

ARTICLE II.

MY TIME AT RUGBY (1869-74).

BY THE REV. HENRY HAYMAN, D. D.

THIRD PAPER.

SUCH was the character of the opposition with which I had to contend. I know that among my then colleagues of the hostile clique were several who were incapable of thus trifling with the vital elements of schoolboy faith. But they gave me no support, save that of a "nominal" sort already recorded above; while on the Governing Body the bishops and other clerical members took the course which has been shown above, and of which other examples will follow.

It will be remembered¹ that I had dismissed one School-house tutor absolutely, and requested the trustees to dismiss the other from his post as master. From the tuition of the School-house I had myself removed him. This left that side of his hitherto emoluments blank. I did not intend or desire this; but it was the result of the financial system which I found existing and could not summarily alter. I could not recommend private pupils to one who by his attitude and conduct had made my confidence impossible. This, however, on his complaining to the Governors, was what they required me to do. I complied with their decision, but let it be known that it was their act, not mine. They then passed a minute calling on me either to state my grounds for want of confidence (which were, to

¹ See *supra*, p. 95 *et seq.*

those of them who had followed the history of school-affairs since my appointment, unmistakably evident), or else treat those grounds as non-existent and not allow them to influence my conduct.

The Chairman-Bishop (Worcester) had concurred in the minute reflecting on the assistant masters generally and their purely "nominal coöperation." He knew of the insolent letter with this same gentleman's signature to it, and of Dr. (by this time Bishop) Temple's arrogant impeachment of my appointment. But all this he now thought it decent to ignore, and, having now surrendered to the Temple clique, he thought it further decent to require me to ignore the same facts also. Thus the affectation of not being aware of my reasons for lack of confidence was a flagrant hypocrisy.

In compliance, however, with the official requirement, I wrote to the complainant master a private letter in which I stated the most recent of these reasons hypothetically only, as depending upon statements which had reached me to his discredit, and leaving it open to him to rebut those statements. He made no attempt of the kind, but forwarded my private letter to him, written in compliance with their own requirement, to the Governors, who immediately proceeded to treat it as an accusation brought by *me* against *him*. They followed up this plain violation of all equity by giving me no notice that they had adopted this view, nor any opportunity for any defense or explanation, and proceeded to frame a hostile minute dated October 23, 1872, deciding the case without my ever being heard,—a condemnation without even the form of a trial. This was followed by a partisan paragraph in a newspaper, showing that the purport of it had leaked out.

On November 23d and 30th they again held meetings, following up the same subject. On each of these days counsel was instructed on my behalf, and was known to be

in attendance, but was each time excluded, and dismissed unheard. On the latter date a more elaborate and more censorious minute was framed, again of course without my ever being called upon to explain or defend; of which minute three paragraphs were sent to me and to the hostile master. Within three days *these same three paragraphs* appeared in various hostile newspapers; utterly unauthorized, but, as before, supplied by one of the Governors or one of their *protégés*. I tried in vain to get from either their Chairman-Bishop or their clerk any explanation of this treachery. I had made the same attempt in vain earlier, when, in February, 1872, the minute declaring that "they refrained from expressing approval," etc., as stated above,¹ had surreptitiously appeared. Somewhat later a friendly member of their Body drew attention to this furtive delation, with, I believe, severe comments of his own. This, I was informed, drew from the Bishop of Exeter the remark, made openly at the Governors' meeting, that "he should like to see who would stop his mouth."

I may be told that this is a doubtful report and mere hearsay. But I beg attention to the following fact: I have still a private letter, dated April, 1872, i.e. in the full flush of then recent facts, from one of the Governing Body, stating, in reference to the same question of divulgence, then raised, that—

"Dr. Temple and Dr. Bateson met it by stating, that they considered themselves free to state to any one anything they pleased, and they would *not be bound* [underlined by the writer] by any vote to fetter them."

It is impossible to resist the crushing weight of such evidence to a fact thus scandalous. Here we see one Right Reverend and one Reverend rebelling against the authority of their own Body, claiming a mutinous right to pirate its confidential documents in order to damage the Headmaster;

¹See *supra*, p. 110.

and, provided they could but raise prejudice against *him*, reckless how their treacherous *communiqués* might drive parents from resorting to the School committed to their charge.

