

## Conversations with Mr Michael J. Prichard

by  
Lesley Dingle<sup>1</sup> and Daniel Bates<sup>2</sup>

### First Interview: Early Years (1927-1950)

Date: 2nd March 2012

*In March 2012, Mr Prichard was interviewed three at the Squire Law Library to record his reminiscences of over sixty years research and teaching in the Faculty of Law and Gonville & Caius College.*

*The interviews were recorded, and the audio version is available on this website with this transcript of those recordings. The questions and topics are sequentially numbered in the three interviews for use in a database of citations made across the Eminent Scholars Archive to personalities mentioned therein.*

Interviewer: Lesley Dingle, **her questions and topics are in bold type**

Mr Prichard's answers are in normal type.

Comments added by LD, *in italics*.

All footnotes added by LD.

**1. Mr Prichard, as you know, we have previously interviewed several eminent scholars whose connections with the faculty extend back to the Second World War, and these are a valuable source of information on what was a time of great change. You have been associated with the faculty for over 60 years, and I hope you'll be able to provide us with further reminiscences on this intriguing period. Also, as we talk about your own career, I'm sure you will give us many insights into the evolution of the teaching of law at Cambridge and the many personalities that you've met over the following half century during your time at Gonville and Caius. And finally, I hope that we can visit some of your own research topics that I know include, *inter alia*, admiralty law and tort.**

**So, can we start by talking about your early life in pre-war England? You were born in 1927 in Banstead, Surrey, near Epsom? Is this where you spent your childhood?**

No, we moved from there fairly soon thereafter to Wimbledon because, with three brothers, the four of us, we all went to the Jesuit school, Wimbledon College. It's called a college now, though it's really a school. All of the Jesuit schools are called colleges. It's called a faith school today, but it wasn't in those days. So we moved to Wimbledon and then, shortly before the war, just before the war in fact, and that's the Second World War, we moved back to Sutton, fairly close to Banstead, because my father, who had been gassed in the First World War, needed to live on chalk and high ground. Wimbledon was a little too damp and low. So, we moved back there, but it meant, of course, daily travelling across from Sutton all the way to Wimbledon, during the war included. One vividly remembers it during the war, travelling across each day.

---

<sup>1</sup> Foreign & International Law Librarian, Squire Law Library, Cambridge University

<sup>2</sup> Freshfields Legal IT Teaching and Development Officer, Faculty of Law, Cambridge University



## 2. Was this a religious school?

Yes, under the 1944 Act, they had to discuss it [*religion*] because before that, it had been a private school, though of course a Jesuit school. The fees were very low, but it became a maintained school in 1944. But that was the Butler Education Act<sup>3</sup>. I was there during 1945. In fact, I left in 1945.

## 3. What subjects did you excel at Mr Prichard?

Well, I don't know about excelling, but I tended to be on the literary side. Arts rather than the science side. I like to excuse myself on that, in that I've always been interested in some of the science things, but it was virtually impossible to get any scientific materials. For instance chemistry got hardly any teaching during the war because you simply couldn't get hold of the chemicals. But I never took to this in the slightest. Physics tended to be more the mathematical side - of statics and dynamics rather than anything else. But it was mostly classics and then history and French. At school certificate level [*we did*] eight subjects and they were all fairly equal, and then one had to choose which to go into... Well, the Jesuits were very keen on one going onto the classical side. There was not actually a lesson in Greek - I can think of two lessons, but not as a regret, as I never really mastered Greek. Latin came in very useful a little later, as we will see. Then I learnt Roman law.

That was during the war. I can still vividly remember we would travel over in the bus and, occasionally, the bus would stop and we would all have to get out and go for the nearest shelter. That was in the early years, when the bombings were. Nothing came very close to us. Sutton was very close to Croydon Aerodrome.

## 4. You would have been 12 years old when war actually broke out?

Yes and they were very impressionable years, those five or six years. I'm not complaining but it rather messed up study. Even during the war, one would [*carry on*]; the sirens would go, and we'd go down to the shelters.

## 5. Incredible.

There were four of us [*children*]. The eldest one was a territorial, so, he was called up before war was declared, and [*remaining*] three of us, and mother and father agreed, that since dad would have to stay in London for his work, mother was very keen to stay there too, [*they*] preferred that we should all stay on the ground: that we would stay or go together. So, we weren't evacuated at all. Wimbledon College wasn't evacuated, unlike many schools, because it was felt that the Jesuits would stay there, and so they did.

## 6. Were there any other deprivations that you recall?

Books were difficult; and things like exercise books of paper had to be kept fairly frugally [*used*], because they weren't easily replaced. But, no. I think we were probably healthier during the war: we had fairly sparse rations. I felt much better in fact, I think, yes.

## 7. Did you witness any serious bombing?

Nothing very much. The school didn't get hit at all, because we weren't over in the East End or anything. They were bombing London. It was much more at night when it was

---

<sup>3</sup> The Education Act 1944 [the Butler Act] changed the system for secondary schools in England and Wales. Named after the Conservative politician R.A. Butler, it introduced a tripartite system of secondary education. It also created a regime in which independent schools could receive a direct grant from the Ministry of Education in exchange for accepting a number of pupils on "free places"



over the whole of the city, but we were still on the suburbs. I don't want to over dramatise it, but there were one or two fairly close. Put it this way, near enough at home to blow out the windows of the houses, the glass in the houses. So, my brothers and I tended to spend our evenings going round houses replacing panes of glass and things, you know. But nothing dramatic at all. I was too young to go in [*the armed forces*], just too young. I didn't get my medical for call up until early 1945. In fact, effectively, the war was virtually over by that time and they decided they could do without me, that I should be more trouble medically to them. So, I wasn't called up for National Service.

#### **8. Did you feel like you'd been spared?**

No, not really. I think a bit disappointed, in some ways because that was the sort of spirit, but very happy, really. My father, very luckily, got us into King's College, London. Curiously enough, although I was the third child, I was the first to go through King's London. Then followed Brian, my second brother, who became a solicitor in London, (he was still in the Navy) and then my younger brother Alan who later became a Professor of Law at Nottingham<sup>4</sup>. We all read law at King's London immediately after the war under Harold Potter<sup>5</sup>. [*LMD: the oldest brother Hugh, who served throughout the war did not go to Kings*]

#### **9. Did the war affect your outlook on life in any way? I know that it did for Professor Allott. It had a fairly profound effect on the way he viewed the world.**

I don't think so. No. I think we were fairly young, so it was all very exciting and I know that sounds [*strange*] nowadays, but you know, as boys, one would plot the flow and the fall back of the German troops in Russia. So, one learned a good deal of geography.

Apart from that, general worries. One's brothers were serving. But not really, no.

#### **10. When you moved to London, did you find that this was very different to the way you grew up and had been to school?**

Well, King's London was still badly damaged. That was in Somerset House. That had been bombed. King's was carrying on remarkably well, but in just the narrow Eastern third of Somerset House, with the Inland Revenue on the main part of Somerset House. Lectures and supervisions were very packed into a small space.

