latin, and mathematics worried him and confirmed him in his desire to go to sea.

He failed to pass into the Navy at the age of twelve and cried. He tried again at thirteen and got in. If he had failed a second time his intention was to be an artist.

Another brother, Mr. Arthur C. Richmond, writes as follows:

When a boy he received a good deal of help from his father in developing a talent for drawing. But he was of a rather dynamic temperament seeking continually for outlets for his energy which resulted in his early years in some sense of frustration. He did not find what satisfied him. His choice of the Navy as a career was, he told me, quite accidental. He disliked intensely the private school he was sent to and declared his choice for the Navy because that offered a way of escape from school. But the career of a naval officer alone would never have satisfied him. He was possessed throughout his life by a creative urge. Even as a midshipman he would not just keep a log-book. He had to illustrate and decorate it. And even at that time of life he was

a great letter-writer. I think he always had to write. It was a necessary form of self-expression to him, and he wrote excellent and vivid letters. By nature he had to seek perfection. By that I mean that wherever he touched life in a practical form and found what seemed to him defects he had to try and remedy them. For that reason he could have been anything. Essentially his interests and sympathies were liberal. He hated injustices and if the circumstances of his life had brought him into touch with social problems he would have been an ardent social reformer. Perhaps as a result of his early training in the Navy, which in some ways was a hard one, he developed a superficial attitude of sympathy with conservative and traditional ideas and methods, but in fact he spent his life fighting against established ways of thought in his profession and championing ideas which were often regarded by his superiors as revolutionary. Indeed the liberalism of his instinctive outlook constantly broke through the conservatism of a partially superimposed personality. Yet he had prejudices which he cherished. They were part of his intense loyalty. He was incapable of being disloyal and his affections were very strong.

Throughout his life he had to use his hands in some way or other. In his leisure he painted or he carved or he fixed up some gadget in his house or he re-planned his garden and himself worked at carrying out his ideas.

At fifteen he went to sea as a midshipman and was three years on the Australian station. He used in after life to regale his family with stories of midshipman's pranks and adventures that recall Marryat's tales.

His first sea-going ships were under sail, and he was always glad to have had his training in such a school. He would recall how as midshipman of the fore-top there was never a dull moment in the four hours on watch; there was a sail to adjust, a rope to be made fast, a hundred and one things that might need attention, and the officer's eyes had to be everywhere, seeing that all was in order. He would compare such watch-keeping with the dreary walking up and down the bridge of a modern ship, which takes its place to-day.

At the age of about twenty-four when he had passed all his examinations and was qualified as a torpedo lieutenant, the technical and routine side of naval life ceased to satisfy him, and he began to ask himself what it was all for. The study of naval history, which arose out of that, proved to be the dominating interest of his life. He soon saw the connexion between naval happenings in the past and those of to-day, and sought to establish the principles that should govern the employment of navies in war. The perfecting of the Navy as a fighting

instrument was what he was always working for and thinking of. 'When he was courting me', writes his wife, 'the chief thing I remember about our conversations was his outlining with fervour his plans for a Naval General Staff.'

His marriage, which took place in 1907, began a long and very happy family life. Elsa Bell was the daughter of a very remarkable and delightful man. Sir Hugh Bell, the iron-master of Middlesbrough, was a man of the first class of intellectual power, deeply interested in literature and in politics as well as in business, and devoted to the service of his country in all sorts of ways. His second wife, Florence, Lady Bell, Lady Richmond's mother, was also a most remarkable woman and hostess, with a great knowledge of French language and society. Their house in 95 Sloane Street and their Yorkshire house of Rounton were centres of a great society of cousins and friends, with whom Herbert was very soon a favourite. He much enjoyed the social life in London, and in Yorkshire he threw himself with zest into whatever was going on—the hunting and shooting, the dancing, the skating on ice however rough, the acting in village plays, and all the round of country activities. It was a side of English life he had not known intimately before, and he loved every bit of it. That was a happy period for him, in the years before 1914, with so much already in hand, and a career full of possibilities still ahead. Like many sailors too, who have lived for years in officers' messes, he relished the seclusion and comfort of home life, and as time went on, he was a devoted and delightful father and companion to his family of four daughters and one son. His wife's sister Mary had married Charles (now Sir Charles) Trevelyan, and her half-sister was Gertrude Bell of Arabia, with both of whom, as well as with her brothers, Herbert was on terms of the friendliest intimacy.

