value to the College. Pressure of work caused him, however, to relinquish the chair in 1923, and it is significant of the aims of Armstrong College that he was succeeded by Dr. Cecil Cochrane, whose connexion with iron manufacture is too well known to need emphasising here.

Sir Hugh Bell was a notable exception to the widely held view that an able father does not produce an able son. Although in this case both father and son were distinguished ironmasters, it must, however, be admitted that their mentalities were of an entirely different order. Sir Lowthian Bell will be remembered best for his scientific acquirements and their application to technology, whilst Sir Hugh Bell's fame is not that of a man of science, but of a man who devoted his brilliant abilities and keen insight to the service of the community. It is not too much to say that he would have been eminent in any profession or career that he had cared to take up. It is a curious comment on the lives of these two great men that Sir Lowthian Bell, eminent as his scientific acquirements were, is now seen to have thrown back the industries of coke-making and of pig-iron production, to which he devoted his life, many years by his obstinate preference for the old-fashioned beehive to the more modern retort-oven coke. The future may possibly show that his brilliant son may have retarded the progress of the nation to a similar extent by his obstinate adherence to old-fashioned free trade principles. He appeared to disregard entirely the wise saying, *Temporibus mores sapiens sine crimine mutat*, and did not seem to realise that a policy which might have been entirely right and sound at one period of the world's history, might be disastrous under different conditions.

As is perhaps only natural in the case of a man who has succeeded in living to an age beyond that of most others, the closing years of Sir Hugh's life were saddened by the loss of many dear to him; here it is only necessary to mention the death of his gifted daughter, Gertrude Bell, who died in July 1926, and that of Lady Bell, who died a little more than a year ago.

The whole record of the life and activities of the man whose loss we mourn is that of a man of keen and penetrating intellect, a brilliant speaker, an advanced thinker, and a shrewd observer, whose keenness was, however, tempered by the geniality of his character, a man who devoted his great gifts unselfishly and unsparingly to the service of his fellow-men.

HENRY LOUIS.

THOUGH the Science Museum at South Kensington was established in 1857, the development of its collections had lagged far behind those representing art; but in 1909 a number of people distinguished in science and representing technical institutions sought an interview with the President of the Board of Education in order to represent the urgent importance of developing its collections and of providing more suitable buildings for their accommodation. The result of the representation thus made was that a Departmental Committee

was appointed in the following year, of which Sir Hugh Bell was the chairman, its terms of reference being to consider and report upon the condition and the future development of the Science Museum and the Geological Museum.

Sir Hugh Bell took the keenest interest in this task, and under his guidance the Committee prepared a detailed report, which was adopted by the Board, laying down the lines which the development of the Museum has since followed. The report proposed the replacement of the old buildings by others of modern type, of which the eastern and centre blocks were to be completed as soon as practicable, but the outbreak of war delayed the execution of this plan and only the former of these has as yet been constructed.

In 1913 Sir Hugh Bell was appointed chairman of the Advisory Council of the Science Museum, and in this capacity for eighteen years he watched over the development of the collections and their exhibition in the galleries of the new building in accordance with the plan devised by his Committee. Difficulties and delays occurred from time to time, and on all such occasions his tact, influence, and ready help were of the greatest value in overcoming them. He took a wide view of the influence which the museums at South Kensington might, he thought, exert, and he strongly advocated a general policy of co-operation in which each museum would not only work out its own line of policy but should also look out for and develop contact with the others in order that the various aspects of human endeavour might be more fully represented.

The Science Museum owes more to Sir Hugh Bell than to anyone, and by his death it has lost a wise counsellor, a ready helper, and a valued friend.

PROF. H. WILDON CARR.

By the death of Prof. Herbert Wildon Carr, which took place on July 8 at Los Angeles, at the age of seventy-four years, philosophy has lost an enthusiastic student and exponent, and philosophers in many countries a friend greatly respected for his single-minded devotion to learning and beloved for his generosity and kindness of heart.

Wildon Carr's life had some of the features of a romance, including (one may be permitted to say) a singularly fortunate and happy marriage. Born in circumstances which precluded a prolonged education, he had to go out into the world at the age of fourteen. But even at that tender age he had already marked out for himself what was to be the real business of his life, and addressed himself deliberately to the task of winning as soon as possible a financial competence in order that he might thereafter devote himself to philosophy. Not often have the dreams of boyhood worked out more completely 'according to plan'. For in due course Wildon Carr enjoyed in succession the status of a member of committee of the London Stock Exchange and of a president of the Aristotelian

Society and honorary professor of philosophy in the University of London.