#### **11. It must have been a strange mix, because you had a lot of these people returning from the war who were much more experienced?**

Yes, in the first year they were very largely prisoners of war returning, including from the Far East. Yes, quite a lot of those, and people from the services. I was relatively one of the young ones, because at that stage, they didn't really want a lot more National Servicemen. It was mostly trying to cope with the large number of people who needed demobilisation.

I should perhaps explain. At King's London the teaching was very much organised with two other colleges, University College London and LSE [*London School of Economics*]. So, we would have to travel between the three for lectures. I still remember you would get on a bus to go up to the Godless institution of Gower Street, which is how we referred to University College<sup>6</sup>, but one would have some lectures there. But it had the enormous

---

<sup>4</sup> Alan Prichard (b. 1931) Emeritus Professor of Law, University of Nottingham, part-time paperwork barrister in property law for thirty years. He has retired in the Lake District where he writes sonnets

<sup>5</sup> Harold Potter (1896-1951), Professor of English Law, University of London (1938-1951)

<sup>6</sup> Founded in 1826, it was the first secular university in England



advantage that one got lectures from all the very good law professors, the outstanding people, in London, not just at King's London. I can still vividly remember them all. In fact, one does tend to remember things at that age.

It's an exciting change. It's law. It's a completely new subject to one and one doesn't forget. At King's the Dean of the Faculty was Harold Potter, who instilled in all us boys a sort of love of the law. Not so much a tick for brilliance, but rather just a passionate interest in law and what it should do for society. Harold Potter had a relatively small, but very hard working, staff. There was Albert Kiralfy<sup>7</sup> and there was Nokes<sup>8</sup> on evidence.

Supervisions weren't supervisions like Cambridge. They were all in eights and tens and were really just groups looking at problems - and cases, and discussing cases. But I remember the one who would drive us hardest in supervision later, who only came for a year from Oxford, where he'd been studying, was Fleming<sup>9</sup>. When Fleming returned as Goodhart Professor, we had some very pleasant times chatting about what life was like. Some lecturers were at King's - for instance, Potter's. David Hughes Parry<sup>10</sup> would come over from the London School of Economics, which really just showed how hard people were pressed in those days, because he was also Vice Chancellor of the university but, at the same time, a full time professor and lecturer.

Hughes Parry's lectures were always extremely clear. Potter's lectures weren't clear, but they were exciting. To give you some flavour of it, he would lecture on Land law and there was no question of concessions to the weak. The first lecture was upon types of ownership and the second one, though it won't mean much to anyone now, was on the powers of the estate owner of the Settled Land Act<sup>11</sup> - and that was my second lecture on Land law! Well, for anybody who knew Land law, or knows the history of Land law at all, the powers of the owner under the Settled Land Act are not the easiest topics for the second lecture. Particularly when they were concerned with raising money, but that was the second lecture.

Then I would just mention who we had from the London School of Economics - we had Glanville Williams<sup>12</sup>. Another two who stick in my mind were from University College: George Keeton<sup>13</sup> on Equity, and [*particularly*] Professor Jolowicz<sup>14</sup>, that's Tony's father,

---

<sup>7</sup> Albert Kenneth Roland Kiralfy (1915-2001) Professor at Kings College London, specialist in Soviet & Russian law

<sup>8</sup> Gerald Dacre Nokes, Reader in English Law, University of London, Middle Temple and South-Eastern Circuit, Barrister-at-Law. 1952 *An Introduction to Evidence*, Sweet & Maxwell

<sup>9</sup> John Gunther Fleming (1919-97), Goodhart Professor 1987-88, Trinity College. Cecil Shannon Turner Professor of Law, Emeritus at the University of California, Berkeley (Boalt Hall). Born in Berlin, emigrated to England 1935, undergraduate at Brasenose College. Emigrated to Canberra 1949, Dean of Law Australian National University, Emigrated to USA 1970. Briefly lectured at Kings College after the war

<sup>10</sup> Professor Sir David Hughes Parry, (1893-1973) Director Institute of Advanced Legal Studies (1947-1958), and Professor of English Law at LSE (1930-59)

<sup>11</sup> Settled Land Act 1925. An Act to consolidate the enactments relating to settled land in England and Wales. <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/Geo5/15-16/18>

<sup>12</sup> Glanville Llewelyn Williams (1911-97), Research Fellow, St John's College, Cambridge 1936-42; Quain Professor of Jurisprudence, London University 1945-55; Fellow, Jesus College, Cambridge 1955-97; Reader in Law, Cambridge University 1957-65, Professor of English Law 1966-68, Rouse Ball Professor of English Law 1968-78

<sup>13</sup> George W. Keeton (1902-1989). Professor of English Law, UCL (1937-69)



who was quite a remarkable scholar and taught us Roman law. Taught me all the Roman law I ever knew. He was really quite an exceptional lecturer and very keen and extremely conscientious in his lectures and everything. For years I used to rely on his notes entirely. In fact, in the third year we returned to him, and he gave me the best lectures I ever attended on Jurisprudence.

It was more on the historical side but, I tended, at that stage, to like the historical side.

## 12. He'd been in intelligence.

Yes, he had. I didn't know that at the time but, you see, all of them were coming back. For instance, Ronald Graveson<sup>15</sup>, when he came back to King's, had to lecture in his army uniform. For the first few lectures, because he hadn't got his demob clothes. You know, they came straight back out and straight into lecturing and he was a Reader at that stage. And we also had one very nice person called Kitson, who was an RAF pilot, who had been blinded in the RAF. So, his wife had to come and sit with him while he lectured but he, unfortunately, didn't stay in lecturing. He was very good, very conscientious but, since he really needed an amanuensis, and King's London couldn't afford that, he went into the Civil Service. But you see, I have an admiration and affection for these people because they were pitch forked into it, you know, at the deep end. If you can pitch fork somebody into the deep end, and they were tossed in at the deep end, and very few of them had been there during the war. Some had, and the older ones had, but some were coming back.

The young one I'm just telling you was Glanville Williams and he was at London School of Economics and I was lucky enough to have him in the first year, lecturing on constitutional law, and he was remarkably good, and then, in the second year, I was even more fortunate to have him for criminal law and it still is quite exciting to remember how one became aware of the distinction between intention and recklessness and negligence and concepts like this. But they were all very precise and clearly expounded. Just as in constitutional law, my first acquaintance with Venn diagrams was Glanville Williams explaining the non-separation of power in this country. But in constitutional law, of course in those days, you see, the third term was still devoted, quite what now would be almost unintelligible to people, to the Empire and Commonwealth and so, where Glanville was extremely good, was on the difference in the constitutions of Canada and the constitutions of Australia, but fairly soon the whole of the Commonwealth's changed. That was one third term.

