

This is not the version of record. The final paper was published in: Trusted, Marjorie and Barnes, Joanna (eds.) (2021) Toppling statues : papers from the 2020 PSSA webinar. Watford : PSSA Publishing. ISBN: 9781838397609

PSSA Website - <https://pssauk.org/>

Jonathan Black

'A War Memorial In Every Sense': Charles Sargeant Jagger MC (1885-1934) and the Memorial to the Royal Regiment of Artillery, 1925-2020

Abstract:

This essay will focus on the Royal Regiment of Artillery Memorial at Hyde Park Corner, London, the work of the sculptor Charles Sargeant Jagger MC (1885-1934) and the architect Lionel Godfrey Pearson (1879-1953), it proved to be intensely controversial when unveiled in October 1925. A number of leading cultural commentators even argued that the imagery on the memorial, particularly the reproduction in stone of a 9.2 inch siege howitzer, was so disturbing that the entire memorial be dismantled and perhaps erected somewhere else in a less prominent public site. This essay will explore why the memorial remained unmolested, why it was so loved by veterans and relatives of the dead, and why today it is regularly described as one of the finest examples of public sculpture ever erected in the UK. Comment will also be offered concerning the one Jagger Great War memorial that has been toppled: not by the actions of enraged protestors, but caught in the crossfire of the Yom Kippur War in October 1973.¹ This was the memorial to the missing of the Indian Army from the Sinai and Palestine campaigns of 1915-18 situated at Port Tewfik, at the southern end of the Suez Canal, which was virtually destroyed in 1973 by a combination of fire from Israeli tanks and from the artillery of the Egyptian Army.² The fate of this memorial has largely been forgotten, as the sacrifices of the Indian Army of the First World War are not politically fashionable today with the successor states to the partition of India in 1947. Moreover, the memorial is sited in a zone of continuing conflict between the Egyptian Army and militant Islamists.³

Memorials to the British dead of the First World War are omnipresent within the UK. Out of the many thousands erected between 1919 and 1939⁴ only about 560 have any form of figurative

sculpture as part of their design.⁵ Once erected, war memorials are subsequently difficult to dismantle or move to another site. In this essay, I will focus on a war memorial in central London that is now widely regarded as one of Europe's finest examples of public sculpture (fig. 1). When first unveiled however in October 1925 the memorial to the Royal Regiment of Artillery's First World War dead proved immensely controversial to the point that some influential commentators such as Roger Fry seriously called for the memorial to be taken down and moved to a less public site.⁶

Jagger's conception of the memorial was closely linked to his searing experience of frontline combat in the First World War. After studying sculpture at the Royal College of Art, early in September 1914 he volunteered as a private in the 28th Battalion of the London Regiment. In May the following year, he was commissioned as a Second Lieutenant in the Worcestershire Regiment (fig. 2). In September 1915, he set sail from Southampton to serve on/in the Suvla Bay sector of the Gallipoli Campaign.⁷ He arrived at the front line as a platoon commander with the 4th Worcesters early in October 1915. He lasted about a month at Suvla Bay before he was shot through the right shoulder by a Turkish sniper while out on patrol on/in no-man's-land.⁸ Jagger was one of 54,000 British soldiers wounded during the Gallipoli campaign.⁹ Jagger later stated that it was while sheltering from a Turkish artillery barrage at Suvla that he resolved, ~~that~~ if he ever survived the war, he would make a war memorial design which would fully acknowledge the terrifying power of modern artillery over infantrymen cowering for protection within a trench.¹⁰

After a lengthy convalescence from the sniper's bullet, Jagger was attached in the autumn of 1917 as a platoon commander to the 2nd battalion of the Worcesters based in Flanders. He took part in the Third Battle of Ypres in October 1917 and then in the Battle of Neuve Église in April 1918. In the face of a massive German assault, Jagger took command of D Company as it defended a key crossroads from repeated German attacks. For the bravery and calm leadership Jagger displayed under fire on 13-14 April 1918 he was later awarded the Military Cross.¹¹ On the evening of the second day of the action Jagger was wounded in the left shoulder by a German machine gun bullet. Convalescing in the

2nd Western General Hospital in Manchester, Jagger determined that after the war he would focus on the creation of war memorials. Moreover, that they would convey to the general public something of the visceral reality of combat in the First World War that he himself had so vividly experienced.¹²