Nevertheless, all did not go smoothly; for the youth who set out on the philosophical quest in high hopes found himself as a man brought up against the blank wall of Humean scepticism. At a memorable dinner which Carr gave in 1911 in honour of Henri Bergson, he pictured in moving terms the sadness of his intellectual plight and hailed the French philosopher with gratitude as his rescuer. Students who have followed Wildon Carr's work during the last twenty years will, indeed, recognise how powerful an impulse he received from Bergson—an impulse which, reinforced by the later influences of Croce and Gentile, carried him forward to his own monadistic idealism.

Wildon Carr's development as a philosopher is dealt with below by another hand. It is, however, fitting to emphasise here what he did for philosophy and philosophers, apart from his output as a writer. For many years he was the honorary secretary of the Aristotelian Society, and from the death of Shadworth Hodgson onwards to the time when the state of his own health compelled him to seek sunnier skies, he might almost be said to have been himself the Society. This does not mean that he ruled it as an autocrat, seeking to make its voice his own. On the contrary, there was never a more generous appraiser of an opponent's merits, nor a scholar who sought more earnestly to let all sides of a question have the best exposition and the fairest hearing. Nor did an older philosopher ever keep a more watchful eye upon promising beginners or give them more encouragement.

Under Carr's kindly and inspiring rule the Aristotelian Society was for many years a forum where most of the notable thinkers of the day debated most of the living philosophical issues. His associates during those fruitful years knew how dear the welfare of the Society was to him, and how generously he spent upon it both his time and his material means. The solid work done by it under his guidance will be an enduring part of the monument he has left behind him; while so long as those who knew him and worked with him still live, the memory of his singularly gracious and generous personality must continue to "smell sweet and blossom".

T. PERCY NUNN.

IN speaking of Carr's philosophy, it is particularly difficult to separate the philosopher from the man. Like his first teacher, Shadworth Hodgson, he, if any man of my time did, lived the philosophic life, and, after his success in business enabled him to retire, he devoted himself entirely to cultivating philosophy in himself and others. Yet he remained rather a centre of philosophers than of philosophy, and his work was an influence rather than an achievement. He taught us, through his own devotion and through the affection he inspired, to feel that we were fellow-workers in one subject, however different in our methods of approach; and I scarcely like to think what we shall do without him. Nor was it only philosophers he

brought together; he also brought science and philosophy into their wholesome and natural contact. He believed that philosophy and science belonged together, and that philosophy could not be indifferent to changes in scientific ideas such as his time had witnessed. In this he was surely right. The work of the Aristotelian Society in the last twenty years is a standing witness to his success in this effort and to its fruitfulness.

Carr owed both his strength and his weakness to his open-mindedness; and the personal hold he had over philosophers of such differing views was only the other side of his candour and his intense effort to understand and assimilate. His own originality and independence showed itself in the tenacity with which he worked out a doctrine for himself, while making use of what he was continually learning from them. You would call him markedly suggestible, and impulsive as well, so that, as each successive thinker like Bergson or Croce or Einstein or Gentile fascinated him, he devoted himself to expounding them with enthusiasm. When I knew him first, he was still a disciple of Hodgson. Afterwards he leaned towards a Humean idealism, and the idealism which began thus early he never ceased to entertain under some form or other. In the end he worked his way to a kind of Leibnizianism which was very much his own. But, as anyone may see from his latest constructive pronouncement, "*Cogitans Cogitata*", it retained plain traces of the doctrines that had influenced his mind, and it would be an interesting and profitable task to follow him from his phase of discipleship up to that of mastery.

Carr's readiness to accept from others may have disturbed some persons; for my part, I admired rather the independence with which he converted them to his own uses, and always, even without assenting to him, I found him one of the most interesting and stimulating minds among my contemporaries. I still have the feeling that in dealing with relativity he was over-hasty in his deliverances. I subscribe to Bertrand Russell's statement that relativity is of immense importance to philosophy but that we do not yet quite know in what way. Carr had no doubt. He thought it had dethroned Newtonianism to make way for Leibnizianism; and I expect he was, in general, right. There was, however, a want of special authority about what he said when he was expounding the new science as science, and I understand his exciting some impatience among those who knew. But he showed philosophers the way, and that it was our duty to find material for our philosophy in a thorough understanding of this new mode of scientific thought. It would be an evil day for metaphysics if a great change should occur in men's minds about the science of things and we philosophers should go our way as if nothing particular had occurred.

In philosophy there has been a marked tendency in recent years to revert to Leibniz and monadism, but to treat the monads not as windowless, like Leibniz's, but as communicating. Carr would have nothing of it, and insisted that the monads were