Of course, with this to encourage them from the hostile clique above me, that below me followed suit. I remember that, on one occasion when I addressed an important private letter to a master, his acknowledgment was anticipated by some newspaper lines showing a guilty knowledge of it. I drew the Governors' attention to this; but of course without result. How could they prosecute the quest of piracy, when one or more of themselves had arrogated such piracy as a right? I take all this in connection with Bishop Temple's deliberate prediction of my failure to manage the School; and leave readers to judge how far the above facts suggest an attempt to verify it by making the management of the School impossible. A prophet may well exercise his predictive gift, when he possesses also the gift of fulfilment.

I have referred to a hostile minute of November 30, 1872. In less than a month later, the following facts occurred, which have their ludicrous side. On the occasion of a supper given to the workmen then engaged on the Tercentenary buildings, followed by toasts and speeches, one speech by the same hostile colleague, my sometime School-house tutor, was reported to me orally, as being favorable to and even laudatory of myself; confirmed by the report in the next following *Rugby Advertiser*. On which appearing, the speaker wrote to me privately and to the editor publicly, repudiating the favorable phrases, "put into his mouth [he said] by an error of the reporter, and for which the editor had expressed his regret" in a conversation held privately at the editor's own office. This, locally published, was rather amusing, especially I suppose to the British workman, who, *potus et exlex*, had

been a listener at the feast, one organized indeed expressly in his honor, *libertate Decembri*; for the Christmas holidays had now begun. To our surprise, it was at once republished in a big London daily paper, which I may call the *Vae Victis*, from its proclivity for the stronger side and its amiable habit of trampling on the weaker.

The whole matter was so petty, personal, and local, that no first-class editor would have stooped to it, but for a hostile interest dominating his columns. Thus challenged in a wider circle, the Rugby editor wrote publicly in utter contradiction of the speaker. He had been his own reporter. He confirmed the fact that the speaker had called at his office,

"when I read him the shorthand notes (written by myself) of his brief speech, and assured him that the words objected to were really used by him. He replied that on such an occasion one naturally wished to be as agreeable as possible, and that when he spoke, . . . he had no idea a reporter was present."

These last words show a candid *navveté*, reminding one of Mr. Fagg's avowal in "The Rivals," that "it hurt his conscience to be found out." Further, every one will see that by explaining his wish "to be as agreeable as possible," the speaker in effect explained away his own retraction. The editor thus wrote not in my defense, but in his own, against the charge of tampering first with reported words, and then of apologizing for an error which he denied having made.

It was now a question of veracity between a local editor and a master on the staff, which the latter had been the means of blazoning abroad for all the world to notice. I was only indirectly concerned in it; but, as I had had the first-hand, independent testimony of my trusty colleague, the Rev. L. F. Burrows, coming straight from the supper-table with the words fresh in his memory, which he afterwards confirmed in writing, I could hardly affect any doubt on which side the truth lay. This speaker was the gentle-

man whom the Governing Body for two months previous had been studiously patronizing at my expense, and giving vent the while to their feelings on his behalf in a series of imperious *ex-parte* minutes, all treating him as the injured party and me as the wanton aggressor; some expressing indignation that I did not treat him as entitled to my full confidence; some that I had, on frivolous suspicions, diminished his emoluments; some directing me to retract and apologize for what I had written to him privately, at their own direction, and which they had then treated as injurious charges preferred to them by me against him; and several of these hostile minutes escaping, as has been shown, by treachery, presumably that of some of their own Body, into the daily press, or casting their shadows there in hostile paragraphs, to the continuous detriment of the School. The mischief of these fire-brand piracies taken by themselves was incalculable; but every such treachery, beyond its immediate mischief, fired a train of fresh explosives in the press; until the journalistic sky all around me was lurid with the glare of an ever-blazing controversy. The boys in their home circles—it being, as stated, now vacation time—would absorb it all, and hear, and mutually retail, the comments passed *in foro domestico* when they returned, to find the town of Rugby itself the very center of the outburst. The Governors also knew that all Rugby was ringing with the scandal that the veracity of Mr.—, their special *protégé*, had been publicly impeached. The local editor offered to appear before them and, shorthand notes in hand, confront that gentleman. The flagrancy was such that a resident parent, Mr. Stuart Russell, formally called upon them to investigate a public charge of untruthfulness against a foundation master.