In college, we were lucky enough to have Hood-Phillips<sup>16</sup>, who had curiously, worked here in Cambridge with Wade & Phillips<sup>17</sup> in constitutional law. So, we were really very lucky there but, as I say, Glanville Williams, when he was asked to lecture on a subject

---

<sup>14</sup> Herbert Felix Jolowicz (1890-1954), Professor of Roman Law, University of London 1931-48, Regius Professor of Civil Law, University of Oxford, 1948-1954

<sup>15</sup> Prof Ronald Graveson CBE (1911-91), Professor of Law at King's College London from 1947-74, Joint Editor of the *International and Comparative Law Quarterly* from 1955-61, and President of the International Association of Legal Science from 1960-2 and of the Society of Public Teachers of Law from 1972-3

<sup>16</sup> Owen Hood Phillips (1907-1986). Professor of Jurisprudence at the University of Birmingham (1946-1974). *Constitutional and Administrative Law* (with Paul Jackson). Chairman of BIALL (1972-6). Also an authority on William Shakespeare

<sup>17</sup> *Constitutional Law*, E. C. S. Wade & G. Godfrey Phillips, First Edition, 1933, Longmans, Green & Co



or became later, for instance, Quain Professor of Jurisprudence<sup>18</sup>, he would write a book on the subject more or less. He was switched from constitutional law to criminal law before he had time to write a book on constitutional law. On criminal law, of course there were early lectures and, without the slightest disrespect to him, he later became very much more concerned with the penal side of it and the effects of it: purely concerned with analysing the concept of the criminal law. So, when I was at London, I was really rather privileged to have these.

### **13. I'm fascinated by what you say, particularly the module in constitutional law that focused on Australian constitutional law. Was it a far cry from today?**

But also you had to deal with the difference between protectorates and dependencies and crown colonies and things of this sort, because they were all there. As regards the constitutional law itself, it hadn't yet really changed in the sense that judicial review had not really developed, and one still had the old royal orders of *mandamus* and *certiorari*. They hadn't been changed into judicial review. That was ten years later.

### **14. Mr Prichard, what prompted you then to apply to do an LLB at Queens'?**

Well, in fact I'd done rather well in the examinations there at London and Harold Potter saw that I was quite interested on the academic side, much more interested in the academic side. It was he who persuaded me to apply for the Cambridge LLB. For a long time it was a question of whether one could possibly afford it, because there was no question in those days of grants to go to university. You paid your own fees, and mother and father had four of us, but luckily I managed to get enough scholarships from various places. King's were very good. I got a post-graduate scholarship there and that allowed me to hold it at Cambridge. I was at Gray's Inn by that time - Harold Potter sent all his King's people to Gray's Inn. I had a scholarship there to study law.

My first contact with Cambridge was that Harold Potter was in touch with Emlyn Wade<sup>19</sup>, who was a great friend. Emlyn became very interested and got me to apply for a Squire Law scholarship. I remember the first letter I ever got from the Faculty was one from Kurt Lipstein<sup>20</sup>. I've still got the letter, telling me that I had been awarded a Squire Law scholarship. They were £60 a year, but it made all the difference, and that was my first communication with the Faculty. So, I came up to Queens' because Emlyn Wade and Harold Potter were suggesting I should try. Arthur Armitage<sup>21</sup> was there, and he was very dynamic.

I went up to Queens' to read the LLB, and that was two years. You had to do two years for any degree in Cambridge. So, you took the exam in one year and the next year you did some research. Others, later, repeated by doing the tripos - they repeated what they'd done at King's London and they did the LLB in the second of the two years. But that was thought to be not a really quite the right way to spend the year when I was there, so we went

---

<sup>18</sup> At University College London (1945-55)

<sup>19</sup> Professor Emlyn Capel Stewart Wade (1895-1978), Downing Professor of the Laws of England, University of Cambridge, 1945-62

<sup>20</sup> Professor Kurt Lipstein (1909-2006), Professor of Comparative Law, University of Cambridge 1973-76. See: <http://www.squire.law.cam.ac.uk/eminentscholars/kurtlipstein.php>

<sup>21</sup> Professor Sir Arthur Llywellyn Armitage (1916-1984), Professor of Common Law Victoria University of Manchester, President of Queens' College (1958-1970), Vice-Chancellor of the University of Manchester (1970-80)



straight to the LLB. I was too late applying, because I only got my results in London in July 1948. Then I had to make my application to get in. Kurt working, as always, during the summer, so was still hard at work in August and September. It was September he wrote and said I could have the Squires scholarship and Arthur Armitage, at the last moment, managed to find me room to get into Queens'.

I couldn't live in college in Queens', because it was all full by that time. Turning to that for one moment, the staggering difference between going to London and coming to Cambridge, was that the day was three hours longer straightaway. The day was three hours longer because in London no lecture could start before 10 at the earliest. It was an hour and a half to travel up to London immediately after the war with bus interruption. So, you would leave soon after eight in order to get to a 10 o'clock lecture, and no lecture, supervision or anything, went on beyond 3:30pm, it might go on until 4 o'clock, but you needed to get away before the ordinary workers, because the traffic became so jammed onto buses and the underground. Many of them lived out. For instance, Keeton lived at Berkhamstead, and Potter lived out near Royston. Then coming up to Cambridge and one found there were literally, well, literally is the wrong word, but there were three hours extra a day for students. You could study in the Squire Law library up until just before seven, and then you walk round back to halls in Queens'.

### **15. Wasn't that delightful, Mr Prichard?**

It was just a complete change. It meant one had time in the library whereas, at King's London, one had very little time in the library. Most of your information had to come from lectures and supervision. Many cases you had to take on trust. There would only be odd copy here. King's were short on things - that's why one came to appreciate very much lecturers like Jolowicz and Glanville Williams, who put in an enormous amount of time on their lectures to make sure they were good.

But, while I'm still down in London. I remember I was extremely impressed with Glanville Williams at that time - as a young man he was, not a great sense of humour in lectures or anything, but he encouraged questions. But they had to be genuine questions. If it was just show off questions, he would put them down very much, but if it was a genuine question, he would stop the lecture and write a careful note that this was a point which had caused genuine concern. The result is that, after about two or three years, his lectures had ceased to be the stuff that might bore us all, but it was the points which might trip us up or anything so that more and more came into the lectures of what was upsetting the student, or what was puzzling the student. Of course, they got better and better for that reason. I was always impressed with that. He would always stop and make a note of it and not just, deal with it. He would always deal with it, or say "I'll come back to this one", because at some times he said "we're going to deal with this", but it transformed the lectures in a course of about two or three years. The one he gave after three years after he gave his first one was changed quite remarkably because they were good to start with. The first ones were the text book stuff, but three years later he would be lecturing on the points that trouble the student. Quite remarkable.