In July 1918, Jagger was recommended as an official war artist by Professors Gerald Moira and Henry Tonks of the Slade School of Art, and by the celebrated American portrait painter John Singer Sargent (1856-1925).¹³ During the spring of 1919, he produced the coruscating image of the front line in France, *No Man's Land*. This very much impressed a more conventional sculptor, Francis Derwent Wood (dates) and the eminent architect Sir Edwin Lutyens (1869-1944). They both recommended Jagger as the possible sculptor for the Royal Artillery memorial project.¹⁴ They had been initially asked to produce a memorial design for the Regiment, to commemorate its 55,638 dead and 129,156 wounded, and in late July 1920 were asked to consider topping the memorial with a life-sized artillery piece. Just before Christmas 1920, Lutyens replied that it would be preposterous to have the Artillery memorial topped by a copy in stone of a British gun of a calibre widely used during the war.¹⁵

It was then that Jagger's name was mentioned as a 'soldier-sculptor' likely to produce the sort of convincing imagery of battle the Regiment sought. Jagger was approached in February 1921 to produce a sketch model of an artillery memorial and had done so by late April that year.¹⁶ The memorial committee members were somewhat startled but pleased by the design Jagger submitted. From the start he was determined that his memorial design would be topped with an over-life-sized replica in Portland stone of a 9.2 inch siege howitzer, one of the most deadly and formidable artillery pieces in the British Army during the First World War, which could fire a 300lb high explosive shell up to eight miles away and with great accuracy.¹⁷ Jagger based the siege howitzer on his memorial on the original first experimental model of the gun which was first tested London in June 1914 and was nicknamed 'Mother' by its operators in the Royal Garrison Artillery (RGA). The howitzer went into

production early in 1915 and the first of 512 models used by the RGA were delivered to the Western Front in the summer of 1915.¹⁸ The original 'Mother' is still in the collection of the Imperial War Museum.

King George V, as Honorary Colonel-in-Chief of the Regiment, inspected the sketch model closely in July 1921. He did not object so much to the prominence of the siege howitzer within the design, but did have reservations concerning one of the two eight-foot tall bronze figures Jagger had proposed. The King felt that Jagger's *The Driver* (fig. 3) with its intimations of the crucified Christ was 'far too gloomy.'¹⁹ It was typical of Jagger's determination to pursue strict corporeal authenticity that he deliberately selected as principal model for *The Driver* an ex-serviceman Bombardier William Fosten, who had survived two years on the Western Front, 1916-18, in service with the Royal Field Artillery. Impressed by his war record, Jagger in 1920 gave the unemployed Fosten a job in his studio as a plaster modeller. Later in the 1920s, when Jagger found he could no longer afford to employ Fosten, the sculptor recommended the man to work as a studio assistant and general handyman for two of his more commercially successful contemporaries: Gilbert Bayes (1872-1953) and William Reid Dick (1879-1961).²⁰

Jagger replied that the Artillery Memorial design he had devised was one to 'men who had died on active service and in battle.' For him, as an infantry man during the war, at Gallipoli and in France, the artillery came to possess: 'terrifying power ... the last word in force ... Strength, power and force.'²¹ With his pungent experience at the sharp end of combat in 1915 and in 1918, Jagger had grasped one of the great truths of the First World War. The key to success was plentiful and accurate artillery, especially heavy artillery, not only for pulverising enemy defences behind the immediate front-line positions, but also for destroying enemy guns firing in a defensive role.²²

He also added he had deliberately selected the 9.2 inch siege howitzer to top the memorial because the artillery piece possessed distinct sculptural qualities and the appearance of permanence. It rather reminded him of the great pyramid at Cairo and gave him the reassuring feeling that it would

last as long as the edifices of ancient Egypt.²³ Jagger would have been familiar with the 9.2 inch siege howitzer during the time he spent on the Western Front c. late September 1917-mid-April 1918. There were far more guns of that calibre in action in France in 1918, as the Royal Artillery significantly expanded in size, especially the Royal Garrison Artillery which operated the heavy 'trench-busting' howitzers such as the 9.2 inch. When Jagger joined the British Army in September 1914, it only had six batteries of heavy guns in France and Flanders; by the summer of 1918, this had increased to an impressive 440 batteries of heavy artillery.²⁴

