



ARTHUR GOODHART

Ramsay & Muspratt

Arthur Lehman Goodhart 1891–1978

ARTHUR LEHMAN GOODHART, one of the outstanding common lawyers of the century, was born in New York on 1 March 1891, and died in London on 10 November 1978, aged eighty-seven. For nearly sixty years he lived and worked in England, but despite his Anglophilia and his thorough acclimatisation here, he remained throughout a citizen of the USA, and unmistakably American. For over fifty years, nobody had a greater influence on the development of the common law. This resulted mainly from the steady flow of his writings, but also from his teaching, his committee work, and his easy relationship with many leading figures in the law. Though England was the main beneficiary, the whole common law world profited.

His inheritance was rich. He was endowed with ability, public spirit, modesty, and generosity, as well as material wealth. His grandparents were all born in Europe and emigrated to the USA in the 1830s and 1840s. His father, Philip, was born in Cincinnati, but as a young man he went to New York, where in due time he became a prominent member of the New York Stock Exchange, in partnership with his brother. He was a kind and gentle man who died in 1944 at the age of eighty-eight. Arthur's mother, Harriet, was a sister of Irving Lehman, who became Chief Judge of the New York Court of Appeals, and of Herbert Lehman, who, after being Governor of the State of New York from 1932–42, became Director-General of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration (UNRRA), and then from 1948–56 a US Senator who was one of Senator Joe McCarthy's most resolute adversaries. Harriet

© The British Academy 1997.

was small, serious, dominant, and rather fierce; and she too lived to be eighty-eight, dying in 1949. Her father and one of his brothers had been shopkeepers in Alabama, and through accepting payment in cotton instead of cash they had become cotton brokers. After the end of the Civil War, the brothers became established in New York as general commodity dealers, and from that they progressed into merchant banking. By the end of the century Lehman Brothers had become one of the leading merchant banks in New York.

Arthur was the third and youngest child of Philip and Harriet. They were devout Jews, but members of the Reform wing, which had discarded the dietary laws and other minutiae of the Talmud. At an early age Arthur abandoned any religious belief or observance; but throughout his life he remained very much concerned with Jews and Jewish causes, and in his latter years his support for the State of Israel tended to the fanatical. His upbringing was in a brownstone house on 88th Street, just west of Central Park, and next door to the house of Harriet's sister and her family. He went to day-school in New York, and then to Hotchkiss School, a well-known preparatory school in northern Connecticut. From there he entered Yale, graduating in 1912 with high honours. At Yale he was popular with his fellows, and was the first Jew to be elected a member of Alpha Delta Phi. For this, the Yale Chapter was suspended by the national organisation. He became an editor of the *Yale Literary Magazine* and other Yale periodicals, and graduated with high academic honours, a Phi Beta Kappa. His athletic activities were limited by poor eyesight, but he was a good cross-country runner. He enjoyed lawn tennis and, after he had come to England, real tennis.

Arthur had been intended to join Lehman Brothers. Fortunately, his father had come to admire British bankers, and so in 1912 Arthur was sent to Trinity College, Cambridge, to read economics. When he arrived, his tutor, Morley Fletcher, told him that the Trinity economics fellow was away for the year. 'If you really want to read economics, we will have to send you to a young don at King's called Keynes. But nobody thinks him very sound; why don't you read law instead?' This advice fell on receptive ears, for although Arthur had not read law at Yale, he had gone to Professor Arthur Corbin's classes on the law of contract, and this had convinced him that law was a subject of 'the most profound interest'. So at Cambridge he began to read law, with H. A. Hollond as his director of studies. Hollond had been a fellow of Trinity for only three years, and was still in his twenties; but he was to play a significant part in Arthur's life. A close friendship which was to last sixty years soon sprang up between them.

Goodhart greatly enjoyed his two years at Cambridge; and this did not prevent him from getting a First in Part II of the law tripos. Among his contemporaries at Trinity, Lawrence Bragg and George Thomson, both to be Nobel prize-winners in physics, became his lifelong friends. Some time later, when they were young bachelor dons, they hired a sailing boat in the Solent for a cruise along the south coast, and there was a series of disasters which, in retrospect, Goodhart enjoyed recounting.