Coming back to Cambridge, it was totally different. Supervisions were different. Not that we had any supervision in the LLB. There weren't very many lecturers at that stage. It was a fairly lonely existence, because there were two papers on legal history, and then Administrative Law which was under Emlyn Wade, and comparative English and Roman law



or transfer of movables as under J. W. C. Turner<sup>22</sup>. Those were the four papers, but there was no supervision at all. One was lucky at Queens', because there were three other extraordinarily good students at the time, not doing my subjects. Bill Wedderburn<sup>23</sup>, and there was David Widdicombe, who later became Liberal MP for Widecombe - Widdicombe for Widecombe! and then there was Newy, who later became a Master of Chancery. They were all very good. Arthur Armitage had got us very nice, good stable of people there at that stage. So, that was very great fun and they were interesting and it meant that in meetings of the Queens' Bench, they still stick in my mind, we used to meet in Arthur's room.

#### **16. You met in Arthur Armitage's room?**

In the evenings. Sometimes it was larger, and we would have to into a hall or something like this. He had come back in 1945, at the time when I was at King's London, but he had been away during the war, like so many of them, like John Thornley<sup>24</sup>. They were all the returning ones after the war. Yes, the LLB was an interesting period.

#### **17. Who were your mentors during this period, Mr Prichard?**

Well, in the LLB one was very largely left to oneself. Harry Hollond<sup>25</sup>, in the legal history lectures stood out, just as Glanville Williams' lectures of London stood out, and so did Harold Potter. At Cambridge, I was privileged to attend Toby Milsom's<sup>26</sup> first lecture. He was just back as a researcher for Trinity and they were trying him out for lectures. I attended his first lectures on Action on the Case, which was very exciting. Because it was totally new, totally different from everything we'd learned beforehand. Everything on Action on the Case was quite a totally different approach to it. I remember that was very exciting. I think the LLB examination was really interesting because, in those days we had an extraordinary good provision in the rubric. The examination was *answer up to four questions* but, whether you answered one or four, was entirely left to you and I do remember, in one of the legal history papers, I spent the whole three hours writing on Action on the Case.

#### **18. So, he inspired you?**

In legal history, yes. I was already interested in legal history, because history had been the main subject at school. They were in a little room called room seven in the Squire Law, down in the old law school. The first of the ones we lost to a coffee room or something, for staff. It's the downstairs of the lift. No, lectures were all there.

#### **19. Toby Milsom would have been about 26 years old at the time, because he was born in 1923.**

---

<sup>22</sup> J. W. C. Turner (?1886-1968), M.C, M.A., LL.D., Middle Temple, Barrister-at-Law; Fellow of Trinity Hall, Cambridge. *Introduction to the study of Roman Private Law* 1953 *Outlines of Criminal Law* J.W.C. Turner & C.S. Kenny (1966), *Sexual Offences* by Sir Leon Radzinowicz & J.W.C. Turner (Eds)

<sup>23</sup> Kenneth William Wedderburn (1927-2012). Baron Wedderburn of Charlton, Labour politician, lecturer in law at Cambridge, later Cassell Professor of Commercial Law, London School of Economics

<sup>24</sup> J. W. A Thornley, Sidney Sussex College

<sup>25</sup> Professor Henry Arthur Hollond (1888-1974), Rouse Ball Professor of English Law, University of Cambridge 1943-50

<sup>26</sup> Stroud Francis Charles (Toby) Milsom, QC MA FBA, (b. 1923). Professor of Law Cambridge 1976-90





Yes, but he still looked very young. He was very young and they were great fun, and he was great in his lectures. They were a totally different type of lecture. They were always put very tentatively and not stutteringly, but hesitantly. But you could see the mind at work.

**20. And that lovely laugh, his sense of humour.**

He really was fun. If I could just illustrate that one. A year or two year later, I used to go to his lectures, even though I'd taken the exam and finished. I remember that Harry Hollond had arranged for him to give his lecture, and that morning it was going to be on the Court of Exchequer in the time of Henry II and Henry III. It was a subject he was working on. Harry announced that his friend, Sir Hilary Jenkinson<sup>27</sup>, was up in Cambridge. So, he was going to come to the Toby's lecture. Now, Hilary Jenkinson had written the book on the Exchequer. So, you were going to the lecture to the man who knew more. And I'm glad to say that Toby, with lecture notes on the Exchequer in front of him, had sort of switched his subject at the last moment onto the King's Bench, and I remember his revealing this afterwards. Quite rightly he didn't dare..... They were good fun.

**21. Mr Prichard, you use the word fun. That word crops up many times in the interviews I did with Toby. That was very important to him - in his appreciation of life.**

It was a fun time in any argument as we were trying to work out what happened, because it was largely detective work. You got a similar sense of excitement from Harold Potter too. Glanville was much more purely intellectual. It was exciting rather than fun, but, with Toby, it was fun. Fun all the way. But that was the LLB.

What I remember at Queens' was, because sometimes people have asked, was "and how well did you fit in?" for what might be called just, not really a grammar school boy, but a day school boy from London coming into Cambridge. Well, actually, I was lucky in a way in the sense that many of my colleagues were ex-service. They were straight demob and, at that stage they were given places at the universities. So at Queens' I never had the slightest feeling that one was a sort of, you know, a working class boy or something. There was no class distinction - very striking. And looking back, one puts it down to the fact that Queens' was, at that stage, completely full of people from all sorts of different backgrounds who had served in the Forces. Most of them were youngsters, not much older than myself, from all walks of life beforehand. No, those were very good days at Queens', those two years.

**22. Fascinating. that was 60 years ago, when you first came to Cambridge.**

63 years ago. 1948. Well, it's 64 years now, isn't it?

**23. A hugely different place to today?**

In some ways life was hugely different, I think, rather than the place. Well, looking ahead, to Caius in 1950, there was less specialisation, much less specialisation. There were people who were outstanding and distinguished in their own subject, but lecturers, for example, as in London and here lectured on what they had to lecture on when they came back from the Forces. One of the things the Chairman of the Faculty and the Secretary had to do was organise the lecture list. They had to decide somebody's got to lecture on this subject. I may say that, when I went over to Caius as a Fellow in 1950, (I hadn't got the university post until the following year), there were about fifty second year students. Some had been doing

---

<sup>27</sup> Sir Hilary Jenkinson (1882-1961), President of Society of Archivists (1955-61), Assistant, then Deputy Keeper at Public Record Office (1938-54). *Select Cases in the Exchequer of Pleas* (Selden Society), vol. 48, 1931



economics in the first year and then law and the rest. There was nobody else, so one did the teaching or got weekenders to do it. We'd learn quite a lot by having to learn the subject the night before to teach them the supervision. Yes, and that happened at university, level too. People were very rarely, unless they were professorial or readership level, able to lecture on the subject they were really keen on.

There were relatively few of them. People like John Thornley and Mickey Dias<sup>28</sup>. Mickey Dias in particular, would be called on to do almost anything. I may say that when I got my assistant lectureship [1951], they decided that they wanted a lecturer in the LLB course on transfer of movables and I'd taken the course before. But then they decided to switch it to negligence in English and Roman law. They said "Well, you know, you did well in law school". So, from having done a first year course on Roman law, luckily with Jolowicz's father down in London, to be switched to using that for LLB lectures, I still remember to my horror, in the audience was Geoffrey Wilson<sup>29</sup>, who had just got the George Long prize for Roman law and everything else, and he would sit at the back. But he was a Queens' man. It was fun, but that's what happened. Everybody had to switch from one subject to another and to another. For many years the Squire Law Library was the heart and the soul of the place [*Faculty*]. Do you remember it?

