The Edward Extension medal was instituted by royal warrant dated 13 July 1907. It was designed to supplement the Edward Medal, which rewarded acts of gallantry in mines and quarries. Included within the new medal’s scope were those who ‘in course of Industrial Employment endanger their own lives in saving or endeavouring to save the lives of others from perils incurred in connection with such Industrial Employment’. In his letter requesting William Ellison-Macartney, deputy master of the Royal Mint, to commence the process of obtaining a design, Sir Henry Cunynghame, assistant under-secretary at the Home Office, suggested: ‘it might be either allegorical, or else realistic. What do you think best?’ Ellison-Macartney, following his usual practice, instituted a limited competition. Designs were sought from two established artists, the sculptor William Reynolds-Stephens and the portrait medallist Theodore Spicer-Simson, and two less familiar names, J.B. Petch, a pupil of Edouard Lanteri who had applied to the Royal Mint for work some months earlier, and Kathleen Scott. The last named was at the very beginning of her sculptural career, and it was a fortunate circumstance that Ellison-Macartney was married to her husband’s sister and held the affairs of the Scott family close to his heart. Each artist was asked to supply up to three designs. The decision as to whether these were to be ‘emblematic’ or ‘illustrative’ was to be theirs. Reynolds-Stephens declined to participate claiming that the financial reward was insufficient; the other three accepted.
The artists’ designs were duly sent to the Home Office, but by the end of 1909 a decision on who was to be given the commission had still not been taken. The following January, R. F. Reynard, a clerk at the Home Office, replying to a request from Ellison-Macartney, informed the deputy master that the Secretary of State, Lord Gladstone, was still meditating on the designs. But, the following month, Ellison-Macartney was able to inform Scott that she had won the competition, and by April the plaster model was completed and despatched to the Home Office. However, the matter was not to progress smoothly. Winston Churchill, who had succeeded Gladstone at the Home Office, pronounced himself unhappy with the design and suggested that one of the others might be more appropriate. Ellison-Macartney objected that the design had been approved by the King, who had ‘expressed a wish that the finished casts of this medal and of the new Police Medal, which has also been accepted, should be sent to him when completed’. He continued: ‘I feel sure that any reversal of a definite decision about a design, no matter how strong the grounds may be, would raise very unpleasant feelings in artistic circles, and would lead to insinuations which it is most desirable to avoid . . . Mr Churchill is in no way responsible for this design. There must always be differences of opinion where artistic merit is concerned. The act for which this medal is to be given, viz., saving the lives of others from perils incurred with Industrial Employment, is peculiarly difficult to represent either by way of illustration or emblematically, and the Secretary of State might find it difficult to secure a design which would be free from much artistic criticism if this is rejected’. 

Sidney Harris, private secretary successively to Gladstone and Churchill, replied that it was not the case that the design had been submitted to the King. Ellison-Macartney was annoyed: ‘I was not informed as to the actual steps taken by Lord Gladstone, but I was told by telephone that Miss Bruce’s (Scott’s maiden name) had been accepted, and this design and that for the Police Medal were sent back to me to have the finished casts prepared by the artists. I assumed from subsequent conversations I had with Mr Reynard on the telephone that both had been submitted to the King. As to this latter point, however, I do not enquire as I act on the decision of the Department and the action upon which that decision is based is immaterial to me. If any further steps had to be taken about the design, I ought not to have been told that it had been accepted, as it is at this stage that the final commission is given to the artist, as was done in this case. I met Miss Bruce, and she told me that Lord Gladstone had told her that her design had been accepted’.

These unfortunate events would seem to have been the result of a misunderstanding. Whilst it is true that the letter informing the Mint of the King’s approval of Gilbert Bayes’s Police medal makes no mention of the Edward Extension medal, it is clear from the above that, before he left the Home Office to take up the governor-generalship of South Africa, Herbert Gladstone had informed both Ellison-Macartney and Scott that her design had been accepted. Notwithstanding Ellison-Macartney’s remonstrances that Scott had by this time been given the commission, executed the plaster model and been paid for the work, Churchill refused to submit her model to the King, insisting that the design, although possessed of ‘excellent qualities from an artistic point of view’, was not ‘altogether suitable’ for its purpose; he suggested that a request be made to the artist for alternative designs. Upon being shown the other artists’
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9 Letter from S.W. Harris, Home Office, to Ellison-Macartney, dated 22 April 1910.
10 Letter from Ellison-Macartney to Harris, dated 23 April 1910.
11 Letter from Harris to Ellison-Macartney, dated 25 April 1910.
12 Letter from Ellison-Macartney to Harris, dated 25 April 1910.
13 The letter from Reynard to Ellison-Macartney giving approval for Bayes’ Police Medal is dated 3 February 1910 (PRO Mint 20/387).
14 Letter from Harris to Ellison-Macartney, dated 26 April 1910.
designs, Harris admitted that they too were unsatisfactory.