With the outbreak of war in 1914, Goodhart joined the Officers' Training Corps, and later volunteered for the Army; but he was refused a commission on account of his nationality. He then returned to the USA, and after passing the New York State Bar examinations, he became an assistant corporation counsel for New York City in 1915. When his country entered the war in 1917 he joined the US Army, and became a captain. At the end of the war he went to Poland as counsel to the US Military Mission. Out of this visit came his first book, *Poland and the Minority Races* (1920), which was particularly concerned with the position of Polish Jews. By this time Hollond had suggested that Goodhart should teach law at Cambridge, and the percipient eye of Will Spens of Corpus Christi had recognised his ability. The result was a law fellowship at Corpus and a university lectureship in law in 1919. He was also called to the Bar by the Inner Temple, which he had joined in 1912. He never practised in England, but settled down to teaching.

In 1921 Goodhart became secretary to the Vice-Chancellor of the university, a post which he held until 1923. But another event in 1921 was to have greater significance in his life. This was the foundation of the *Cambridge Law Journal*, with Goodhart as its editor for the initial four years. This venture was largely due to his initiative as well as his substantial financial support. In the USA it had long been common for law schools to publish learned periodicals. An outstanding feature of these publications was that although the articles and book reviews were written by established lawyers on the academic staff and elsewhere, the notes on recent cases were written by students in the law school. Selection as one of the student editors of the law review, and so as one of its contributors, was a hallmark of distinction, both in the law school and beyond. The *Cambridge Law Journal* was established on this model. But somehow this system of student case-notes never really flourished in England. Despite notable exceptions, and the presence of names later to become highly distinguished in the law, by 1954 the system had come to be replaced by one of case-notes written by senior

members of the faculty and others. Nevertheless, the *Journal* achieved an immediate and sustained success, due in no small part to Goodhart's flair for obtaining articles of a high standard.

Another significant feature of those early years in the law was Goodhart's choice of subject. By inclination and nature he was a common lawyer. His heart was in tort and contract, with some crime and constitutional law; yet he made jurisprudence his subject. A university lecturer in jurisprudence had been killed in the war, and so had left a vacancy in that subject. As a subject, jurisprudence can be almost all things to all men. It may be analytical, anthropological, comparative, ethical, general, historical, normative, particular, post-modernist, sociological, and realist, and, more recently, feminist. None of these labels really fitted Goodhart, though 'analytical' was *proxime accessit*. He seldom soared to the rarefied heights of jurisprudential abstraction, and remained firmly in the world of living law. He became not so much a professor of jurisprudence as a jurisprudential professor of the common law. There is no difficulty in making law seem complex and obscure, and many succeed. Without being simplistic, Goodhart's simplicity of utterance matched his clarity of thought, and brought him nearer to judges and practitioners than any academic lawyer before him. His approach was to subject the common law to his formidable powers of jurisprudential analysis and then to apply his sturdy common sense and reason to it. For him, principle never lost sight of the practical.

In 1924 Goodhart married Cecily Carter, of Beaulieu, Hampshire. A notable beauty, she had gone up to read history at Newnham in 1919, a little belatedly on account of her having volunteered for factory work during the war. Goodhart's family accepted his marriage to a gentile without dissension, and the American husband and English wife with their three sons (1925, 1933 and 1936) became a truly Anglo-American family. Goodhart's frequent (and often extended) visits to America left untouched his affection for England.

A major step in Goodhart's life was his appointment as editor of the *Law Quarterly Review*, in 1926, when he was thirty-four. The *Review* had been founded in 1885, mainly by Sir Frederick Pollock. From 1885 to 1919 he was the editor of the first learned legal periodical in the common-law world. It was followed in 1887 by the *Harvard Law Review*, and then by many other American journals; but in England it remained unique until the *Cambridge Law Journal* appeared in 1921. Pollock's successor, A. E. Randall, died suddenly in 1925, and Goodhart was his obvious successor. He remained editor for fifty years, the

last five as editor-in-chief, with P. V. Baker as editor. His run was unbroken except for 1929 while he was a visiting professor in the Yale Law School and P. H. Winfield deputised for him. His editorship of the *LQR* and the body of his contributions to it were the outstanding achievements of his life in the law.