The Governors met on January 15, 1873, with his letter before them, described in their own minutes of that date (I speak from having seen and made extracts from their

minute-book) as “referring to the matters in dispute between Dr. Hayman and Mr. —”; and, I suppose by way of a lesson in truthfulness, directed or drafted on the very same day the two following statements, in direct conflict with each other:—

CLERK'S LETTER TO MR. STUART
RUSSELL.

“That the subject to which your letter relates having been disposed of, they [the Governors] cannot consent to reopen it.”

MINUTE AS REGARDS MYSELF.

“That the Governing Body are not satisfied with Dr. Hayman's letters to Mr. — on the 8th and 14th instant, and that they now consider it their duty to deliberate on all the circumstances before them.” (Moved by the Bishop of Exeter.)

Taking, therefore, the letter of Mr. Russell as part of the whole subject, as between myself and my colleague, they declared it to the writer of that letter *closed*, and shut the door of inquiry in his face; at the same time they place on record the fact, that, as against myself, they keep the same subject *open*, and make it a topic of further “deliberation on all the circumstances”; of which the latest and most *éclatante* was that upon which they thus shut the door. I could not believe this myself until I had verified it by comparing the original documents with the text of the minute-book.

Further, as a matter of fact, the “case” presented by Mr. Stuart Russell, viewed in itself as a crying scandal, involving the credit and character of a foundation master, so far from being “closed,” had never even been touched. When they had last met on November 30th *it did not yet exist!* Thus, besides its flat contradiction to the minute of the same day, the reply contained a special, separate dose of falsehood against a parent appealing on behalf of the credit of the School, by declaring a case closed which had never been before them at all. The Governing Body out-Herods, in this light, the famous doctrine of the *choso*

jugée in the Dreyfus case; while, in respect of its patronizing falsehood in order to perpetrate injustice, it resembles that famous case; and in its successful resistance to the scrutiny of daylight, goes beyond it. Except the figurative tribunal of public opinion, it can never now be arraigned at any human bar of justice. It remains for appeal at the bar of Eternal Justice, and the Chairman-Bishop, the signer of the minutes, is gone to give account there for his share in it.

Now notice what followed. The Body met to pursue their purpose of "deliberating on all the," etc., on February 5th, having given me notice that they "would be prepared to hear me or receive any further written statement." I was in attendance three hours, with the express purpose of being heard, but *was never admitted*. On that day, thus behind my back, another hostile minute was recorded against me, stating that "my position and that of the School was so seriously compromised, that . . . they must consider whether I should not be requested to retire from the Headmastership." The reader will probably form an opinion from the above facts as to who were responsible for the "compromising" incidents referred to. The Body met again on February 25th, and I was then admitted, *after* being on the 5th condemned unheard. The chairman at once began by referring to certain statements in reference to Mr. — (the same person as before), adding that "an unfavorable effect had been left by them on some members of the Governing Body." Thus, whereas on January 15th they declared to Mr. Stuart Russell that "the subject" of "matters in dispute between me and Mr. — was disposed of" and "not to be reopened," here was I, questioned up and down the table on those very same matters for upwards of an hour, six weeks afterwards. The public impeachment of Mr. —'s veracity by the local editor was never even adverted to, during this "reopen-

ing" of the case in order to carry on the persecution against myself.

It will be seen, then, on a retrospective summary, that on three occasions, in February, October, and November, 1872, adverse or hostile minutes were allowed to gain a surreptitious publicity, either textually or in their general purport; and that on four others, in October and November, 1872, and in January and February, 1873, such minutes were passed without myself or my counsel's being heard, although known to be in waiting for the purpose. Bishop Temple and Dr. Bateson having claimed the right to make what communications they pleased, it seems beyond reasonable doubt that they acted upon the right they so claimed, and that the paragraphs in the press, which show treachery at work somewhere, were the results.