I am not competent myself to assess his professional career, but Rear-Admiral Henry Thursfield has kindly communicated the following account to me for publication here:

Throughout his service in the Navy, Herbert Richmond was recognized as an officer of outstanding qualities. Even those who, in the later stages of it, could not believe that one of his wide reading and literary distinction could possibly be at the same time a practical man of affairs—as in fact throughout his life he was—and who lacked the breadth of view and insight that would have led them to accept the validity of the principles for which he strove, admitted both his great abilities and his services to the Navy. The misfortune that during his service on the flag list that school was predominant in the higher ranks

of the Navy excluded him from the highest posts, and deprived the Navy of the services therein of the ablest man of his generation. But his writings after he had retired from the Service and begun his academic career, continued to have an immense influence on current naval thought, and he lived to see the soundness of the principles for which he had striven so hard fully substantiated by the course of events in the last war.

Herbert Richmond entered the Navy as a cadet in the *Britannia* in 1885, going to sea two years later as a midshipman in the *Nelson*, flagship of Rear-Admiral Fairfax, Commander-in-Chief on the Australian Station, one of the first of twin-screw warships but also fully rigged as a sailing ship. He thus had experience of naval conditions that had all but passed away, which was repeated a few years later when he served as a lieutenant in the *Active*, flagship of the sailing Training Squadron which survived until 1898; in the interval, he had served for a short period in the Hydrographic Service—in which his inherited talent as an artist may well have proved useful—in the surveying ship H.M.S. *Stork* in the Mediterranean, one of whose lieutenants was the present Admiral of the Fleet Sir Henry Oliver. In 1894 he was one of those selected to qualify as a torpedo lieutenant—evidence at that time of abilities above the average—and after qualifying high in his class, served in that capacity in several ships. One of them was the flagship of the Commander-in-Chief, Mediterranean, another the flagship of the Channel Squadron, whence he was promoted commander in 1903. The officers of flagships were specially selected from those of high promise, and his bare record of service at this period is evidence of distinction on the scientific and technical side of his profession, which was further recognized by his employment, after promotion to commander, in the Naval Ordnance Department at the Admiralty. That was the last of his technical appointments, however, and after a little more than two years as executive officer of the *Crescent*, flagship of the Commander-in-Chief on the Cape Station, he returned to the Admiralty as Assistant to the Second Sea Lord, whose duties included the supervision and administration of all training. After two years there he was promoted captain.

His first seagoing appointment was the plum of the whole Navy—command of the famous battleship *Dreadnought*, then a new ship and flagship of Sir William May, Commander-in-Chief of the Home Fleet. Staff duties under a chief who was determined to bring about a renaissance in the science of tactics, together with command of one of the largest ships in the Navy of the day, can have left him little leisure for any intensive study of naval history to which his interest had already turned; but after the full two years of that command, his appointment to the cruiser attached to the Torpedo School left him the time to undertake a task after his own heart, that of editing for the Navy Records Society a volume on *The Loss of Minorca*. His own study of the operations at sea in that war, begun some years earlier, was embodied in his book on the War of the Austrian Succession, which he had in hand at that

time but which was not actually published until after the 1914-18 War. The present writer has a very vivid recollection of Richmond's lectures on some of the sea campaigns of that war, delivered voluntarily to officers undergoing the first Naval Staff Course, instituted when Mr. Churchill in 1912 established the Naval Staff to which Richmond was one of the first officers appointed. It was at that period that he took the leading part in establishing *The Naval Review*, a privately printed and circulated magazine designed to encourage young officers to study and think about the higher problems of their profession, and to provide a medium, in spite of the repressive spirit of the Regulations of the day, in which they could put their ideas down on paper. He was in rebellion against the tradition, fairly firmly established among senior naval officers of the day, that the higher direction of war was a matter for admirals alone, and that for younger officers to venture an opinion on them was impertinent and presumptuous; and he held that it was a great handicap to naval officers never to have had an opportunity of discussing important matters of policy, or indeed of expressing themselves clearly and concisely on paper, until they reached exalted rank.