In the late autumn of 1924, Jagger suggested two further 8 foot 6 inches (259 cm) high bronze figures to be sited before the stone base of the artillery memorial: a shell-carrier and a 'dead gunner' (fig. 4). The desirability of the latter was much discussed within the Artillery memorial's executive committee and would prove a keen talking point on the memorial's unveiling in October 1925. In May 1925 the memorial's executive committee took a vote as to whether to accept Jagger's dead gunner. One committee member who had seen action in France, Lt. Col. H.F.C. Lewin protested by letter: 'The monument is an inspiration to those who come after to follow in the footsteps of the fallen and as an emblem of hope and comfort to bereaved relatives. I know that in this view I differ from the opinion of Mr. Jagger ... He regards a war memorial as a means of forcing home on the minds of the public the horror and the terror of war. But imagine the feelings of a Mother, or a Widow, coming to see the memorial to their Gunner son, or husband, and finding there such a glum, realistic, presentiment of his stark, dead corpse, just as it lay when pulled aside from the gun, with the coat thrown over his face to cover the ghastly stare of death. We have seen only too many such sights ourselves. It would be cruel to represent them so vividly to a sorrowing relative ...'²⁵ Despite Lewin's heartfelt and articulate protest, the Executive Committee voted by a two-thirds majority in favour of Jagger's dead gunner. It also saw no need to ask Jagger to alter or tone down the prominence of the siege howitzer within his design.

After the memorial was unveiled on 18 October 1925 by the Duke of Connaught, the presence of the howitzer attracted much sharp criticism, notably from those associated with the Bloomsbury Group such as Roger Fry (1866-1934) (the gun was a 'vulgar, catch-penny conceit'), Clive Bell, Raymond Mortimer and Desmond McCarthy who deplored the flagrant celebration of the technology of death in such a public space.²⁶ The design was also attacked by pre-war modernists such as Selwyn Image, editor of the progressive-orientated magazine *The New Age*. Image argued in *The Times* in October 1925 that Jagger's imagery was so unsparing that it risked driving a wedge between ex-combatants on the one hand and civilians and those too young to have participated in the war on the other. He acknowledged that understandably: 'In the relief that runs around the lower part of the memorial and in the four bronze figures silhouetted against it, vivid inescapable emphasis is laid upon the unspeakable horror of war ... But is it really a fine culminating symbol to have set high aloft over all as finally expressive of our thankfulness to God for deliverance and to keep green the blessed memory of those who sacrificed their lives for us just this bare facsimile in stone of the latest mechanical invention of man's wit for blowing ... his fellow creatures and their habitations to pieces?'²⁷ Four days later, Image again returned to the letters page of *The Times* arguing that: '... in a much frequented thoroughfare, such as Hyde Park Corner, the appeal of the memorial, from sight of which there is no escape, is not confined to the artillery. It is an appeal to the public at large, to the vast majority of whom the significance and attraction of this dominating symbol will be quite other than they are to the men who took actual part in the War. I fear that, to the public at large, the symbol will be little else than the skilful facsimile of a prodigious engine of destruction, tending to excite sentiments of horror or even of hatred.'²⁸

The prominence of the artillery piece was also criticised by those who had been associated with Vorticism such as Percy Wyndham Lewis (1882-1957), William Roberts (1895-1980) and Fred Etchells (1886-1973). Jagger seemed little concerned by this reaction: he made no secret of his contention that the Bloomsberries were: 'deviant, decadent and debauched'.²⁹ Indeed, how did they know the

war had been hell? None of them had experienced life at the front. In general, Jagger did not win friends among the modernists as he memorably described modern art as: 'the plaything of the neurotic and the pervert.'

The dead gunner at the north end of the memorial was acknowledged to be disturbing and yet it was part of a memorial that existed to jolt the viewer out of peacetime complacency and patterns of thought. The low relief panels depicting scenes of furious action were carved in the sides of the memorial in a 'neo-Assyrian manner' (fig. 5), informed by carvings on display within the British Museum's new Assyrian Galleries (opened in January 1920) from the palace of Ashur-nasir-pal II (883-859 BCE) at Nimrud and the palace of Ashur-bani-pal (668-627 BCE) at Nineveh (fig. 6). Jagger's enthusiasm for ancient Assyrian sculpture in the early 1920s was shared by a number of his artistic contemporaries such as Jacob Epstein (1880-1959), Frank Dobson (1886-1963), Eric Kennington (1888-1960), Aristide Maillol (1861-1944), Emile-Antoine Bourdelle (1861-1929), Ernst Barlach (1870-1938) and Percy Wyndham Lewis (1882-1957). Indeed, Jagger's tutor at the Royal College of Art before the war, Edouard Lantri, (1848-1917) had encouraged him to study the Assyrian low-relief carvings in the British Museum in 1911 for example, and he was also aware that a number of older sculptors, such as Lantéri's colleague at the Royal College, William Goscombe John (1860-1952) and friends such as Auguste Rodin (1840-1917) and Albert Toft, (1862-1949) greatly admired such carvings and urged younger sculptors before 1914 to pay them closer attention, Toft in 1910 for example.³⁰