From and after June, 1872, I was constantly requesting the Governing Body to define their own view of the Headmaster's powers, especially as regards the dismissal of assistant masters. They, up to this date of February, 1873, had as persistently declined to do it. Thus for over half a year the work of framing statutes stood still, in order to make way for hostile minutes baiting the Headmaster. I dare say that, thus beset and worried, I made some mistakes. To avoid an occasional false step is not easy when you live the life of a hunted hare. To chronicle these worries in detail would be impossible. Often when the day's work was nominally over, my hardest brain-toil began; and I have not once, but often, sat up writing letters of consultation to friendly advisers, or replying to the chairman of the Governors or their clerk. Sometimes after such work, to save the night-mail for London, I had to make a rush down the street to the post-office between 2 and 3 A.M. More than once, having to confer with counsel or some adviser in London and return in time for early duties next day, I could, owing to the conditions of

the railway service, do so only by begging a place in the guard's van of a goods train, which would land me at Rugby at 4 to 5 A.M., while the jolting and the uproar incident to goods traffic would "make night horrible" and sleep impossible. Amidst such a life the school-teaching itself seems, on the retrospect, a mere recreation and diversion. And in spite of the hostile broadsides in the press, kept up through the vacation and continuing into term, I now felt sure of the allegiance of the boys. "Treason had done its worst" in the spring of 1871, and had failed to produce the results which the spitefulness of the "snipers" intended and expected—nay, declared with their usual veracity to be an accomplished fact! Of course discipline had some worries inevitable. I will touch here on one only, because it was the direct outcome of the factious spirit which followed me all along.

At the end of 1873, when the boys had again gone home for vacation, a Housemaster found glaring evidence of the consumption of illicit whisky by his boys. The labels, I presume, on the empty bottles in a dustbin, gave a clue to the retailer, and so through him to his customers. He quite rightly pursued the investigation at once, but quite wrongly took upon himself to promise immunity to any who would confess. There was not the slightest excuse for this excess of jurisdiction on his part. Indeed, as he conducted the whole case by correspondence, it would have been just as easy for him to have obtained my consent by letter in the first instance, as to inform me, *ex post facto*, that he had settled it and assumed independent rights. I of course told him my mind at once on knowing the facts. But of course he was in this only following the lead of the Governors in parading before the boys, for whom he was answerable to me, his contempt for my authority; and without their august precedent of insolence, and the certainty of their patronage against any complaint of mine, I

suppose he would hardly have ventured the experiment of thus posing as the supreme arbiter of penalties. Of course the question, whether the pledge of amnesty given to the culprits was, as a step of disciplinary procedure, judicious under the circumstances, lies wholly outside the question of his competency to give it; and I might possibly have concurred with his view, had he consulted me on the subject. When the School met after the holidays, I called the offenders before me, and told them plainly that I did not feel bound by a promise given by the Housemaster without consulting me; and asked each boy severally, "What would you now think if I, repudiating it, took penal measures against you?" They all candidly replied to the same effect, that they would feel they had been entrapped. But the greatest culprit of all being the Housemaster, to proceed penally did not seem a desirable course. I merely told them that they had escaped by his indiscretion; and that any grave violation of discipline in future on the part of any would cause the offender's speedy removal without further question. That Housemaster was Mr. J. M. Wilson. He has since been a Headmaster himself, and entered holy orders, besides being, as I have said before, now incumbent of a parish, and Archdeacon, but he has never made the slightest approach to retractation or apology for his insolent appropriation of what was not his, but mine, in 1873. My view that he probably counted upon the patronage of the Governors was confirmed by the fact that, when I officially reported the facts to them, they took not the slightest notice. This entitles me to say that they upheld my colleagues in their contempt for my authority, and allowed it to be treated with open contumely before the boys, for whose good discipline I was yet responsible to them. The culprits in question (now, I hope, good and prosperous men, and unaddicted to whisky) on whom Mr. J. M. Wilson thus bestowed

private absolution, have, I dare say, not forgotten the circumstances.