#### **24. Just before my time.**

The upstairs of the old Squire, (not the downstairs - the downstairs was the history library), all the law lectures took place in very nice lecture rooms in the Old Schools with wood benches, which had been put in just before the war. Looking back, I didn't realise at the time, it just looked as if the Law Faculty's always been there, but it had only been there for about five years before the Second World War. People like Kurt [*Lipsten*] remembered it when it was in the Downing Street site in the museum of Archaeology and Anthropology. I don't remember that at all.

The faculty was very much a closely knit body, even though we all had colleges. Most of Faculty would try and get in for tea in the mornings at 11 o'clock. Many lectures would be nine until ten, ten until eleven or eleven until twelve. Not all of them by any means, and consequently those who were lecturing from ten until eleven would come in at eleven and just stay there for a cup of tea until about ten past until they went back to their colleges. Those who were going to lecture at 11 o'clock would come in at about ten to, but others who had been upstairs would always come down. Kurt, for instance, he was inevitably up in room five. He'd come down for tea and that was where really most of the Faculty business was done. One would talk about the latest cases arguments, and visitors to the Faculty would come too. That took place in the old Lecturers' Combination Room, which was right downstairs and later became lecture room two or three. It was always tea and made in an enormous great pot by the lady cleaner. It was good because people like Bill Wedderburn would always come in and one could always argue a case with him - he was always very good at that.

#### **25. This was when you were lecturing, Mr Prichard, rather than a student?**

Yes, this was after 1950. In 1948 – 1950, one was just a student. It was still in the

---

<sup>28</sup> Mr Reginald Walter Michael (Mickey) Dias (1921-2009), Lecturer in Law, University of Cambridge (Jurisprudence & Tort) 1951-1986. Fellow Magdalene College. See: [http://www.squire.law.cam.ac.uk/eminentscholars/rwm\\_dias.php](http://www.squire.law.cam.ac.uk/eminentscholars/rwm_dias.php)

<sup>29</sup> Geoffrey Philip Wilson, M.A., LL.B., Barrister, Gray's Inn, Emeritus Professor of Law University of Warwick



same place, and the lecturers were still about but, from 1950 onwards Hersch Lauterpacht<sup>30</sup> would always be up in his room six in the Old Squire. Almost every day he would come in, and Kurt would be in five. They would always be very good at coming down [*for tea*] and others would be there, and many would come along from other colleges. I'm not saying necessarily from the furthest flung colleges, but they were very good at coming - they would come along from John's - Jackson<sup>31</sup> would come along, and Bailey<sup>32</sup> would come along, later Scott<sup>33</sup> and John Hall<sup>34</sup>, for example.

That kept going for a long time, the whole of the fifties really, and the early sixties. In the middle of the sixties the coffee tradition took over and since the lady cleaner couldn't really cope with coffee - you couldn't stand stewing as the tea could, because younger members of the faculty tended to drift off into the Regent House upstairs for a coffee. So the tea habit rather broke down. In the early days, I remember people like Jack Hamson<sup>35</sup>, would always come in and Kurt would come down, almost as a matter of course. So the faculty had a sort of a collegiate spirit as well as a college. In fact, I think, we were probably better organised as a Faculty, no, not better organised, that's the wrong word, but more cohesive as a Faculty, than most of the other arts faculties. Not the science faculties, of course, because they all had their laboratories and departments - chemistry was in the chemistry building, and so on. Whereas history tended to be scattered. Although it had the Seeley History Library below us in the Old Schools, none of its lectures were there.

Before the war, Harry Hollond and McNair<sup>36</sup> had organised that the law faculty would get the Old Schools. They were lovely lecture rooms. When the University Library moved over the river, to the big building, we shared it with the Administration and we had all our lectures there. The administration hadn't started to trespass and encroach then. That really came with the sixties, but the fifties were a period when it was still a small, fairly compact, faculty. Although some of the giants had retired by that time. Percy Winfield<sup>37</sup> was still there, [*although*] he wouldn't come - by that time he'd retired, but I remember his last few lectures. That was only when I was a student.

It was still a fairly small faculty: it was the law school. I never talked about the Old School. I talked about the law school. For example, criminology, which is now a building of its own, used to be in a tiny little room, the whole of criminology, in the West End of the North Gallery in the Squire Law library. It's now used as a little store room with a tiny window, but that was where it was. It started up there with J. W. C. Turner, who was still

---

<sup>30</sup> Professor Sir Hersch Lauterpacht (1897-1960). Judge at International Court of Justice 1954-60. Whewell Professor of International Law 1938-55

<sup>31</sup> Richard Meredith Jackson, (1903-86), Downing Professor of the Laws of England 1966-70

<sup>32</sup> Stanley John Bailey (1901-1980), Rouse Ball Professor of English Law 1950-68

<sup>33</sup> K. Scott

<sup>34</sup> J. C. Hall

<sup>35</sup> Charles John Hamson (1905-1987), Professor of Comparative Law 1953-73

<sup>36</sup> Professor Sir Arnold Duncan McNair (1885-1976), Whewell Professor of International Law, 1935-37, Vice-Chancellor Liverpool University, 1937-45, Professor of Comparative Law 1945-46

<sup>37</sup> Professor Sir Percy Henry Winfield (1878-1953) Inaugural Rouse Ball Professor in English Law University Cambridge 1928-1943



very largely concerned with it. Radzinowicz<sup>38</sup> just arriving, and then it started to expand and develop. That was in the fifties.

## **26. Mr Prichard, did you decide after you graduated, that you wanted to become an academic?**

Yes, it was a very tempting offer. I was torn between that and practice, I have to say. I'll explain in a moment that I was lucky, in some ways, to have both. But I was offered a Fellowship while I was still a student at Queens' by Caius. It was really rather nice to live in college for the first time, so I became a Fellow of the college.

I got my university post rather rapidly after that [1951]. I should say straightaway that, even though I was the only law Fellow at the time, because of course Emlyn Wade was professor, and Arnold McNair had retired. Though he was still very much a figure in Cambridge, having come back from Liverpool as vice chancellor, he didn't come back to a chair because, by that time, Hersch Lauterpacht had his chair.

No, Emlyn and Arnold were extremely good, because they persuaded the college that the law done at the college ought to have some sort of professional. I was already a member of the Bar, the Gray's Inn, but he [Arnold McNair] said "No, you should go and have some experience". So, even though I held a Fellowship, the college, entirely on their persuasion, and they were very persuasive people, particularly Arnold McNair, the college also allowed me to do my teaching. There had to be 12 hours supervision at the weekend, then spend the week down in Chambers in London. I had the particular privilege of spending a whole year - it was supposed to be six months, six months in equity, six months in chancery and six months in common law, but I stayed the whole 12 months.