We do not have Scott’s controversial design, but that it bore some resemblance to the finished medal is clear from a letter written by Harris, in which he refers to a recumbent figure and a wheel. Harris complained that the man appeared to be a victim of the wheel rather than someone saved from it, and asked whether a symbolic design might not be better, adding: ‘She might produce the industrial atmosphere by means of a background — say a factory town in the distance?’ This last idea, he wrote, had been suggested to him by a trade union poster! Understandably, the artist, upon being informed of the sequence of events, was not pleased. But by June she had produced three new designs, one of which received the royal approval later that month. The iron casting made for the reducing machine from the artist’s model (pl. 19B) remains nowadays in the Royal Mint collection, along with a reduction punch dated 31 August 1910 and two dies dated 19 September 1910.

The final design centres on a figure who has one hand against a broken beam inscribed FOR COURAGE, whilst with the other he supports an injured workmate; behind them is a large wheel, and in the distance a factory. It is hardly surprising if, given the sequence of events described above, the artist did not give of her best. Without the evidence of the two sets of designs and the first plaster model, it is not possible to comment on the range of her invention, nor can we judge the correctness or otherwise of Harris’s criticism of the recumbent figure. But it is immediately apparent from a perusal of the medal that ultimately the artist has failed to resolve the different parts of the composition into an effective whole. This is partly a result of outside interference in the creative process. Whereas the wheel belongs to the artist’s original conception, the seated figure is a replacement for an earlier recumbent figure, and the factory is a late addition based on a proposal emanating from the Home Office. The resultant design confuses the onlooker. Has the beam struck the seated figure or has he been saved from it? Does the structure suspended above their heads threaten the figures? Does the oncoming wheel, which appears to be unattached, also pose a threat? The absence of any support for the lower half of the beam, the inappropriateness of placing the inscription on the side of the offending beam, the poor delineation of the wheel and the weak perspective of the window through which the factory is glimpsed, all contribute to the weakness of the design, which contrasts sadly with, for example, Gilbert Bayes’s monumental King’s Police Medal, which we have already had cause to mention, or indeed with the quiet dignity of De Saulles’ profile of Edward VII on the obverse.

The medal did not remain in use for long. On 13 January 1911, Reynard wrote to Sir

15 Letter from Harris to Ellison-Macartney, dated 27 April 1910.
16 Letter from Scott to Ellison-Macartney, dated 28 April 1910.
17 Letter from Ellison-Macartney to Reynard, dated 18 June 1910, enclosing 3 designs.
18 Letter from Reynard to Ellison-Macartney, dated 24 June 1910. Scott was paid 10 guineas for the 3 designs and 20 guineas for the plaster model. That Ellison-Macartney remained exasperated at such outside interference in the question of medal designs is shown by a memorandum he composed following the accession of George V (PRO Mint 20/417). In it he described the system in operation under the previous reign, whereby, upon the institution of a new medal, the relevant government department would request designs from the deputy master, one of which would be selected by that department for submission to the King. He wrote: ‘The effect of this was that the design selected was that which commended itself to the head of the Department or his staff, relations, or other persons who were invited by him to criticise the designs. I need hardly point out that neither the head of the Department nor those whom he consulted had any knowledge of the technical work of casting and striking medals, and were generally totally ignorant of medallic art. The result was that the most ludicrous suggestions were frequently made, and in many cases the best design was not chosen.’ He went on to propose that, in the future, artists’ designs be submitted to the king directly by the deputy master. The proposal was accepted by George V on 24 September 1910, but, if acted upon at all, the new system did not remain in use for long, possibly as a result of the arrival of a new deputy master two years later and the disruption of war from 1914. Certainly, in 1919 it was the Home Office which submitted to the King the Royal Mint’s proposed design for the Imperial Service Medal.
19 I am grateful to Mr Graham Dyer for this information.
KATHLEEN SCOTT