I believe I had a narrow escape of being dismissed in the winter of 1872-73, to which indeed the minute of February 5, 1873, cited above, seemed directly to point. I suppose that the *éclat* of the scandal caused by the challenge given to the veracity of Mr. — their *protégé*, by the local editor, was what checked such an extreme measure at the moment. To have dismissed me then would have provoked investigation and exposure of that scandal, which their minute-book shows they shrank from facing: obviously, because to establish the untruthfulness of Mr. — would have been to discredit and condemn of partiality their unswerving policy in patronizing his cause against the Headmaster for several previous months. They therefore took the course of stifling all inquiry into the scandal referred to.

The reader who has followed me thus far will have seen that, until the advent to office of the new Governing Body at the end of 1871, the primary factors of opposition were Bishop Temple and the hostile clique of masters, then these latter with their allies in the press. From early in 1872 the hostile Governors, among whom Bishop Temple had now taken his place and secured his following in Drs. Bradley, Bateson, etc., take the lead throughout; and only one, or two at most, of the clique occupies any prominence. Further the press has now become not merely an organ of vituperative controversy, but an engine of delation—a sink as it were to receive the leakage of what should have been confidential, and, until I became Headmaster, had always been so regarded. It was this conjunction which dealt incalculable damage to the School. The numbers declined. I wonder indeed that the decline was not more rapid. But early in 1873 it had progressed so far, that, for lack of funds to pay them, the same staff of

assistants could not be maintained. The Governors too, in the summer of 1873, put forward a new financial scheme, the result of which I found would be to accentuate my difficulties. I suppose it was their policy to aggravate, not relieve, financial tightness, in order to force upon the Headmaster an embarrassing alternative. I gave notice of regretful dismissal, therefore, to two of the juniors. One of these, however, had secured himself a prospective post more to his mind elsewhere, and on him, therefore, it entailed no sacrifice. Still the *duress* of finance continued. If I now gave notice to two more in the order of juniority, I should have but one on the whole staff on whose loyalty I could rely. Delation would probably continue, then a still lower ebb of numbers, and then my isolation between hostile Governors and hostile "assistants" above and below me. I therefore gave notice next to two of relatively senior standing. One was the lower mathematical master, the other was he against whose religious unbelief, as shown in his form-teaching, I had received parental complaints. Here I should add that I was by formal appointment Chaplain as well as Headmaster; and it was therefore doubly impossible to avoid giving weight to such complaints. But it was enough to justify my decision, although not of course in the eyes of the Governors, that he was one of the hostile cabal from the first, who had never wavered from their disloyalty or from their original attitude of open defiance.

Upon this I found myself arraigned before the Governors as having violated "the usages and customs of the School" in dismissing seniors before juniors on the staff. Mere seniority is not an absolutely safe rule even for loyal colleagues and quiet times. But to erect it into an inviolable principle under conditions exactly the opposite, was only another example of the spirit of faction, the policy of which was now enlisted to uphold that inviolability. When

I claimed to be shown any evidence of the existence of "custom and usage," as alleged, two papers were produced, (1) a private letter of Dr. Temple, when Head, to one whom he was then appointing; and (2) a more formal document from the same hand, drawn up when he was leaving the School, and which, if intended to guide my actions, ought of course to have been placed in my, his successor's, hands. As a fact, neither of them had ever been shown to me from the day of my taking the post until thus sprung upon me. As a further fact, neither could have any obligatory power to override the Public Schools Regulation Act, a statute of the Realm, which left the Headmaster's powers of dismissal absolute. When I confronted him at the Board on this subject, Bishop Temple stated that he had mentioned the purport of this second document to me when at his house in December, 1869. On my inquiring when it was drawn up, for it was undated, he replied that it was just about that time. On my asking why he had not handed it to me, he said that he had regarded it as a financial detail only, and placed it in the hands of one of the bursars. These last were two of the assistant masters; one of them the Mr. J. M. Wilson aforesaid; the other, now deceased, was one at whose house mostly went on all the hostile caucuses held from time to time by the clique of my opponents. It was this gentleman whom Dr. Temple singled out as the depository of a document which I never was allowed to see until produced to support an accusation against me. If I had ever seen it, I should have at once, in face of the organized hostility which confronted me, have given notice to all whom it concerned, that I declined to be bound in any degree by it. I explicitly denied at the Board the statement of the Bishop that he had orally mentioned the purport of it. But assuming, if you please, that his memory was correct and mine the reverse, his statement seems to condemn him. Why did he draw up-