He was a discerning and open-minded editor, accepting contributions over the whole range of law even when he disagreed with them or lacked interest in them. But he was insistent on maintaining a high standard, and looked for tenable originality and lucid presentation. Nothing was rejected out of hand. The good, the bad, and the indifferent were all considered, at a cost of time and patience which was sometimes increased by giving advice and encouragement to the inexperienced. With himself, he could be downright. A hint of fallibility would sometimes be met with a pause, and then a flat 'No—it's wrong'. In discussion, he would put his point directly and reasonably, often ending with a characteristic sound, 'D'there'. This was as eloquent as Puff made Lord Burleigh's shake of the head in *The Critic*, and meant: 'I think this deals with it, but let me reflect for a moment, and meanwhile tell me what you think about it'. His editorship was very personal, with no supporting staff except a combined assistant editor and book review editor; and his correspondence and his contributions alike were all in a handwriting which remained bold and clear throughout. After the war, visiting American lawyers, with the establishments of law reviews in the USA in mind, would sometimes ask to see the *LQR* offices; and it pleased him to say that the nearest thing to an editorial office was an armchair in the assistant editor's chambers¹ where each quarterly issue was put together.

In 1931, an unexpected vacancy occurred in the chair of jurisprudence at Oxford which had once been Pollock's. Goodhart had published no book on law which could support an application. He speedily assembled thirteen articles of his, ranging far and wide in their sources and their substance. Four had appeared in the *Yale Law Journal*, three in the *Cambridge Law Journal*, and singletons in the *LQR*, the *Cornell Law Quarterly*, the *Canadian Bar Review*, the *New Zealand Law Journal*, the *Buffalo Law Journal* and *Cambridge Legal Essays*. These formed his *Essays in Jurisprudence and the Common Law*, the book by which he was best known. The title of the book matched the chair by putting jurisprudence first, but in its substance the common law

¹ Mine for nearly twenty-five years, and then Paul Baker's.

predominated. His *Three Cases on Possession* from the *Cambridge Law Journal* analysed cases on the possession of objects found in or on land in a way that still exerts influence sixty years later; but it was one of the Yale contributions, *Determining the Ratio Decidendi of a Case*, that was a jurisprudential classic from the start. The question was how to distinguish the *ratio decidendi* of a case that would bind all courts of an equal or lower status from mere dicta which would not. At the core of the article was the proposition that the principle of a case was to be found not in the reasons or rule of law set out in the judgment, but by determining the facts treated by the judge as being material, and his decision as based on those facts. In doing this, the reasons given by the judge was a guide to which of the facts he considered to be material. Over the years this contention attracted much critical appraisal and reappraisal.²

With the publication of this book and other support, Goodhart was elected to the chair and also to a fellowship at University College that went with it. At thirty-nine, the main course of his life was settled. As a lecturer, he was deservedly popular. He was direct, clear and audible, with touches of his own style of humour (sometimes mordant) and a measured pace that carried both the quick and the slow in thought. There was no lack of critical evaluation and lines for further thought, but unlike some lecturers he never sought to pass off the law that should be as being the law that was. He held the attention of his audience throughout.

In 1935, after he had become established in Oxford, Goodhart joined Lincoln's Inn *ad eundem*. He had taken over Pollock's chambers in the Inn, and Hollond had recently been elected an honorary bencher there. Less than three years later, quite exceptionally, Goodhart too was elected an honorary bencher. This was to prove significant to the law.

When war came in 1939, Goodhart remained in Oxford and continued with such teaching as there was. He joined the Home Guard, and as Chairman of the Southern Region Price Regulation Committee he played his part in enforcing price controls. When the USA joined the war he did much for the short courses in law that were provided for American and English officers awaiting the invasion of France, and he also was vigorous in promoting Anglo-American relations among the many other Americans in the country. Both during the war and after, he

² See e.g. Goodhart (1959) 22 *Modern Law Review* 117; Cross and Harris, *Precedent in English Law* (4th edn., 1991), ch. 2.

was sent on lecture tours and missions to America in aid of Britain; and he tirelessly wrote, spoke and broadcast in furthering understanding on both sides. To his delight he was made a KC in 1943. No appointments had been made since 1939, and in the list of twenty-four he was one of four non-practising barristers, known at the Bar as 'artificial silks'. Goodhart's appointment was very properly acclaimed; indeed, it was probably unique. Under the Act of Settlement 1700, s. 3, no person 'born out of the kingdoms of England Scotland or Ireland or the dominions thereunto belonging' was to be capable of being a Privy Counsellor or MP or of enjoying 'any office or place of trust either civil or military'; and clearly New York in 1891 was not 'thereunto belonging'. If the point had emerged, Goodhart would have relished silk that was illegal as well as artificial. To his great pleasure further recognition came in 1948 when he was aptly made an honorary KBE; but neither at home or abroad did he seek to use the 'Sir'.