In 1913 he was appointed Deputy Director of the Operations Division of the newly-established Naval Staff at the Admiralty—a post in which he would have delighted if he could have been given real responsibility and an opportunity to turn to good account the results of several years study of strategy and history. But the tradition about which I have written was too strong for him; and once the war had begun in 1914 he was shut out from all useful work in its direction, condemned to inaction and to watching helplessly what he regarded as the negation of clear thought and the plain teachings of history. It was doubtless a relief to him when, in May 1915, he went out to the Mediterranean as Liaison Officer with the Italian Naval Command. In April 1917 he was given command of the battleship *Conqueror* in the Grand Fleet, and after he had held it for a year was appointed to the Admiralty as Director of the newly-established Training and Staff Duties Division of the Naval Staff. Again the prospect was entirely congenial, and he looked forward to the opportunity of remedying all the defects of staff organization that had irked him so much three years earlier, and of inaugurating reforms in the training of officers of which he had been a warm advocate for several years. He wanted to extend the entry of officers from public schools, at the expense of the early entry, and to do away with the system which endeavoured, after midshipmen went to sea, to carry on general education simultaneously with the performance of duty as an officer—a system which still survived though condemned by committee after committee which had examined the subject. But again tradition was too strong for him. Despite the title of his office, he was allowed no say in action by the Admiralty, decision being in the hands of flag officers on the Board who had no sympathy with such unorthodox ideas. Again it was probably a relief to him after less than a year to leave an appointment in which he

experienced nothing but frustration, and return to sea in command of the battleship *Erin* in the Grand Fleet. But one, at least, of his proposals bore fruit after the war—that sub-lieutenants whose education had been perforce cut short by the war should after it be sent for a term or two to Cambridge, where the outlook would be wider than at the Naval College at Greenwich, where their predecessors had been given courses at that stage of their service.

In 1920 Richmond was promoted to flag rank, and very soon afterwards was selected for the duty that he was capable of performing better than any other, that of restarting the Senior Officers' War Course, suspended since the outbreak of war. It was a task after his own heart, and he had practically a free hand, though he incurred their lordships' disapprobation on one occasion. When Admiral Niblack, President of the United States Naval War College at Newport, R.I., visited England, Richmond, who had known him before, invited him to Greenwich to address the officers of the British War Course, without asking Admiralty permission beforehand. He was informed officially that permission ought to have been asked, and that it would not have been granted. Richmond's withers were unwrung by that bit of foolishness, as he saw it, but he felt deeply the next blow that fell. When the 'Geddes Axe' descended on the Navy in 1921, more than three-quarters of the officers at the War College, comprising his own staff as well as those taking the course, were found to be amongst those selected for immediate retirement; and he regarded that action, not without some justification, as an indication that those then in authority at the Admiralty really regarded the historical and strategical studies there pursued—which in his view were of the highest importance—as of so little value that only officers for whom there was no other employment were sent to take part in them. But the course was resumed in due time. The War College had long vacations between courses, and Richmond profited by these to resume work for the Naval Records Society, taking over the last two volumes of the 'Spencer Papers' from Sir Julian Corbett who was too fully occupied with the Official Naval History of the War to complete the series he had started.