a written record unless because, in his own view, oral statement was *not* sufficient, while he yet gave me oral statement only? The document was fresh from his own hands just about the time that I became his visitor. I maintain that, in public official life, an attempt to make a man responsible, nearly four years after the date of an oral statement, upon that statement *only*, while a written document, drawn up expressly *ad hoc* and simultaneously, had been deposited in the hands of one notoriously hostile, and all the while been kept out of his sight, would be deemed a *reductio ad absurdum* of official treachery and tyranny. Yet under precisely these circumstances the Governors taxed me with a responsible knowledge of the "usage" infringed. But, further, if Bishop Temple really meant to claim for his arrangements a right to override statute law, the least he could reasonably do was to leave its record equally accessible. I leave readers to judge, whether, bearing in view the declared hostility of the masters before I became, in December, 1869, his visitor, and his own outburst of sympathy with them while I was so, and his own evident complicity with them since, the concealment was designed. "The power of speech," said Talleyrand, "was given to man to conceal his thoughts." May we extend the same remark to the use of writing?

But, however it might have bound Dr. Temple personally towards masters by himself appointed, his "usage" as regards myself was nugatory. I could point to usage and custom embodied and attested decisively elsewhere: (1) in the scheme contained in the Blue Book report of a Parliamentary Commission, 1862; and (2) in a Report of Dr. Temple to the Rugby Trustees in 1864. Those documents have the authority (1) of the Court of Chancery, and (2) of the Trustees themselves, then Governors. Subject to these, the Headmaster could control the apportionment of School-fees; but neither of them contains any statement or

suggestion of limiting in any way his dismissal of assistants. The attempt of the Governors in 1873 was in effect one to set up a "bogus" tradition and manufacture a spurious "usage and custom," or, more exactly perhaps, to patronize and validate one emanating from Dr. Temple himself.

I am nearing the end of my story. I suggest that all these items of conduct of Bishop Temple towards myself, with those of his late colleagues, and those of his subsequent compeers on the Governing Body, are of a piece. They fit as parts into a whole; and a whole, when consisting of many parts emerging throughout a series of years, fitting into each other, and conducing to one end, suggest a plan or policy. The point of that policy now reached was that, under financial necessity, some assistants *must* go, and that I claimed to decide which could best be spared. Whence that necessity?—From the decrease in numbers. Why that decrease?—From the repeated delation of confidential matters to the public press, and the angry newspaper controversy thence arising. By whom were those delations and that agitation fed?—I think the evidence I have adduced can leave no doubt in any reasonable mind that they were fed by the hostile Governors, or by the hostile clique of masters whom they patronized, or by both. If this is not a complete chain of causes and effects, there is no such chain traceable in human actions anywhere. I do not, of course, mean that any covenant to the above effect was signed and sealed between that prelate, his late colleagues and his then compeers, as between the "high contracting parties" of an international treaty. But common sympathies mold the growth of concerted action, and a mutual convenience of like helping like begets a mutual *convenience* in conduct. I believe the earlier idea was to make my government of the School such a plainly hopeless task as to worry me into resigning my post. Finding

that course ineffective for its purpose, they resolved to dismiss me from it. For already in 1873 there were signs of a disturbance of the political atmosphere. The change of government which took place in the spring of 1874 was casting its shadow before it. The flood of popular changes which had brought in new Governing Bodies everywhere—themselves among others—was on the ebb. They would no longer have the swing of a certain mass of political sympathy in their favor. I suppose that they thought it behoved them to strike quickly if at all, and so caught at this pretext of "usage and custom" violated, and gave me in September, 1873, notice to quit, to take effect the following April. In December, 1873, I requested an audience of the Governing Body, in order to submit further and fresh evidence against that dismissal. This was refused. In the next January the following memorial was laid before them, largely and influentially signed, the signatures having been collected by friendly and private efforts only in about ten days:—

"We, the undersigned, beg to express our strong sympathy with Dr. Hayman under the treatment which he has experienced since his election as Headmaster; and on the broad grounds of justice and fair play, and also of the momentous issues involved towards all public schools, we respectfully request the Governors to reconsider their recent decision with a view to retaining him in that post."