In 1951 a new phase of Goodhart's life began. He was elected Master of his college, the first American to head a college at Oxford or Cambridge. Under the Oxford system he was obliged to relinquish the chair of jurisprudence that he had held for twenty years. Despite earlier portents, he had expected this step less than nearly everyone else. He proved to be an outstanding Master. He combined respect for tradition and a reforming zeal with an amiable but firm leadership that avoided differences on policy degenerating into lasting animosity; and with his genius for personal relations he earned the affection of all. The Master's Lodgings became a centre of wide and generous hospitality for all members of the college, from freshmen to honorary fellows, and for many others as well; and the college servants became devoted to him. In all this Cecily played a large part. Each of them engaged fully in all forms of college life, and they were zealous in their pastoral care. When the time came, the college extended Goodhart's tenure to 1963, the maximum possible extent. His portrait by A. R. Middleton Todd RA which hangs in the hall shows him as he appeared for decades, save that it sadly lacks the twinkle in his eye.³

While he was Master, his work on the *LQR*, both as editor and as contributor, had gone on unabated. He had also continued to make visits abroad to give lectures or attend conferences, and in 1959 he went on a noteworthy lecture tour of Australia and New Zealand in company with Lord Justice Pearce and Justice Harlan of the US Supreme Court. After

³ So also the photograph reproduced above.

he retired he made many more visits abroad, and the improvement in air travel encouraged short visits as well as long. These visits included being a visiting professor at the law schools of Harvard, the University of Virginia, and McGill, and being a scholar in residence at the New York City Bar Association.

Goodhart never wrote or edited a legal textbook. His work as a legal author is to be found almost entirely in his articles and notes in learned legal periodicals, particularly the *LQR*. His 'notes' were miniature articles, ranging from half a page or less to five pages or more; and some notes grew into articles in the writing. Most of the notes and articles were based on recent decisions of the courts; for him, these were the life of the law.

The contrast with writing or editing legal textbooks is sharp. So much law is static, both settled and well settled; and a major part of the work of writing or editing textbooks, though worthy, tends to be time-consuming and tedious. There are also the inelastic bonds of the space available, as contrasted with the flexibility of notes and articles. Above all, notes and articles confer liberty to concentrate on the law as it lives and develops and sometimes retrogresses: and this became the centre of Goodhart's life in the law. He was a tireless and economical worker who enjoyed working, and wasted no time on trivialities. When he could, he put up his feet for half an hour after lunch in order to extend his working day by two hours or more in the evening.

Goodhart's notes were models of concise relevance. Though they ranged far and wide in their subjects, style and approach, most of them fell within a pattern. Usually they began with a sentence that set the scene and caught the interest. Then the facts of the case and the decision were set out economically before turning to a critical appraisal of the decision and its consequences. Criticism was constructive, and laudation not uncommon. The note took the reader to the heart of the case in a tithe of the time needed for reading and digesting the judgment. Some of the notes were bread-and-butter notes, doing little more than welcoming a significant decision and putting it in context; but the great majority provoked thought. Those attending his postgraduate classes on recent cases at Oxford were often given a preview of impending notes. Discussion was encouraged, and sometimes it led to useful revisions. The notes were written in English English, with only an occasional transatlantic reverter, such as 'in back of' for 'behind'. The style was simple and direct, with no attempt at fine writing, but sometimes a

Puckish quirk or a sardonic flick. Some of his articles ranged over a wider field, but the general style was the same.

Goodhart's notes and articles embraced the whole of the common law. Tort, contract, and crime predominated, but constitutional and administrative law, international law, company law, divorce, and much else besides were also represented, with equity and land law the more notable absentees. The concentration was on English law, but many other jurisdictions made their contributions, not least the USA. Apart from 1929, while Goodhart was a visiting professor at Yale, the flow was unbroken. At varying intervals over fifty years well over sixty articles were published. The index to the *LQR* lists thirty-six (though a few were less than articles) and there were many others, including twelve in the *Cambridge Law Journal*, five in the *Yale Law Journal*, and four in the *Modern Law Review*. On the other hand, the notes in the *LQR* appeared in every issue with unfailing regularity. Usually there were between fifteen and twenty pages of them, though rather less in the latter five years when Goodhart was editor-in-chief instead of editor. In mere volume, Goodhart's notes and articles equalled several textbooks; but in concentrated and relevant penetration they amounted to much more. Although he was a judicious book reviewer, he contributed relatively little, usually on books concerned with America.