Jagger was an unrepentant Imperialist: for him the British Empire was following in the footsteps of the Assyrian Empire. Indeed, following the decisions of the Versailles Peace Treaty in June 1919 much of what had been the Assyrian Empire now became part of the British Empire in the Middle East. The Assyrian Empire was perhaps the first non-white, non-Western European Empire to be accorded the respect late nineteenth-century Europe had lavished on Ancient Greece and Rome. Part of its allure undoubtedly lay its formidable military reputation for extreme and implacable

violence with its conquests often involving mass slaughter, deportations and enslavement. A recent testament to the chilling sheer predatory ruthlessness of the Assyrian military machine at the height of its power in the 9th century BCE.³¹ Archaeologists were only beginning to grasp during the 1920s how truly rapacious, murderous and exotically sinister the Assyrian state had been. Jagger had noted that the most successful Assyrian generals had tended to be eunuchs,³² and once wryly remarked that emasculation could have greatly improved the quality of British generalship in 1914-18.³³

Major Assyrian cities to the north and north-east of Mosul were now part of the new Kingdom of Iraq which had been created as a compliant pro-British monarchy. Jagger was not blind to the fact that all Empires crumble and collapse; he was a huge admirer of the writing of Rudyard Kipling and could readily quote at length from his July 1897 poem 'Recessional' which imagined the British Empire as subject to the same fate as the once mighty states of Assyria and Phoenicia: 'Far-called, our navies melt away. On dune and headland sinks the fire, Lo, all our pomp of yesterday Is one with Nineveh and Tyre! Judge of the Nations, spare us yet, Lest we forget – lest we forget!' ³⁴

Jagger was pleased that the imagery on his low reliefs for the Artillery memorial was undoubtedly forceful and challenging. The vast majority of the public present at its unveiling seemed to genuinely appreciate it. The London correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian* was particularly impressed. He wrote that Jagger's 'pictures in stone' on the sides of the memorial offered 'the shock of reality [and] were felt by the public to be 'the real naked thing.' The journalist went so far as to write that 'when the coverings were torn away [to reveal the artillery memorial] some cherished illusions went with them. At the same time the soldiers who have never spoken frankly to their home folks of what they went through during those years [at the front] were given a means of expression ... One could see this memorial had brought a new idea of art to the people. Men will bring their wives and children here to show them things they have never been able to tell them – what happened and what they went through on the field. It is a terrible revelation, long overdue ...' ³⁵

Among the minority of mainstream critics who approved of the memorial's imagery was Robert Tatlock of the *Daily Telegraph*. He, as a veteran of the Salonica campaign c. 1916-18, was particularly impressed by the figure of *The Driver*. Some observers may well interpret his suggestive pose reminiscent of the Crucifixion as excessive, even blasphemous. However, Tatlock felt the figure's calculated ambiguity, in which the ideal and the credible were cleverly and delicately balanced, was especially effective: '... there will be suggested to the minds of many by the relaxed figure of the driver .., with his arms flung out as he leans upon the stone step, and his helmet tilted over his musing face, the unspoken question as to the meaning and purpose and fruit of all that daring, all that endurance and all that suffering [depicted in the bas reliefs immediately behind him]?. It is the question which will continue to be asked by generations to come.'³⁶

For weeks after the unveiling, the sides of the memorial were buried under a flood of floral wreaths and tributes (fig. 7). Jagger was pleased the memorial appeared to have generated such fervent approval but complained all the flowers were obscuring a good deal of the imagery on the bas-reliefs.³⁷ A number of postcards of the memorial under siege from floral tributes were produced after the unveiling; at least six sets of 10,000 cards each which had ~~been~~ sold out by the end of the 1920s.