I had the great privilege of being under John Brunyate<sup>39</sup> who was Counsel. He was very disabled and he couldn't hardly walk, but he had a brilliant mind. He'd been a Fellow, a mathematics Fellow at Trinity. He'd been a very distinguished prize Fellow at Trinity and written the work on charity. But, he was the great intellectual in the Chancery Division. He didn't go into court much, and he wasn't a QC, simply because he couldn't get about much and he was very disabled, but he was deferred to very much by Counsel. So, very lucky, they got me as John Brunyate's pupil in John's Chambers 4 Stone Buildings. I'll mention that for a particular reason in a moment. And it was a very happy year there. Fortunately, my parents were still living down in Epsom at that stage, so during the week I could go and stay there at night, and just come back and teach at the weekends. There was quite a lot to teach.

## **27. It sounds like a lovely life.**

It was, yes. It was very pleasant. I might not have done well at the Bar, but I would have enjoyed the life. The life was very, very much the same, particularly in Chancery Chambers, like 4 Stone Buildings. They would have tea in the afternoon and would discuss some problem - obviously not professional competence or anything - but some intellectual problem which would have arisen. They would toss it around Chambers. Occasionally, after we'd gone to the Bench, and we'd come back for tea. "Was I all right"? we would ask John. "Was I right this morning"? Which is rather amusing. You all would rather assume that they must pass. They were quite keen to keep me, but I'd only got the year off from Caius. I think that was 1952 - 1953. I'd got my lectureship by that time. So, it was very heavy.

---

<sup>38</sup> Professor Sir Leon Radzinowicz (1906-1999), Wolfson Professor of Criminology, Department of Criminal Science, Cambridge

<sup>39</sup> John Waddingham Brunyate, *F.W. Maitland, Equity: A Course of Lectures*, John Brunyate (ed.), 2d ed. 1936. *The Legal Definition of Charity* (1945) 61 *Law Quarterly Review* 268



But, going back to the Faculty. People didn't work as hard, in the sense that they weren't rushing around so much, but they spent the hours enormously industriously. Most people would lecture on the Saturday morning. In fact, two sets of lectures were always given. Roman Dutch law, which we used to teach, was always given on Saturday morning.

### **28. Do you remember who taught that, Mr Prichard?**

Well, the one who sticks in my mind was a bit later, was Coulson. Coulson did the Roman Dutch law at the end. For a number of years we had Scots law. That was Ashton Cross<sup>40</sup>, who used to come down from Scotland on Friday afternoons and Saturday mornings. But Scottish law sticks in my mind because, of course, he used to attract a number of Scots down. There were quite a number of Scots in the Faculty and they used to do Scots law. Tony Weir<sup>41</sup>, I think, took over the lectures on it.

We always thought the Scots did very well because they would do one year's Scots law and they were supposed to do five subjects spread over the Tripos. It was a bit of a fraud that one paper was introduction to contract and tort. The second paper was contract. The third paper was tort. The fourth paper was Scots law of contract and the fifth paper was the Scots law of tort. So, in fact, they got away with two subjects, contract and tort, whereas everybody else had to do five very different subjects. But, there we are. I used to pull Tony Weir's leg on this.

### **29. That reminds me of someone I wanted to ask you about in 1949, and that was Peter Stein. He was at, of course, your college, at Gonville and Caius.**

1949? He was earlier than that as an undergraduate, I think? He'd graduated by 1948, because he wasn't my student. Peter was always senior to me. I'd have to look him up, but he came back to do the LLB, but not in residence, I don't think. Sorry, he may have been at Caius in 1949.

### **30. I think he was at Caius in 1949.**

That was to do the LLB. He'd already done the Tripos, because he'd been the star pupil of David Daube. But he'd gone in 1950, by the time that I went to Caius. That's it, you see, I was at Queens'. He was doing the LLB in the same year as David Yale<sup>42</sup>, whom of course I got to know very well, because he did the legal history option and I had to lecture to him.

Peter, yes, he went off to Aberdeen, didn't he? Nottingham first, and then on to Aberdeen. Nottingham for a couple of years. I know, because he overlapped with my brother [Alan], when my brother went there and then he went off to Aberdeen. No, he was the star pupil. David Daube was at Caius, and he taught some very bright people for me in Roman law, but he would only take the bright ones.

### **31. Do you remember him?**

Oh, yes, very well. He was very serious and, of course, I would have a particular interest in his work because, when I was doing negligence in English and Roman law, the

---

<sup>40</sup> D. I. C. Ashton-Cross. (1964). Negligence, injury to Unborn Child, Scots Law. *The Cambridge Law Journal*, 22, 202-203

<sup>41</sup> J. A (Tony) Weir, (1936-2011), Reader in Law, Trinity College

<sup>42</sup> David. E. C. Yale (b. 1928), Emeritus Fellow in Law Christ's College. Reader in English Legal History (1969-93), Inner Temple, President of the Selden Society (1994-97).



article which had made him well known in Roman Law, or the *Lex Aquilia* was essential to those lectures. He hadn't got a Fellowship, because he wouldn't do any teaching, so the college wouldn't extend his Fellowship.

He had come over, been very largely brought over just before the war [1933], as a refugee by Buckland<sup>43</sup>. Buckland was a Caius man, and at that stage the President and Vice Master of the college and very, very senior, in his eighties. He had got him a Fellowship at Caius before the war, and it was extended as long as we could possibly extend research Fellowships, but he didn't really qualify for a teaching one, because he was not willing to do 12 hours teaching in all subjects.

### **32. Which does sound quite arduous.**

Oh, it was arduous, yes, but the undergraduates were far less demanding, far, far less demanding than they are now. They didn't want to be, as it were, spoon fed. I don't wish to run down the present undergraduates, but they do expect everything to be laid out on a plate, and that was not the case then. Students did not expect it, in the slightest, particularly the ones who were coming back. And many of them were older than I was when I first became a Fellow. I had started teaching at Caius the year before, in that gap year, when I still had to be a member of Queens' to qualify for the LLB. That was 1949 to 1950, I came across and supervised, but many of them were older and naturally, of course, they'd been in the Forces. But, they had, how shall I put it, a proper feeling for how much time should be spent on study and how much time on life.

Generally speaking, nobody taught between two and about five. That was sport. Then five to seven, two hours solid. The morning tended to be in the Squire and annex rooms there and you expected undergraduates to go to lectures, and there were lots of them. They would go through at least three a morning. Lots of lectures. But [*for*] supervisions I didn't drive them nearly hard enough. Not having had much writing to do during the war, at school and the rest, I'd never really acquired the habit or done any supervision, essays and things, myself. There were more discussions, as it were. I think that would be true, generally speaking, all round. One wasn't expected to have spent the whole of the evening before reading the latest case.