Frederick Ponsonby, the King’s assistant private secretary, suggesting that both Reynolds-Stephens’ Edward Medal and Scott’s Extension Medal be replaced: ‘The present design in each case strikes me as so inartistic and meaningless’. Of Scott he wrote: ‘She was a pupil of Rodin, and, if only on that account, would not, I think, have received the training for designing Medals’; and went on to suggest Gilbert Bayes as a medallist who could provide suitable replacements. In a letter to Clive Wigram, the King’s equerry, written the following week, he expatiated on his thoughts on medals: ‘There are in England not more than two or three artists who know anything about medal work, which requires, as you know, quite a different training from ordinary sculpture. Some of the Masters of the work who flourished at the time of the Renaissance did nothing else but chased gold and silver cups’.  

Reynard’s low opinion of the medal was, as we have seen, shared by Churchill, who readily took up the idea of commissioning a new version from Bayes. Harris, writing to the King’s private secretary Lord Knollys on 25 February, took a different line on Reynolds-Stephens’ medal but concurred with Reynard on Scott’s design. ‘The miner’s Medal was designed by Mr Reynolds-Stephens, and is generally considered a very successful design. The design for the other Edward Medal was executed by an artist of less repute, and has been the subject of a considerable amount of criticism. Mr Churchill chose the design out of several which were submitted to him, and it was certainly the best of those sent in, but he agrees that it is rather poor. No doubt it is more difficult to design a Medal which embraces so many industries than it was in the case of the miner’s Medal, but Mr Churchill does not think it would be impossible to get a much more satisfactory design than the existing one’. George V agreed with Reynard’s and Churchill’s verdict, and Bayes’s medal was ready for issue the following year.  

It was between the execution of the first and second design for the Edward Extension medal that Scott was commissioned by the Royal Geographical Society to execute the medal to be awarded to the American Robert E. Peary for his Arctic explorations of 1886–1909 (pl. 20). On 2 February 1910, J. Scott Keltie, secretary of the Society, wrote to her: ‘You may remember that a good many months ago, when I was lunching at your house, we talked about the Shackleton Medal which was then in preparation by Mr Gilbert Bayes. I remember you were very much shocked at the fee which he was charging, and you assured me that it could be done in first-class style for about one-third. I gathered that you yourself would very much have liked to have been entrusted with the matter, but unfortunately, it was then too late.  

‘As soon as the question of the Peary Medal came up, I thought of you, and I was not surprised to learn from Sir Lewis Beaumont, that you would like to be entrusted with its preparation. In compliance with a suggestion by Mr Freshfield which I felt bound to act on, I had to write to another artist, who is willing to undertake it, but in conference with the President yesterday, it was decided to request you to be good enough to undertake the Medal. I need not say how delighted I am that the matter has been placed in your hands. I do not know whether you have been thinking over any design. I expect within a day or two,
to have a profile or 3-face photograph from Peary, for one side of the Medal. Perhaps you
will kindly let me know what design you would suggest for the other side, and for the
composition of the Medal as a whole? We should like it to be ready for presentation at
the Albert Hall meeting on May 4; do you think you could manage that? We can talk
about the making of the die later. Might I ask you also to let me know what your fee
would be?' 25

The other artist to whom Keltie had written on the suggestion of Douglas Freshfield, a
past secretary and future president of the Society, was Havard Thomas, who had
responded by sending a suggestion for the reverse of the medal. However, Leonard
Darwin, the Society’s president, had taken advice on Scott’s work from a mutual
acquaintance, the explorer and archaeologist (and another future RGS president) David
Hogarth, who had written that a ‘medal design, which she showed me a week or two ago, is
distinctly good and she is particularly well accustomed to small scale relief. I think you
might very well give her this commission. Her small portrait figures, which she has
exhibited for some years back, are quite good and one of Carfax’s people told me they
always sell well’. 26

On the day that he wrote to Scott offering her the commission, Keltie wrote regretfully
to Havard Thomas informing him that it was no longer his. Scott accepted the commission
by return of post: ‘Thank you for your letter. I am delighted to hear I am to be entrusted
with the medal for Peary, there is no medal I would be so glad to undertake. I had not
thought of designs . . . I should be very grateful for as many suggestions from yourself and
others as possible, and I would try and work up something really good.

‘As regards the fee for the design I wish you would remind me what Mr Gilbert Bayes
asked and I regarded as much too much – I have quite forgotten.