The memorial was still criticised in some professional art world quarters for being 'vulgar' and 'hysterical.' However, the evidence suggests that it was overwhelmingly popular with veterans of the Regiment and with relatives of gunners killed in the war. In July 1926, Jagger was awarded the Beit Gold Medal for sculpture for the Artillery Memorial by the Royal Society of British Sculptors (now the Royal Society of Sculptors). According to the London correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian*, this award could be construed as a conclusively 'effective reply to the criticism, extending to abuse, which this memorial received when first unveiled. The memorial is undoubtedly the finest sculpture monument of the war in this country.'³⁸

The memorial also proved itself to be a highly robust structure. When in 1929 it was rammed in thick fog by a delivery van, the memorial was hardly scratched, while the van was a write-off. Before the memorial was unveiled, Jagger told a London newspaper that the siege howitzer on his memorial had been carved from a block of Portland stone weighing ten tons; the actual base for the memorial was in fact hollow and built from bricks to reduce costs.³⁹

Jagger regularly attended Armistice Day ceremonies at the Artillery memorial every year. He did so for what proved the last time on 11 November 1934, even though he was suffering from a heavy cold at the time. Two days later he took to his bed showing early signs of pneumonia. On the morning of 16 November 1934, Jagger was found dead in his bed by his wife. He had died in his sleep from a heart attack. One of the two doctors he had been seeing for chest pains (typically he had not told his wife of these pains) was convinced his condition had been exacerbated by his wartime wounds.⁴⁰ Interviewed by *The Scotsman*, Jagger's friend and Vice President of the Royal Society of British Sculptors (now the RSS), Gilbert Bayes, declared that even if the critics were deeply divided over the merits of the artillery memorial 'artists and soldiers regard the memorial as one of the very best war memorials? in the country.' Jagger deserved such plaudits because he was prepared to court controversy as his realism 'broke away very sharply from the more conventional forms of memorial.' Moreover, Bayes was convinced that Jagger's demise had 'robbed the world of an irreplaceable artist. He was the most outstanding sculptor of his type and I know of no one in England, or on the Continent for that matter, who can take his place. His war memorials, particularly his Artillery memorial, are works which will live forever.'⁴¹

During the Second World War the Artillery memorial survived a near miss from a 250lb Luftwaffe bomb in May 1941 and from the ton of high explosive in a V-1 Flying Bomb which crashed nearby in September 1944. The memorial was so well-regarded by the Royal Artillery that the Regiment decided it would also serve as a memorial to the 29,000 gunners killed in the Second World War.⁴²

No further sculpture was required, only a bronze plaque indicating the Regiments' losses between 1939 and 1945.

A major retrospective of Jagger's sculpture was held at the Imperial War Museum in London between May and September 1985 and this led to a generally favourable critical re-evaluation of Jagger's work and since then, during the past thirty-five years, the Royal Artillery memorial has repeatedly been singled out as one of Britain's finest examples of public sculpture from a wide array of luminaries including Andrew Graham Dixon⁴³, Deyan Sudjic⁴⁴, Simon Heffer⁴⁵, Sir Sandy Nairne⁴⁶, Jonathan Glancey⁴⁷ and even the late Brian Sewell⁴⁸ as well as Sir Michael Palin.⁴⁹

The German Army, retreating from Brussels in September 1944, attempted to blow up Jagger's Anglo-Belgian memorial. But it was too solidly constructed and the Germans did not have sufficient high explosive to dislodge the ten-feet high British and Belgian infantrymen Jagger had carved as the memorial's principal sculptural element.⁵⁰

The one Jagger memorial that has been successfully toppled was only done so as the consequence of modern firepower in the midst of a full-scale war. In October 1973, during the closing stages of the Yom Kippur War, two fourteen foot long four and a half feet high Bengal tigers in Nabresina marble (fig. 8) that Jagger had provided for the Indian Army memorial at Port Tewfik at the southern end of the Suez Canal (unveiled on 16 May 1926) were largely destroyed by a combination of Israeli Army tank fire and Egyptian Army artillery.⁵¹ The two tigers had been commissioned from Jagger early in July 1923, largely at the urging of Sir John Burnet, architect for the Imperial War Graves Commission Port Tewfik memorial project. Burnet had been impressed by sketch models for the artillery memorial he had seen in recent visits to Jagger's studio.⁵²