### **33. And today it's so exam centred?**

I think the exams were as tough then. They could be very tough. Tony [*Weir*] could set some tough ones, believe it or not, in English law. He was always very good in English law. No, there wasn't the same panic about exams because, frankly, for most of the students, a first was for those who wanted to become academics. The rest - they were probably happy with 2:1's or even thirds.

I'm not saying they were brighter, but it wasn't desperate for them. People didn't attach just to classes. It would be very nice if they got a First and stood out, but that wasn't what really counted. And the Bar didn't really expect everybody to get either a First or a 2:1. What they wanted was the sort of pupil who could argue and present a case. So, there wasn't the examination pressure.

### **34. A different world.**

That was a different world, yes. They didn't expect things to be spoon fed. Though, to be frank, I have to say it was carried on [*immediately*] after the war, believe it or not. The

---

<sup>43</sup> William Warwick Buckland (1859-1946). Regius Professor of Civil Law, University of Cambridge (1914-45). Fellow of Gonville & Caius



University Press would print some of the lectures to be handed out. Actually print them to put it on a sheet, with headings and the title and references. So, you've got them ready and they were printed by the University Press before and handed out at the lecture. That had virtually stopped by my time. I found that quite staggering.

The cyclostyle and Xerox and all that came in, but for a long period you didn't get that at all. Of course there was nothing, no Xerox's at all - it was all handwritten. Duplicators were not really very appropriate. But I do remember, in some of the very early days, people like Winfield and Hollond still expected their lectures to have headings, and to indicate references.

### **35. Were you taught by Hollond?**

I was taught by Hollond. He lectured to me. He was not the most inspiring - he wasn't a lively person at all. He had an enormous influence in the university and for the rest of my life I've been realising just what a part he played in the transformation of the university under the Royal Commission 1922<sup>44</sup>.

He was actually Secretary of that commission, having had a distinguished war record, and most of college statutes, and the wording, you couldn't improve on them. He drafted them and he and Arnold McNair had an enormous amount to do assisting Hugh Anderson<sup>45</sup>. I'm not sure that people quite realise just how much he did in setting up the structure of the university and the colleges in the inter war years, but he was virtually retired.

He'd almost reached retirement by the time that I came up. He was an extremely conscientious lecturer, but not a lively one, the exact opposite. But then Winfield wasn't either. Arthur Armitage was lively, Jack Hamson, of course, and youngsters like that.

### **36. I wanted to ask you about Hamson.**

We discussed a great deal. Oh, yes, he was a very live wire in the faculty in the fifty, sixty period and seventy period.

We've talked mostly about the fifties and sixties but, of course, Kurt was not a Fellow of a college at that stage. He was still, what it was called, a lector in Trinity. Trinity had got a large number of Fellows from inside - Hollond, Milsom, Wade, Tony Jolowicz<sup>46</sup> and Eli Lauterpacht<sup>47</sup>, so they were pretty well stocked. So, Kurt didn't have a college room, and he had the room in the Squire, and he lived there all day long, in the same way that he did here. He became a living legend in there when I came up.

### **37. When you think he'd been here since 1934. That is a long time to not have that facility.**

And he kept that car, the blue Armstrong Siddeley<sup>48</sup>. He used to tell me about what

---

<sup>44</sup> Royal Commission on the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge 1919-1922 - the Asquith Commission, resulting in the Oxford and Cambridge Universities Act 1923, <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/Geo5/13-14/33/contents>

<sup>45</sup> Sir Hugh Kerr Anderson (1865-1928), Master of Caius 1912-1928

<sup>46</sup> J. Anthony Jolowicz, (1926- 2011), Emeritus Professor of Comparative Law 1976-93. Trinity College

<sup>47</sup> Professor Sir Elihu Lauterpacht, (b. 1928), Hon. Professor of International Law 1994-

<sup>48</sup> Called "Nottebohm" after the Nottebohm case (*Liechtenstein v Guatemala*), International Court of Justice 1955. See:



they'd done before the war, yes. It was a rather different Kurt before the war - [with] Glanville Williams, they went off together in their cars touring in Europe. Oh, yes. I never got to the bottom of exactly what happened there. And after the war, he would take the Armstrong Siddeley roaring down to go to conferences. I remember he once took Geoffrey Wilson all the way down to a conference in Northern Italy. That was Kurt's Armstrong Siddeley. It had belonged to Campbell, I think? You know the chap, the racing Campbell, who was killed on the water speed record<sup>49</sup>?

**38. Do you mean that he bought the car from him?**

I think so. He kept that car going for many, many years.

That was long before Kurt became a Fellow at Clare, when Bill Wedderburn left. I went from Queens' to Caius and Bill Wedderburn went from Queens' to Clare, and then left for London. Then we had Kurt and Colin Turpin<sup>50</sup> [at Clare]. I lectured him, I never taught him. On Roman law.

**39. He'd been, presumably, a student from Johannesburg?**

Yes, that's right. He came up as a post-grad, in the same way that Bob Hepple<sup>51</sup> later came.

**40. Yes, in somewhat more dramatic circumstances.**

Yes, there were still very much a link - the Roman Dutch law link with South Africa.

Many of the South African judges and Chief Justices had been to Cambridge. Arnold McNair and Emlyn Wade knew them well.

**41. Still in this period, did you ever come across, or have anything to do with, Hersch Lauterpacht when he was the Whewell Professor from 1948 to 1955?**

Yes, when I said Lauterpacht would come down, that was Hersch I was thinking of. Eli was largely off down in London by that time.

Hersch was in room 6. He was in International Law, which was one of the subjects I never studied. We didn't do it at King's London University. It was one of the options, but only a third year option. International Law hadn't really spread. We're still very much 1945, 1946.

I always saw him almost every day in the Squire. He would always be punctilious - in by about 11 o'clock. I don't say he started work, but he would meet, and the students would be there for a couple of hours beforehand sitting outside on the desks. He would turn up and he would see them one by one. As a research supervisor he must have been a bit formidable. He knew so much, but he knew what he wanted from his students and he got it. They were very good. He was always extremely polite and friendly and he became a great part in the Faculty. He didn't shirk his side of faculty work. He would always come down and talk in the Faculty, which was very helpful in the fifties and sixties because we'd got quite a lot of

---

[http://www.images.law.cam.ac.uk/gallery\\_viewer.php?gallery=acbeeb7c47a7acf9393e46a5fe75b341&image=d490d7b4576290fa60eb31b5fc917ad1&process=pop](http://www.images.law.cam.ac.uk/gallery_viewer.php?gallery=acbeeb7c47a7acf9393e46a5fe75b341&image=d490d7b4576290fa60eb31b5fc917ad1&process=pop)

<sup>49</sup> Sir Donald Campbell died while attempting to break his own water speed record in the jet-powered boat, Bluebird K7, 1967

<sup>50</sup> Colin C. Turpin, (b. 1928). Emeritus Reader in Public Law

<sup>51</sup> Sir Bob Hepple, (b. 1934), Emeritus Professor of Law, Master of Clare College 1993-2003, Professor of English Law UCL, 1982-93





people. With America having rather more money than anybody else, we would tend to have them over from Harvard and places like that, and one of the ones obviously they would know would be Hersch.