‘I am doing a King’s Medal now, for which I am paid £40 for a single side and I am
unbusinesslike enough to tell you that I regard that as very good pay! There is no reason as
far as my design is concerned why you should not have it for May 4th – I can undertake to
finish it 2 or 3 weeks before that’. 27

The business of the fee was soon cleared up. Keltie wrote that Bayes’ fee had been 60
guineas and that Havard Thomas had requested £110, and asked whether 50 guineas would
be sufficient; Scott agreed that it would. The settling of the design was not such an easy
matter, and the lack of decision on the part of the artist, which is revealed in the ensuing
correspondence, prepares one for a disappointing result. In his original letter to Havard
Thomas, Keltie had suggested for the reverse ‘perhaps something in the shape of a map
with the Pole in the centre’. 28 In his reply to Scott’s request for suggestions, he wrote that
Havard Thomas’s design (which does not appear to have survived) ‘seemed to me rather
ingenious. It was a portion of the northern hemisphere filling up about one-half or
two-thirds of the medal with something else over it; I think it was a sort of rude mound of
snow or ice with a flag on the top of it . . . but of course we would hardly adopt that’. 29 He
went on to suggest a rendering of the northern coasts of Siberia and America with
Spitsbergen and Franz Josef Land, with a line indicating Peary’s route to the Pole, and a
tiny star of platinum inset to show the Pole itself; he admitted not to knowing ‘how this
would look from the artistic point of view’. Alternatively, the problem of there being ‘no
scenery up there’ could be avoided by going for an allegorical approach, and he referred
Scott to Elinor Halle’s Stanley medal with its ‘allegorical arrangement showing the source
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26 Letter from Hogarth to Darwin, dated 31 January 1910.  
27 Letter from Scott to Keltie, dated 2 February 1910.  
29 Letter from Keltie to Scott, dated 3 February 1910.
of the Nile'. As regards the obverse, he considered Bayes's Scott and Shackleton medals too cluttered, with the horizontal bands containing the dates detracting from the portraits, and recommended instead the example of the Hansen and Stanley medals.

In her reply, Scott agreed that, for the obverse, simplicity was vital and a head in profile preferable. For the reverse, she too had considered a map of the northern regions of the globe, but had feared that it had already been done; she dismissed the idea of the platinum star, suggesting instead the date of Peary's arrival there. She had also considered figures and sledges ('but that's rather obvious, isn't it?'), a symbolic figure of Endurance, indeed 'a thousand things', but as yet none had satisfied her. She invited Keltie to lunch, so they could discuss the matter.

Their deliberations appear to have resulted in two ideas: an American eagle, the Pole Star, and a mound of ice supporting a flag; and an eagle, Pole Star and globe. The following week Keltie requested sketches to show Darwin. The Goldsmiths & Silversmiths Company, who had been asked to provide estimates for the dies, would, he wrote, also supply ideas for a reverse, and, to judge from a letter written four days later, it would appear that the advice of Peary himself had also been sought, for Keltie relayed to Scott the explorer's view that a slightly inclined globe with a small brilliant or perhaps a platinum cross for the Pole would be a suitable reverse; according to Peary, the American Geographical Society had tried a map reverse but had given the idea up as unsatisfactory. We may imagine that the artist rejected forthwith the suggestion of the jewel or precious metal. Within a few days, she had produced a sketch, which Keltie showed to Darwin. Both of them, he wrote, liked the eagle: 'the question is whether you can make anything artistic out of the heap below'. Seemingly, Scott had suggested that the heap (of ice) could be replaced by a globe, for Keltie also expressed doubt as to whether a globe could be 'artistic'.

Shortly thereafter, Scott announced that the reverse was finished but for the lettering, but on 24 February Keltie was still not happy with the mound as, he wrote, it was not specific to the Pole. Scott replied only that she had designed a new and better eagle, but Keltie's view eventually prevailed, for in the end the mound of ice was replaced by a globe. The head was taken from photographs supplied by Peary. The legend was to read ROBERT EDWIN PEARY 1910 on the obverse, and PRESENTED BY THE ROYAL GEOGRAPHICAL SOCIETY FOR ARCTIC EXPLORATION 1886-1909 on the reverse. The dies were made by the Goldsmiths & Silversmiths Company, which also organised the striking of the medals: one in gold for Peary, one in silver for his companion Captain Bartlett, and an unrecorded number in bronze. They were presented on 4 May 1910.