Both sides still blame each other for destruction of the two tigers – whose design was blessed no less in February 1924 than by Kipling himself (fig. 9) – and the memorial's 65-foot high obelisk. Jagger met his literary hero Kipling on the morning of 26 February 1924 when the writer called on the

sculptor's studio to inspect and access sketch models of the tigers Jagger had devised for the Port Tewfik Memorial.⁵³ The memorial was conceived by the Imperial War Graves Commission and its architect Sir John Burnet (1857-1938), assisted by Thomas S. Tait (1882-1954) c. 1922-24 as a tribute to 4,968 men of the Indian Army killed between 1915 and 1918 fighting the Ottoman Turks in Sinai, Palestine, Lebanon and Syria and who are listed as 'missing' with no known graves. Uniquely, this memorial was paid for with funds contributed by the Imperial War Graves Commission (£9,100), the Government of India/The Viceroy's Office (£3,000) and the Chamber of Independent Indian Princes (£3,000).⁵⁴

The Indian soldiers honoured at Port Tewfik have no champions: the current governments of India and Pakistan cannot agree on the division of the cost for provision of a new memorial or a replacement for the one destroyed in 1973. In October 1980 the government of Anwar Sadat allowed a small memorial to the Indian soldiers honoured by the Port Tewfik memorial to be unveiled inside the Commonwealth War Graves Commission cemetery at Heliopolis, near Cairo. Four years later, in May 1984, the remnants of one of Jagger's less shell-struck Port Tewfik tigers was deposited near to the new memorial.⁵⁵

The site of the Port Tewfik memorial is currently out of bounds to civilian visitors as the whole of the Sinai Peninsula is within a prohibited military security zone. The shattered wreckage of one of Jagger's tigers (fig. 10), and part of the memorial's obelisk may be observed at certain times of the day from the decks of cargo ships entering the southern end of the Suez Canal.

Notes

¹ The Commonwealth War Graves Commission (CWGC) office in Cairo noted in 1977 that the available evidence indicated the Port Tewfik memorial had been 'slightly damaged' during the Six Day War of June 1967 but had then been 'very badly damaged' during the war of October 1973, Briefing Note for the Ministry of Defence, London, 'CWGC Work in Egypt, 23 December 1977, CEM 16441 Part II (1931-1984), Port Tewfik Memorial to the Missing of the Indian Army of the Palestine Campaign, 1917-18, Archives of the CWGC, Maidenhead, Berkshire.

² After a visit to the Port Tewfik site in the spring of 1977 the CWGC's Assistant Director of Works noted that an Israeli tank in 1973 had been destroyed by Egyptian artillery fire less than 100 metres from the remnants of Jagger's tiger guarding the memorial on the south-east side, CEM 16441 Part II (1931-1984), Port Tewfik Memorial to the Missing of the Indian Army of the Palestine Campaign, 1917-18, Archives of the CWGC, Maidenhead, Berkshire.

³ Kirkpatrick, 2018, pp.333-334.

⁴ Crane has calculated approximately 54,000 memorials of myriad design were erected in the UK from 1919-1939 to the dead of the First World War: D. Crane, 2014, p.203.

⁵ Archer 2009, pp.353-72. Archer suggests there are 563 First World War memorials in the UK which include figurative sculpture; the work of some 142 individual sculptors.

⁶ W. Januszczak, *The Guardian*, 7 May 1985, p.8.

⁷ Compton 2004, pp.18-20

⁸ Compton 2004, p.20.

⁹ Mallinson 2014, p.524.

¹⁰ Jagger in unidentified newspaper clipping, 6 May 1923, Jagger File, Department of Art, IWM, London

¹¹ Compton 2004, p.21.

¹² R.R. Tatlock on Jagger in the *Daily Telegraph*, 17 November 1934, p.13.

¹³ Compton 2004, p.22.

¹⁴ Lutyens to the Chairman of the Royal Artillery Memorial Executive Committee, 24 July 1920, Jagger File, Department of Art, IWM, London.

¹⁵ Lutyens to the Chairman of the Royal Artillery Memorial Executive Committee, 9 December 1920, Jagger File, Department of Art, IWM, London.

¹⁶ General Sir J.P. DuCann to C.S. Jagger, 28 February 1921, Jagger File, Department of Art, IWM, London.

¹⁷ Griffith 1994, p.106.

¹⁸ Von Donop 1925, pp.14-16.