It was of course without result, as was probably expected. Earlier in the course of the year 1873 I had received the following letter from a number of the leaders of opinion in Rugby and the neighborhood:—

"We, the undersigned residents in Rugby and its immediate vicinity, desire to express our sympathy with you in the great difficulties you have had to contend with in carrying on your duties as Headmaster of Rugby School. We trust that these difficulties will be successfully overcome, and that you will long continue to retain the high position you now hold among us.

"We are happy to bear witness to the excellent state of discipline among the boys under your care—a state which is attributable mainly to

you and to the boys themselves, and which reflects credit alike on you and them."

This unsolicited testimonial carries a weight of testimony which, I conceive, demolishes the invidious and prejudicial predictions of Dr. Temple, that "my government of the Sixth would assuredly fail," and that I was "absolutely deficient" in the leading disciplinary qualifications necessary for my post. The signatories of the above were, of all classes, the most keenly interested observers of the results of misgovernment or no government among the boys, if such had existed. Their testimony on such a point is worth reams of newspaper invective. For as soon as a great School gets out of hand, the windows, gates, fences, and covers in a wide area round about are sure to tell the tale, more especially those "in its immediate vicinity." This then being the evidence gathered on the spot, I invite readers to form their own estimate of the following slip from the *Daily Craze* of a few months earlier:—

"The surprise which is felt at the fact that Dr. Hayman continues to hold office at Rugby . . . would be exchanged for another feeling, if the public could be made aware of the state of the School. The Sixth Form is, I am assured, in a state of disorganization such as has certainly never been known in an English public school of the first rank for very many years."

This statement, for which there was not the shadow of any foundation, was, I presume, intended to bring about as a result in the near future what it falsely described as existing in the present. To proclaim that a body of youngsters under discipline are in "a state of disorganization" beyond all recent experience, is one way of so playing upon their feelings as to produce it; especially when you know that your mendacious suggestion is sure to be read by some of their leaders. It was like the voice of an incendiary shouting "fire!" The *Daily Craze* writer evidently thought:—

"You Rugby Sixth-formers *must be* disorganized. Don't you know you *ought* to be? Why aren't you? Don't you know all the Rugby

traditions demand it of you? Now then, disorganize yourselves at once, and look sharp about it! Right-about-face, and double quick, too!"

Such were the volleys of venomous weapons with which the air was full. Of course, as regards the boys, the hostile tactics were without result. I never felt more assured and more proud of their loyalty than during the two years of almost continuous controversy with the Governors, and the detonation of their successive hostile minutes against me. The boys were all-worthy of the testimonial volunteered to them by those who knew best, from daily evidence of their dignified good order, that they were proof against the incentives of faction, and that the *Daily Craze* cracked its whip in vain. If it had not been for this sustaining conviction, and for the recreation which I derived from daily teaching them, I might possibly have yielded to the long-drawn worry and vacated my post. The holiday periods were accordingly my heaviest and dreariest time, when this sustaining and recreating force was withdrawn.

But when it became plain that all efforts to move the Governing Body to justice were futile (and indeed, I believe, before that), active and friendly zeal had been at work to raise a defense-fund on my behalf; which issued in a trial at law and a six-days' hearing "on demurrer" before Vice-Chancellor Sir R. Malins. I should have preferred the Queen's Bench, a jury, and a witness-box, with some three or four of the Governors and as many of the assistant masters occupying it by turns. It is a fine but vain theory of law that for every wrong there is a remedy. About a thousand pounds was here laid out in merely making it presumable that wrong had been done, leaving any remedy as far out of reach as ever. The most effective points were missed by counsel of brilliant ability and wide experience. Not a word was said about the "black-white" minute of January 15, 1873; not a word about the falsehood which covered the refusal to hear Mr. Stuart Rus-