Over the years a number of books or booklets by Goodhart were published: usually they were prints of lectures. His 1947 Lucien Wolf Memorial Lecture was published in 1949 in an extended form (74 pp.) as *Five Jewish Lawyers of the Common Law*. This consists of deft sketches of Judah Philip Benjamin Q.C., Sir George Jessel M.R., Louis D. Brandeis J., Rufus Isaacs (L.C.J. and ultimately the first Marquess of Reading), and Benjamin Nathan Cardozo J. In the same year the Benjamin N. Cardozo lecture that he gave in 1948 appeared as *English Contributions to the Philosophy of Law* (34 pp.). His Hamlyn Lectures for 1952 were more substantial. They were published in 1953 as *English Law and the Moral Law* (151 pp.). In this, he examined and sustained the general thesis that the public recognition of a duty to obey the law was based less on force or a fear of punishment than on reason, morality, religion and inherited tradition; that was over forty years ago.

As an editor of books, Goodhart produced Pollock's *Jurisprudence and Legal Essays* in 1961. He selected, edited and introduced, in some 230 pages, substantial parts of Pollock's *First Book of Jurisprudence*

(1896), *Essays in Jurisprudence* (1882), and *Essays in the Law* (1922), seeking in piety to revive writings that were out of print. He also, jointly with Professor H. G. Hanbury, undertook the massive burden of editing and completing volumes 13–16 of Holdsworth's *History of English Law* (1,725 pages in all). Most of the material was in typescript or barely decipherable manuscript; but much had to be added to finish it. The publication of the four volumes between 1952 and 1966 completed a work of which the first volume had originally appeared in 1903.

For long, Goodhart was the most influential academic lawyer in England. Today, it is easy to forget how small and remote the world of English academic law was when Goodhart first came to it. Oxford and Cambridge had indeed been joined by four other universities during the nineteenth century, with five more by 1920, but the total number of those teaching or reading law was, by today's standards, tiny. Intending lawyers often accepted advice to broaden their minds at university by reading any subject other than law. In contrast with today, few solicitors were graduates, and many preferred (some vehemently) to have as articulated clerks those who were straight from school, untainted by academe; the *tabula* must be *rasa*. Legal periodicals were severely practical, addressed to the needs of practitioners, and legal textbooks were in like case until Pollock and others began to write law books of academic stature towards the end of the nineteenth century. Practitioners held academic lawyers in low esteem. 'A jurist', said Lord Bowen, 'is a person who knows a little about the law of every country except his own'. And, added A. V. Dicey, 'jurisprudence is a word which stinks in the nostrils of a practising barrister'. In England (but not the USA) there was a rule that the work of a living author could not be cited in the courts as an authority, though this could be evaded in some degree by counsel 'adopting' the work 'as part of his argument'. This nineteenth-century attitude was still alive in the 1920s, despite all that Pollock had done; but thirty years later it was dying, and Goodhart had played a large part in the change. Academic lawyers rarely mingled with judges in easy informality, and most honorary benchers rarely attended their Inns; but despite the claims of Oxford, Goodhart was often in Lincoln's Inn, especially at lunch, and this opened new doors. Knowing the author sometimes changes the impact of the printed page. Lord Evershed and Lord Pearce (as they became) were soon warm friends, and Lord Denning and Lord Simonds were also benchers, with many other judges and judges-to-be. Other friends were Lord Greene, Lord Wright, and Lord Diplock, all great names in the law.

More than any other academic lawyer, Goodhart was equally at home with judges and practitioners, bridging the previous gulf between the two worlds both at home and abroad.

Through his writings and his membership of committees, Goodhart was in large part responsible for many important changes made by the courts, the legislature or administrative action. Eight examples may be given, four of them in tort. Hospitals were made liable for the negligence of their doctors and nurses while exercising their professional functions even though the hospital managers had no control over them. A person's liability for a negligent act no longer applied to all the consequences, but only to those that were reasonably foreseeable. A person who is injured while attempting to rescue a third party from a peril negligently created by another, such as a runaway horse, is now not prevented from recovering damages on the ground that he had been under no duty to act but had voluntarily undertaken the risk. The liability of an occupier of land to those who are injured while lawfully on it now depends on a common duty of care instead of fine distinctions between invitees and licencees.