¹⁹ Lord Stamfordham speaking on behalf of King George V at a meeting of the Royal Artillery Memorial Executive Committee, 22 July 1921.

²⁰ *Military Illustrated*, February 1987, no. 5, p.20.

-
- ²¹ Jagger to the Royal Artillery Memorial Executive Committee, 22 July 1921.
- ²² Black, 2011, pp.197-8.
- ²³ Jagger interviewed in the *London Evening Standard*, 19 July 1933.
- ²⁴ Black 2011, p.197.
- ²⁵ Lt. Col. H.F.C. Lewin to Royal Artillery Memorial Executive Committee, 12 November 1924.
- ²⁶ W. Januszczak, *The Guardian*, 7 May 1985, p.8.
- ²⁷ Image, letter to *The Times*, 22 October 1925, p.8.
- ²⁸ Image, letter to *The Times*, 26 October 1925, p.10.
- ²⁹ Jagger interviewed in *The Evening News*, 24 October 1933, p. 10.
- ³⁰ Toft 1910, pp.273-76 and E. Lantéri, 1911, pp.1-3 in praise of ancient Assyrian low-relief carving.
- ³¹ Radner 2015, Chapter 6.
- ³² Radner 2015, p. 33.
- ³³ Jagger interviewed in *The Evening News*, 24 October 1933, p. 10.
- ³⁴ Hewitt 2001, p. 38.
- ³⁵ London Correspondent, *Manchester Guardian*, 20 October 1925, p. 10.
- ³⁶ R. R. Tatlock, *The Daily Telegraph*, 19 October 1925, p.10.
- ³⁷ Jagger interviewed in the *London Evening Standard*, 19 July 1933, p. 5.
- ³⁸ London Correspondent, *Manchester Guardian*, 7 July 1926, p. 8.
- ³⁹ Jagger quoted in an unidentified newspaper clipping, 6 May 1923. [What was the source for this? British Library?]
- ⁴⁰ R.R. Tatlock, *The Daily Telegraph*, 17 November 1934, p. 13.
- ⁴¹ Gilbert Bayes interviewed in *The Scotsman*, 17 November 1934, p. 17.
- ⁴² *Manchester Guardian*, 30 May 1949, p.3.
- ⁴³ Dixon1999, p. 211.
- ⁴⁴ *The Observer*, 7 December 2003, p. 6.
- ⁴⁵ *The Sunday Telegraph*, 12 July 2009, p. 12.
- ⁴⁶ *The Observer*, 11 May 2008, p. 11.
- ⁴⁷ *The Independent*, 26 October 1994, p. 2.
- ⁴⁸ *London Evening Standard*, 4 April 2000, p. 15.
- ⁴⁹ *The Observer*, 6 November 2008, p.34.
- ⁵⁰ *The Manchester Guardian*, 30 May 1949, p.3.

⁵¹ Meeting of the Imperial War Graves Commission, London, 25 September 1975, CEM 16441 Part II (1931-1984), Port Tewfik Memorial to the Missing of the Indian Army of the Palestine Campaign, 1917-18, Archives of the CWGC, Maidenhead, Berkshire.

⁵² Sir J.J. Burnet to Director of Works, Imperial War Graves Commission, London, 2 July 1923, CEM 16441 Part I (1920-1930), Port Tewfik Memorial to the Missing of the Indian Army of the Palestine Campaign, 1917-18, Archives of the Commonwealth War Graves Commission (CWGC), Maidenhead, Berkshire.

⁵³ D.G. Smith (Kipling's Personal Secretary) to A. Brown (Imperial War Graves Commission, London), 26 February 1924, Port Tewfik Memorial to the Missing of the Indian Army of the Palestine Campaign, 1917-18, Archives of the CWGC, Maidenhead, Berkshire.

⁵⁴ Director-General CWGC, London to Ministry of Defence, New Delhi, 30 September 1976, CEM 16441 Part II (1931-1984), Port Tewfik Memorial to the Missing of the Indian Army of the Palestine Campaign, 1917-18, Archives of the CWGC, Maidenhead, Berkshire.

⁵⁵ Report of the Director of Information, CWGC, London, 9 May 1984, concerning the war cemetery at Heliopolis near Cairo, Egypt, CEM 16441 Part II (1931-1984), Port Tewfik Memorial to the Missing of the Indian Army of the Palestine Campaign, 1917-18, Archives of the CWGC, Maidenhead, Berkshire.