sell's appeal on behalf of the fair fame of the School, nor about the alleged prevarication of Mr. — at and after the workmen's supper; nor was the letter put in evidence attesting the claim of the Bishop and Dr. Bateson to divulge whatever confidential matters they pleased. The whole seemed to me like a comedy in wig and gown—a *fabula togata* or legal fiction dramatized—but as measured by its result a "Comedy of Errors," a display of skill, in which the rules of the game went for more than the merits of the case. I was told that I ought to think the money well spent, for the dirt which the Governing Body had flung at me so liberally all came off, a good deal settling upon them by the way; but as they had no more sense of shame than of justice, that was to them of small account. Whenever Injustice (and Impudence in brazen panoply, her bodyguard) shall leave the world, her last footsteps, methinks, will be found among the Governing Bodies of public schools. My brethren in America will, if not before, now be able to estimate the stuff of which our Anglican bishops are sometimes made, the influences which sometimes dominate their selection, and the use which they make of the powers they wield. But this by the way. Now, after the lapse of a quarter of a century, "enters Time as chorus." How has he thinned the ranks of my zealous friends and helpers then! I reckon that barely twenty per cent of those who formed the list of subscribers to my "defense and testimonial" fund now survive. *Haec data pœna diu viventibus.* The list was filled with names that I knew then for the first time,—of men whom a sense of justice had roused, as well as with familiar ones, and also with anonymous designations which I refrained from trying to penetrate. Besides defraying the costs of my suit before the Vice-Chancellor, they presented me with a large and splendid memorial vase, the pedestal of which was inscribed as follows:—

“Viro reverendo, Henrico Hayman S.T.P. doctissimo olim Scholae Rugbeiensis archididascolo d. d. amici quidam et publici et privati, patientiam eius fidelitatemque et constantiam admirati, fausta omnia et felicitiora in novo curriculo precantes. MDCCCLXXIV.”

The presentation took place in the town-residence of my sometime diocesan the Bishop of Gloucester; and my old friend Bishop Jackson of London, whose curate I had been in early life, was among the subscribers. This shows that all Anglican bishops are not of the type set forth above. The trial before the Vice-Chancellor was a moral success only. Many severe *obiter dicta*, especially against Bishop Temple and Dr. Bradley, for taking their seats on the Governors' Board after having shown a hostile *animus* to the Headmaster, fell from the Court; besides censuring in sweeping terms the Governors as a Body, by whom “the Headmaster, when he proceeded to exercise his power, was thwarted at every turn”; and who, in dealing with him, “had taken advantage of their own wrong,” adding that “he never saw conduct which so strongly required explanation as theirs.” That explanation has been a *desideratum* ever since, and will be to the end of time. But as the pleadings failed to give legal proof of corrupt motive or malice in the forensic sense, the Court could not overrule my dismissal. Here then ends my story of wrongs never righted. I may say in Schiller's words,

“Ich bin viel
Gehasset worden, doch auch viel geliebt.”

The event was celebrated by some facetious O. R. in the following parody on one of the best-known bits of the folklore of the nursery. And here, in deference to the demands of rhyme, I am obliged, contrary to my practice hitherto, to insert some names:—

I.

Who killed poor Hayman?

"I," said old 'Froddy,'¹

"With my 'Governing Body,'

I killed poor Hayman."

2.

Who saw him die?

L . . W said, "I

With my goggle-eye;²

I saw him die."

3.

Who'll toll the bell?

"I," said old Moberly,³

"For I'll do it soberly;

"I'll toll the bell."

4.

Who'll be chief mourner?

"I will," said Scott,⁴

"'Cos that's what I'm *not*;

I'll be chief mourner."

5.

Who'll preach the sermon?

"I will," said Green,⁵

"'Cos I say what I mean;

I'll preach the sermon."

¹ Supposed by certain critics familiarly to designate Bishop Temple.

² This delicate personal compliment to this gentleman was, I believe, founded on the fact that he wore spectacles.

³ Rev. C. E. Moberly, brother-in-law to Bishop Temple, and one of the hostile School staff.

⁴ I must leave readers to guess, if they can, why this gentleman was singled out for this left-handed compliment to his sincerity. But if they guess, I will ask them not to tell.

⁵ Rev. W. C. Green, now rector of Hepworth, Suffolk; then on the School staff by my own appointment—a right trusty colleague.