**42. I do remember some of the Goodhart incumbents commenting on the fact that how decentralised the faculty is for a visitor now, in contrast to earlier times? People like Hersch, would have been very attractive to visitors.**

Oh, yes. Well, visitors we'd see them mostly during the day. There were rather fewer visitors. The Goodhart Professorship had not been set up, of course, but visitors would normally be on a short stay or come in for a lecture, and they'd all come to the Faculty. We'd meet most of them at tea in the morning. I remember meeting lots of them then. The Goodhart Professorship was set up, when was that, in the late sixties, wasn't it - I think, the seventies?

In the sixties, if we had people over, they would be Pitt Professors<sup>52</sup>, which we had to share with Economics and History - we had a one third share in the Pitt. It always outraged me that the Faculty was very weak kneed that, when it got the Goodhart Professorship<sup>53</sup>, it allowed the Economics representative and the General Board and, no doubt with History, to suggest and get it through the General Board that, since the Law Faculty now had its own visiting professorship, it didn't need part of the Pitt professorship. Therefore we lost our third.

I would have fought it tooth and nail, because Goodhart had given us an extra chair. There was no question that we should have had that as well as the Pitt. The Goodhart Professorship was entirely funded by Arthur Goodhart and he hadn't intended to release the Pitt. We had some very good Pitt professors over, who are particularly from Harvard and the rest.

I don't think we'd get Pitt professors now in Law. Well, we don't in fact. We're getting superb Goodhart Professors. Excellent. Paul Finn<sup>54</sup>, for instance, was here - he'd come back to Caius .

**43. Someone else just springs to mind whom people ask about was Henry Barnes.**

Oh, yes, I knew Henry Barnes<sup>55</sup>, and Mrs Barnes, too. He was quite a character. He and Ashton Cross were the characters of the Faculty. Henry had ceased to be, by that time an officer of Jesus, but he did supervise and he was a very popular supervisor in Criminal Law, and a very generous host too. When Dorothy and myself got engaged, he invited us round for lunch in his rooms. He used to live within his rooms in Sydney Street, very roughly where Sainsbury's used to be, a little bit further down in Sidney Street, opposite Sidney College.

I remember having a superb lunch with him and being offered the most superb wines, because he still was a remarkable judge of wine, even though he wouldn't touch a drop. Earlier memories, he had not been quite so abstemious. He became a complete teetotaler, but

---

<sup>52</sup> Pitt Professorship of American History and Institutions was established in 1944

<sup>53</sup> Arthur Goodhart Visiting Professor in Legal Science, named after Arthur Lehman Goodhart. First appointee 1972-73 was Andre Tunc

<sup>54</sup> Professor Justice Paul Finn, Judge of Federal Court of Australia (1995 – present). Goodhart Professor 2010-2011. Did his PhD at Caius 1971-75. See: [http://www.squire.law.cam.ac.uk/eminent\\_scholars/professor\\_justice\\_paul\\_finn.php](http://www.squire.law.cam.ac.uk/eminent_scholars/professor_justice_paul_finn.php)

<sup>55</sup> Henry Barnes, Fellow of Jesus College until 1939, Lecturer in Law 1932-1959



he was very much one of the characters for undergraduates' stories about being the President of Mexico for a couple of days.

**44. People used to flock to his lectures, apparently - in criminal law?**

Yes, they did. Not necessarily for the right reasons. Arthur Armitage took over the criminal law from him, and he was also very lively, but in a totally different way, but that was before Glanville came back, of course.

I was dragged in for two sessions as Secretary [*of the Faculty*]. The secretaryship then was three years long and, at the end of the first session, so that was about 1961 to about 1964. I took leave of absence and Tony took over for a year, but he couldn't stand the job.

**45. Is that Tony Weir?**

No, Tony Jolowicz. Poppy helped him. Quite rightly, he didn't like the job at all. So, the Faculty dragged me back for another three years. By that time the job had got so much, they decided they must have a faculty assistant, you see. You might see somebody more in the nature of Kirsty Allen and we got a retired Lieutenant Colonel. But they needed somebody to teach. So, I had six years as secretary. I don't think anybody has ever had quite as long. It was a happy period, from some points of view, but it was a fraught and frenetic period during the sixties. That was the battle with the Old Schools about History, and where we should be.

**46. I would love to hear about that. Professor Jolowicz spoke about it.**

And also the Institute of Criminology - it was an exhausting period of time because people, quite rightly, say that the job of the Secretary is terrible these days. I'm sure it is, and a nasty job, but in those days it we [*also*] had to make the tax returns to the Inland Revenue, sign the P45's each year for everybody in the Faculty we had paid. I still remember, you finished your supervising in the Lent term, and you made your P45's. There weren't all that many of them, but we made those returns, we paid the cheques. I'd better leave the secretaryship, because I know there'll be tributes to two before me, Mickey Dias and John Thornley.

Job roles ended in chaos at the 1968 student sit ins and the Faculty and the law school building were never the same after that. Bit by bit, we lost out, room after room.

So, from seventy to eighty was very largely a war of attrition in which the Old Schools took over more and more of the Faculty and in return, of course, we did at least get the downstairs Seeley Library.

And as in the sixties, when we needed a full time professional assistant (although he didn't last - he was a very good man, Farrow, but he didn't last very long), so we needed, for the first time in the sixties, a professional librarian. Previously Tel, Ellis Lewis<sup>56</sup> had done it. All these jobs were done by a member of the academic staff until the mid-sixties. But then, of course, Willi Steiner<sup>57</sup> came and, after him the serious Gordon Hughes<sup>58</sup>, and then Will Major<sup>59</sup> and finally, David Wills<sup>60</sup>.

---

<sup>56</sup> T. Ellis Lewis (1900-1978), Librarian, Squire Law Library 1931-1968

<sup>57</sup> Wilhelm ("Willi") Anton Friedrich Paul Steiner (1918-2003), Assistant Librarian Squire Law Library 1959-1968

<sup>58</sup> Gordon G. E. Hughes, (1924-1982), Second Assistant Librarian 1961-68, Senior Assistant 1968-75, Deputy Librarian in Charge 1975-79, Librarian 1979-82

<sup>59</sup> William T. Major, Librarian, Squire Law Library 1968-70



Also, the Secretary of the Faculty also had to act as Secretary of the Degree Committee and liaise with the Institute of Criminology, which was not very easy in that sixties period.

That's sixties - seventies, a fairly frenetic period. Seventy to eighty was a slightly different one. Eighty to ninety was a different one too, and I came back to help them computerise the Faculty and computerise the examinations.

**46A. Mr Prichard, thank you so much for a fascinating interview.**

---

<sup>60</sup> David Frederick Wills, Squire Law Librarian, 1995-