On leaving the War College in 1923 Richmond became Commander-in-Chief on the East Indies Station. A squadron consisting of three cruisers and some small ships hardly provided full employment for his active brain, and one of the fruits of his tenure of the command was the appearance of a masterly treatise on the principles of Imperial Defence in respect of naval bases in a volume under the title *The Navy in India, 1763-83*. After two years in the East Indies, he would have welcomed a more active sea-going command, or a post of responsibility at the Admiralty; but the 'material school' who regarded him as necessarily an unpractical theorist—no practical naval officer, they held, could possibly have acquired his learning or literary ability—were still in control, and for a time he was unemployed. In 1927, however, when the Imperial Defence College was founded, he was so obviously the

man for the post of its first Commandant that he was selected for it. Again he had a task after his own heart, and he set himself with energy to the work of deducing, from the experience of the past applied to the conditions of the present and future, a British scheme and policy of defence, or British way of war, and seeing to it that his students should neither neglect what history had to teach them on that theme nor tolerate any loose thinking in reaching conclusions regarding policy or the higher conduct of war. It was not his way to seek to instruct so much as to guide the studies of those under him in the new College; he never laid down the law on his own authority in formulating principles or conclusions, but rather sought to convince by argument—in which he rarely failed. No man could have been better fitted to found a tradition for the new College; the pity was that he could only hold the command of it for two years.

After relinquishing that important post, he expected further responsible employment, for it might reasonably be concluded that the man chosen to guide the best brains of all three Services must himself be fitted for the highest posts in his own. It was not to be, for those of the material school were still in the saddle and they were unlikely to abandon their delusion that he was an unpractical theorist; moreover, he soon found himself at issue with them. Revision of the Washington Treaty for the limitation of navies was under discussion, and Richmond wrote two articles in *The Times* in which he pointed out the strategical absurdity of seeking a formula by which to limit the numerical strength of navies, and urging that limitation should be sought rather in the size of individual ships. But his arguments, cogent as they were, were very unwelcome to the Admiralty, already committed to the opposite view; and the result was that Richmond was informed that there would be no further employment for him, and he retired in 1931. It was no new experience for the naval officer whose ideas were in advance of his time, but few if any of his predecessors were able to render such signal service to the Navy after it had discarded them as was Richmond. The series of books that he published after his retirement, and his lectures as Professor of Naval History at Cambridge, did an immense amount to spread sound strategical knowledge and opinion not only in the Navy but elsewhere; and when the full history of the late war comes to be written, it will undoubtedly be manifest that a closer observance of his teaching by those in high places would have avoided many of the disasters and failures which were his country's fate in the course of it.

And so it came about that Richmond's greatest service to this country was his work as a naval historian, in which he was not impeded; indeed his relatively early retirement from his professional career enabled him to fulfil more completely this part of his life's work. But his achievement as an historian is all of a piece with his naval career; both were inspired by a desire to elucidate the true principles of national policy as regards mari-

time affairs, for which the civil government is ultimately responsible, and secondly the principles of naval strategy and tactics. These he sought to discover and illustrate by a close study of our naval history. In all his works there are two lines of investigation: first, what ought to have been the naval policy of the civil government and Admiralty, both as regards preparation of naval strength in time of peace and its use in time of war; and secondly how far the naval officers in charge of particular operations failed or succeeded with the means placed by Government at their disposal in the given circumstances of each case.

These characteristics are equally present in those of his books which are detailed histories of particular wars and in those other books which are rather of the nature of historical essays to instruct the public in the principles of sea power. To the first group, close studies of particular events, belong *The Loss of Minorca, Introduction* (Naval Record Society, 1913); *The Navy and the War of 1739-1748* (three volumes, begun in 1907, published in 1920); and *The Navy in India, 1768-1783* (1930). To the second class of more general works belong *National Policy and Naval Strength* (1928); *Imperial Defence and Capture at Sea in War* (1932); *Sea Power and the Modern World* (1934); and the finest of all his books, *Statesmen and Sea Power* (1946), based on the Ford Lectures of 1943, an historical survey of Britain's use of sea-power from Elizabeth's day to 1945.