Scott was not altogether happy with the finished product, writing that the medal looked 'very weak in bronze' and that the silver version was also not as she had wished; the company, she complained to Keltie, had not obeyed her instructions as to the patination. On the positive side, she considered the lettering very pleasing. Our verdict on the medal must also contain reservations, for again there are weaknesses in the design. On the obverse, Peary's head floats in space, and neither it nor the truncation relates to the surrounding circle. As for the reverse, the symbolic intent of the eagle and the globe (symbols respectively of Peary's nationality and explorations) is diminished by the realism of their portrayal and the casual asymmetry. But, if the design does not function well as
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30 For Halle's medal, see Philip Attwood, 'Elinor Halle', The Medal, no. 6 (Spring 1985), p. 21, fig. 11; Mill, Record of the RGS, pl. 21. On 4 February, Freshfield suggested jokingly to Keltie that the reverse of Peary's medal should show the South Pole with the legend VOLUME TANGERE, to indicate the unpopularity that would follow any attempt to anticipate Scott!

31 Letter from Scott to Keltie, dated 4 February 1910.

32 Letter from Keltie to Scott, dated 11 February 1910.

33 Letter from Keltie to Scott, dated 15 February 1910.

34 Letter from Keltie to Scott, dated 18 February 1910.

35 Letter from Scott to Keltie, undated.

36 Letter from Scott to Keltie, dated 24 February 1910.

37 Letter from Scott to Keltie, undated.

38 Letter from Scott to Keltie, undated.
symbol, nor does it work on a realistic level, for an eagle does not hover in outer space. The unresolved nature of the reverse leaves the onlooker uneasy. Again, a major contributory factor for this must be the outside interference in the design process, but in this case the records show that the interference was invited by the artist. One wonders with what degree of seriousness the artist wrote that she had considered 'a thousand things' for the reverse, but one cannot but regret that she did not choose to develop one of them. 39

Having considered two medal designs and found them wanting, let us consider for a moment an example of her larger scale work. The piece that I have chosen to illustrate (pl. 21) portrays at the age of 81 George Bernard Shaw, one of the sculptor's greatest friends and admirers. 40 'You – effeminate! No woman ever born had a narrower escape from being a man. My affection for you is the nearest I ever came to homosexuality', Shaw told her. 41 'A wonderful woman ... first rate at her job... We got on together to perfection', he wrote elsewhere. 42 Towards the end of the First World War she produced a small bronze statuette of the writer, showing him smiling and relaxed, his arms and legs casually crossed. 43 How different is the work of some twenty years later! His head is held wearily in his hands, its sorrowful expression softened only slightly by a wry half-smile. The craggy features, roughly modelled, are instilled with great intelligence and warmth. Clearly we are dealing with an artist of some power, and her success as a portrait sculptor is shown by this, as by many other of her works, to be justly deserved. 44 David Hogarth was indeed right to praise her portrait figures in his letter of 31 January 1910, but he was wrong to conclude that skill in this branch of sculpture automatically recommended the artist for a medallic commission.

The work of Kathleen Scott adds weight to the notion that a fine sculptor does not always make a fine medallist. Part of the problem in Scott's case was that, as Robert Reynard of the Home Office suspected in 1911, she had never been trained in medal work. Her artistic education had been received at the Slade School, London, and in Paris. The University College London records show her officially registered at the Slade for the two academic years 1900–1902, 45 but she is known to have studied there for a few months only. 46 The revival of interest in medallic work at the Slade that had been spearheaded by
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39 It should be noted that Peary's satisfaction with the medal is demonstrated by the decision to illustrate it in the American edition of his account of his voyage (see note 24 above).

40 The Bernard Shaw at 81 was exhibited at the Royal Academy summer exhibition of 1930 (no. 1588). It was also included in an exhibition of sculpture by living artists which ran at the Russell Cotes Art Gallery, Bournemouth, from December 1943 to March 1944 (no. 110; price 300 guineas). The correspondence between the sculptor and the gallery's curator, Norman L. Silvester, relating to the exhibition remains in the gallery's archives. The Shaw was one of the works about which Silvester was inspired to write a poem: these were published in the gallery's Bulletin. 'Hundreds of pellets/frittened by pressure/built up the outline/giant, disillusioned/Head full of matter...'. It won a public vote on 'the sculpture you consider most worthy to be added to the permanent collection of this gallery', and was consequently acquired from the artist for 300 guineas. I am grateful to Mr Shaun Garner of Bournemouth Museums for this information. A photograph of Shaw in a similar pose, with head in hands, is reproduced in Michael Holroyd, Bernard Shaw, volume 2, 1898–1918, The Pursuit of Power (London, 1989), p. 374.