Other changes are that a company can no longer escape liability for acts done by its servants on the ground that the acts were *ultra vires* its objects. The rule that appellate courts must be slow to disturb findings of fact made by a judge who has seen and heard the witnesses now applies with less force to findings of fact if they are really mere inferences. When quashing a conviction (e.g. on technical grounds) the Court of Appeal is no longer unable to order a new trial where the interests of justice require it (Goodhart's partial success in his lifetime became complete after his death). Lastly, for over forty years all decisions of the Court of Appeal (and not only those that appear in law reports) have become available for all by transcripts being made and filed.

Goodhart gave much time to a wide range of committees and other bodies. At various times he was President of the American Outpost; the International Association of University Professors; the Society of Public Teachers of Law; the American Society; the Pedestrians Association for Road Safety (with the pleasure of being addressed by a Japanese correspondent as 'The Honourable President of the Streetwalkers Association'); and the Selden Society. He was a Vice-President of the British Academy, and of the Pilgrims; Chairman of the International Law Association; and a governor of the Atlantic College at St Donat's Castle. As a member of the Royal Commission on the Police, he

made a dissent which sought the establishment of a national police force. He was also a member of many important committees, including the Committee on Law Reporting (with a dissent which advocated more comprehensive law reporting and better indexes), and committees on monopolies and restrictive practices, Supreme Court procedure (with its series of reports), company law revision, and alternative remedies. He was also a zealous foundation member of two of the Lord Chancellor's major standing committees, the pre-war Law Revision Committee and the post-war Law Reform Committee (whose first report, in 1953, surprisingly cost a mere £10. 7s. 6d. to print and publish). To his various committees he brought innate good timing, and contributions made with a force of reasoning that was enhanced by their moderation in presentation.

His honorary degrees were numerous and far-flung. The USA led the field, with a dozen honorary LL.Ds from California, Cincinnati, Columbia, Dartmouth College, Harvard, New York, Pennsylvania, Princeton, Tulane, Wesleyan University, Williams College, and Yale. There was one in each jurisdiction in the United Kingdom (Edinburgh, London, and Queen's University, Belfast), and also one each from Australia (Melbourne) and Canada (Dalhousie); and he had an honorary D. Litt. from Cambridge. He was also an Honorary Fellow of Trinity, Trinity Hall and Corpus at Cambridge, and Nuffield at Oxford; and on retiring as Master of his college he became an Honorary Fellow Extraordinary. In 1952 he was elected FBA, and ten years later he was a Vice-President of the Academy.

He was a man of an exceptional generosity that was both discerning and imaginative. He was always concerned to see that the need was real and the provision wise and effective. He became the greatest benefactor that his college had had in its life of over seven centuries, and he was also the cause of munificence by members of his family and others. Amongst other additions, the college is grateful for the Alington Room, the Goodhart Building and Quadrangle, the Magpie Building and the Parson's Almshouse; and Helen's Court and Cecily Court preserve the names of the sister and wife of a Master who is held in great affection by the college. In honour of his eightieth birthday the Arthur Goodhart Visiting Professorship of Legal Science at Cambridge was established in 1971. This percipient foundation enables foreign lawyers of great distinction to be in residence at the university for a term or more, with ample provision of a house, a secretary and travelling expenses for them and their families. Goodhart's unostentatious generosity could be found

in many other fields, some of them small and private; and he was also generous with his time and advice, as many of the young remembered as their careers advanced.

Goodhart had little interest in the arts, and none in music. His interest in literature soon narrowed down until he read little except on law, politics (in the wider sense), and current affairs. One of the last of his articles in the *LQR* was a long and convincing assault on the English Press for its attack on the findings of the Warren Commission on the assassination of President Kennedy. In his latter years he became engrossed in two diverse attempts at the virtually impossible: a defence of President Nixon over Watergate, and a justification of Israel's annexation of the West Bank. Hospitality apart, he was simple in his tastes and style of life. There was moderation in everything except his driving urge to work and carry out his duties in abundance, and his gift for friendship. In all that he did, he lived his life to the full, and without stint.

Goodhart died after suffering a severe stroke. He was survived by Cecily, for over six years, and by his three sons. They became Sir Philip, an MP for thirty-five years; Sir William, the Chancery silk; and Professor Charles, FBA, the economist. He also, to his and their delight, had fourteen grandchildren.

R. E. MEGARRY

Fellow of the Academy

Note. For assistance in person or in print, or both, I am greatly indebted to: His Honour Paul Baker QC; Mr George Cawkwell; Lord Diplock; Sir William Goodhart QC; Professor F. H. Lawson FBA; Lord Redcliffe-Maud; and *The Times*.