If such a series of books had been written in the past it would have had a great effect in educating the British people, British statesmen, and British sailors in an understanding of the bases of Britain's power and would probably in the course of years have had profound effects on our policy in peace and in war. But until Mahan's books in the last decade of the nineteenth century, there was no serious naval history, even in England. *The Life of Nelson* had been written by Southey, who knew little indeed about the sea. General historians, Macaulay for instance, had nothing professional to guide them about naval affairs and were therefore often mistaken and generally inadequate on the subject. The 'Silent Service', efficient as it was, did not try to instruct the public nor had it searched history for the principles to guide its own action. In Queen Anne's reign there had indeed been Burchett, but anyone who has used his reliable work knows the very narrow limitations which that prudent civil servant put upon himself as an historian.

Mahan was an American, but his theme was at once followed up by Sir John Laughton and Julian Corbett in this country.

Richmond was of their school. In his early historical work he was helped by Laughton and by Corbett. In this great though entirely modern English school of naval history, which mourns to-day the recent loss of Geoffrey Callender, Herbert Richmond holds a very high place indeed.

Those of his works which are detailed studies of naval events, the loss of Minorca, the war of 1739-48, and the Indian duels of Hughes and Suffren, are interesting even to the non-professional reader because they are not merely chronicles of naval happenings. They discuss at every turn the motives of the rival commanders in view of the circumstances of each moment, and they criticize or approve the decisions taken in the light of possible alternatives. Instructed by meticulous scholarship as well as by professional experience, Richmond's keen intellect is alive on every page, thinking out the problem of the day and hour, first as it presented itself, and secondly as it should have presented itself, to the admiral in his cabin or in some cases to the government at home.

The other class of his works which discusses national policy in relation to sea power, imperial defence, capture at sea, &c., although more of the nature of tracts for the times, are based on history as well as on the situation of the present day. The volume *Statesmen and Sea Power*, written during the recent war, is definitely a history, but it is also a summing up of the principles of sea power as Britain ought to understand them if she is to face the future aright. It is a naval history of Britain from Elizabeth to 1945, and as such ought to be studied by all historians, and read by all citizens who wish to understand their country's interest. This remarkable book was produced at a time when its author was busily engaged in war-time activities at Downing in ways described below, and while he was suffering from chronic heart complaint that might have carried him off at any moment and did carry him off in the end. In the production of this important book he was helped by his daughter Nora. It is his legacy to England. He died on 15 December 1946.

It was in 1934 that I took part in the election of Richmond to the Vere Harmsworth Chair of Naval History. Our choice was a marked compliment to his eminence as an historian, for owing to the age limit affecting professorships he could only hold it for two years; but we felt that his qualifications were so great that even this disadvantage could be overlooked. He was an excellent lecturer and teacher. One of his pupils wrote. 'It

was from him I first realized that history was a true affair and not, as I supposed from the way it was taught at school in those days, a mass of unrelated and dull facts'.

It was fortunate indeed that we thus brought him to Cambridge as professor, for people there got to know him and in consequence he was chosen Master of Downing in 1936 and so had another decade added to his official life in the University. Mr. Cuttle of Downing has told the story of his Mastership in the *Cambridge Review* (25 January 1947) and I am permitted to reprint the relative parts of that article:

He retired in 1932 to his house at Great Kimble in Buckinghamshire, with a charming garden of his own creation: he loved the hard work of hedging and lopping as well as the gentler tasks of planning and planting. But in 1934 he was elected to succeed Dr. Holland Rose in the Vere Harmsworth chair, and a new career began. He used to spend term in his rooms at Jesus, of which College he was made a professorial Fellow, finding this academic world most congenial to him. He was very soon drawn happily into the circle of 'Q' and entered into the life of his college with a whole-hearted zest. Downing owes much to Jesus for all that Richmond learned during the two years of his professorship about the ways of Cambridge and its undergraduates.