41 Self-portrait of an artist, p. 270. Diary entry for 19 September 1929.


44 She exhibited regularly at the Royal Academy from 1913 until her death. The greater part of her oeuvre consists of male portraits. Women appealed to her neither as subjects for her art nor (with a few notable exceptions such as Mabel Beardsley and Isadora Duncan) as friends. Her most celebrated work is the bronze statue of her late husband, Robert Falcon Scott, in Waterloo Place, London. This was unveiled in November 1913. There is a marble version in Christchurch, New Zealand.

45 I am grateful to Mr Derek Kasher for this information.

46 See the artist's obituary in The Times. The artist attached little importance to her time at the Slade and makes no mention of it in the autobiographical section of Self-portrait of an artist. The assertion in the biographical note (p. 9) that she entered the Slade in her 21st year would appear to be inaccurate, as she was born on 27 March 1878.
Alphonse Legros in the early 1880s had survived his retirement in 1892, and sculpture and medal work had continued to be taught by George Frampton. In the Calendar for the year 1898–9, sculpture was listed as a course of study: ‘Instruction is given in modelling from the human figure, making medals, &C.’ But, in 1899, Frampton left the School and, although still titled the Slade School of Drawing, Painting and Sculpture, all mention of sculpture courses was dropped from the prospectus. Clearly, the School’s promotion of medallic work had also come to an end. Scott left for Paris in 1901, and it was at the Académie Colarossi in Montparnasse that she first discovered an interest in sculpture. She also met Rodin, and commenced a friendship which can hardly have failed to help develop her powers as a sculptor, but (as Reynard noted) would have done little to train her in medallic work.

‘A year or two at Julian’s, the Beaux Arts, or Colarossi’s, is worth a cycle of South Kensington’, wrote Clive Holland in 1902. But, as a medallist, she had none of the advantages of the generation of students attending the Slade School under Legros in the 1880s, who were able to watch the professor making medals, look at examples of medals from Pisanello onward and hear lectures on the history of the medal from visiting academics. Scott’s lack of medallic training made her uncertain in her approach to medal making and susceptible to outside interference in the creative process, with unfortunate results. The portraitist’s ability to produce a likeness served her well as a medallist, but she did not grasp the possibilities of the medallic reverse with its subtleties of allegory and emblem. Likewise she failed to appreciate the inseparable link between image and inscription, so that, as we have seen, she could request the wording for the Peary medal only after the rest of the design was complete. Moreover, her problems as a medallist were compounded by her rugged, naturalistic sculptural style which did not easily lend itself to the small scale of the medal.

It would appear that the artist herself derived little satisfaction from her medals. She was inspired to produce very few and makes no mention of them in her published works. It was unsuccessful ‘sculptural’ medals such as these that, in the years after the First World War, led Robert Johnson to recognise the need for new specialised talent in this field. One of Johnson’s first actions as deputy master of the Royal Mint in 1922 was to suggest (unsuccessfully) to the Treasury that money should be made available to bring young and promising artists into medal work. But by this time Kathleen Scott’s career as a portrait sculptor had begun in earnest and she no longer concerned herself with medals.
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48 University College, London, Calendar, MDCCCXCIX-MDCCC (London, 1899), p. 54. At the same time, the sculptor Onslow Ford ceased to act as visitor to the School and was not replaced.
53 The only other medal that I have seen that may be by Scott is one of the ophthalmologist William Mackenzie signed KB (for Kathleen Bruce?). An example, sold at Glendining’s, London, 22 November 1989, lot 480, has since gone to America. She did, however, on occasion work in a circular format on a larger scale, for example, the early bronze The Babes and the Victory of 1945, both exhibited at the Mansard Gallery, London, May 1948, nos. 53 and 56.
54 Christopher Eimer, ‘Sir Robert Johnson, the Mint and medal making in inter-war Britain’, BNJ 55 (1985), 169.
## KEY TO THE PLATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plate</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Kathleen Scott. Photograph, c. 1908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 B</td>
<td>Iron casting of the artist's model of the Edward Extension Medal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Royal Geographical Society Peary Medal.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ATTWOOD: KATHLEEN SCOTT (2)
ATTWOOD: KATHLEEN SCOTT (3)