He was known at Downing before he became its Master in 1936, for he twice addressed the Maitland Society; his charm and his affability—no-one could have been easier for anyone to speak to—showed how well he knew how to encourage young men. He took his Mastership very seriously; he thought of himself, I think, as the captain of the ship, concerned primarily with the well-being of the whole ship's company. Of University and college routine he had at the beginning little knowledge, but he made it his business to inform himself. The commanders of British battleships live in isolation: they have their own quarters where they work and take their meals; and the executive officer of the Royal Navy is at no stage of his career concerned with routine office duties, which are the affairs of another branch. Richmond's modesty quickly yielded to the expectancy which welcomed his company in Hall; and when a matter of business called for his attention he went to great pains to understand it. As the Head of his House, he believed in 'a band of brothers' and proved what the infection of such a belief can be. He was impatient of quiddities and taradiddles, but was too good a fighter as his professional and scholarly record shows, to decry honest controversy decently conducted. Two days before his death he presided at a long and important college meeting with conspicuous skill, acumen, patience and wisdom.

The advent of war though it put an end to many plans for the college, gave him opportunities which partly compensated for the blow. He was able to place his knowledge at the disposal of the Allied cause in a

large number of ways; he wrote and he advised; he and Lady Richmond entertained members of the services, British, Dominion, and Allied, especially those of France, a country for which his friendship was strong and abiding. He eagerly talked with serving members of the College, and was always ready to try to help them if he judged it right. He was first chairman of the Joint Recruiting Board,¹ and was throughout in constant attendance to advise young men about the Navy. It gave him great satisfaction to see the University Naval Division established in his College and to live again with the white ensign flying. He had always felt strongly that young men at Cambridge ought to be well informed on foreign affairs, and among his most notable contributions to this object was a series of talks in the Junior Combination Room on the progress of the war. Of these the most memorable was given in the summer of 1940. After the war the Amalgamation Club of the College wished that these lectures should be continued and extended, and known as 'the Richmond Lecture' and the first visiting speaker, Lord Halifax, addressed the Club just over a week before Richmond's death. The imaginative breadth of Richmond's interest was remarkable; being lent a book on the economics of ancient Greece, he was excited by the discovery of the first expression of the doctrine of sea power in an Athenian writer of the fifth century, and incorporated it into an article he was writing; having been consulted on what should be said about a distinguished naval officer who was to receive an honorary degree, he was eager to get at what he might feel to be an adequate translation of the admirable Latin oration, in order that he might have it printed for naval men to read. When Oxford gave him his own honorary degree in June 1939, he took especial pleasure in the reference to himself as one who had ruled ships and now ruled a college—an *facilius rectu, incertum*. Easier or more difficult, that rule will long be remembered gratefully.

When, in 1940, a serious illness forced him to give up more strenuous pursuits, he fell back upon his sailor's gift of handiness, and found relief from hard thinking in the making to scale of beautiful little reproductions of period furniture, which were sold for the Red Cross; and from this developed the planning, building, and equipment of a large doll's house for a granddaughter, a work of art which might rank with the best that have been produced of that delightful domestic kind. He kept bees, but they were prone to sting him, and he not infrequently bore their marks and objurgated their unreasonable hostility.

The courage with which he lived and worked after that illness needs no stressing. His last book, *Statesmen and Sea Power*, published by the Clarendon Press a few weeks before his death, has been called his masterpiece, a book which Mahan could not have bettered. His

¹ Incidentally, the first undergraduate who appeared before the Board, at the outbreak of war, was his son, then an Exhibitioner in History at Trinity College, and later Lieutenant, R.N.V.R.

wisdom was as great as his intellectual powers; and he was sensitive and tasteful. In all his intercourse with other men he was charming and humorous; but when all his qualities are numbered, the greatest of these was kindness.

In all relations of life he was as nearly perfect as it is given to man to be, and those who were nearest him knew best what he was. When goodness and beauty of character, greatly superior to what we ordinary men can show, are united to great and well-disciplined powers of mind, we see to what height in the hierarchy of being a brother man can rise.

G. M. TREVELYAN