UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OU_154452

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

THE TRANSITION TO DEMOCRACY

THE TRANSITION TO DEMOCRACY

1867 - 1914

BY

O. F. CHRISTIE

M.A. (Oxon), author of "The Transition from Aristocracy," etc.

LONDON
GEORGE ROUTLEDGE & SONS, LTD.
BROADWAY HOUSE, 68-74 CARTER LANE, E.C.
1934

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
THE DEVONSHIRE PRESS, TORQUAY

To
my Sister
ISOBEL CHRISTIE

CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	1
REFORM IN 1866 AND 1867	9
GLADSTONE AND DEMOCRACY	27
THE LIBERAL PARTY	56
NONCONFORMITY AND DEMOCRACY	103
REFORM IN 1884	130
THE DECLINE OF THE SQUIRE	144
THE END OF THE WHIGS	180
TORY DEMOCRACY AND IMPERIALISM	201
THE LIBERAL REVIVAL	235
THE ADVENT OF THE LABOUR PARTY	275
DEMOCRACY AND WAR	305
CHRONOLOGY	331
INDEX	353

The Transition to Democracy

(1867—1914)

INTRODUCTION

THE year 1832 saw a Revolution in England ; an almost bloodless Revolution, it is true, but a Revolution none the less. By the Reform Act of 1832, to use Sir Leicester Dedlock's favourite metaphor, "the floodgates were opened." They were opened still wider by the Reform Acts of 1867 and 1884. First the Ten Pounder was admitted to the Franchise, then the Urban Householder, then the Rural Householder ; the second and third Reform Acts were the inevitable consequences of the first. The Parliament of 1885 was returned by a democratic electorate ; the Aristocracy and the Middle Classes were now at the disposal of the weekly wage-earners, whenever the latter should be sufficiently organized to exercise their power.

"Democracy" (wrote John Austin) "signifies properly a form of Government, that is, any Government in which the governing body is a comparatively large fraction of the entire nation." (He added that the word is also used to mean the people itself, or the body of the people). The number of electors before 1832 is computed to have been about 160,000 ; the total Scottish electorate was under 4,000. The Act of 1832 added much less than half a million to the Register, and that of 1867 about a million more. Gladstone, introducing the Franchise Bill of 1884, reckoned that there were then about three million voters, and that his Bill would add another two millions, bringing the electorate to five millions. These would constitute quite a large enough "fraction of the nation" to satisfy Austin's definition, but would seem to be a mere Oligarchy compared with the 30,158,967 who were on the Register of 1931, and of whom 21,152,713 went to the poll. Still, the increases made by the Acts of 1867 and 1884 were in their day considered enormous ; moreover, with the rapid growth

of population, the disparity between the propertied and non-propertied voter increased year by year.

It naturally followed that this predominance of the working-class vote was reflected in the politician's attitude towards the electorate. The instincts and the wisdom of the people were generally praised; their rights were heartily acknowledged; in the latter part of the period under review legal privileges were conceded to their Trades Unions. And other boons were offered. "What man will speak acceptably to them," asked Robert Lowe in the House of Commons, "except the man who promises somehow or other to re-distribute the good things of the world more equally, so that the poor will get more, and the rich and powerful will get less?"

Many of our great statesmen have believed, many do still believe, that Democracy is the ideal form of Government. Gladstone came to believe it. "Leisured and instructed men" (he admitted) were not necessarily inferior in judgment to the Masses in some things, but "where the leading and determining considerations, that ought to lead to a conclusion, are Truth, Justice and Humanity—upon these, gentlemen, all the world over, I will back the Masses against the Classes." The sphere indicated is a large one; for there can be few political matters which are not concerned with Truth, Justice and Humanity. Sir William Harcourt said that the whole theory of popular government rested on the belief that the mass of men, though imperfectly educated, come to a wiser decision than their highly-educated rulers; but he used to irritate his democratic colleagues by objecting to grant to Municipalities the control of the police, on the ground that a popular body was unfit to exercise such an important function, and there is still a non-representative element on County Committees that control the police. Lord Morley argued that it was better to count than to fight; it certainly provokes less bloodshed. John Bright said that unless the vote were given to the poor the House of Commons would not represent the national intelligence. One might add similar utterances of Campbell-Bannerman, Lord Oxford, Mr. Lloyd George and other democratic leaders. To the Labour Party Democracy means government, not so much by the majority of electors, as according to the views of the manual workers.

The believer in Democracy also believed in Progress,

i.e. that things were continually improving. "It is a time of rapid Progress," said Gladstone in 1879, "and rapid Progress is in itself a good." He was disquieted by Tennyson's *Locksley Hall Sixty Years After*, regarding it as a serious indictment of representative institutions. Could this great effort of popular government in our old country really have failed? In order to confute the pessimism of the bard Gladstone wrote an article for *The Nineteenth Century* (January, 1887), in which he catalogued measures that had been passed in the last half-century—Free Trade, Burial Acts, University Reform, Land Reform, The Ballot, Education Acts and many others. They made an imposing array.

Other eminent men in these years took a different view. To Carlyle History was a History of Corruption rather than of Progress. "Not towards the impossibility, 'self-government of a multitude by a multitude'; but towards some possibility, government by the wisest, does bewildered Europe struggle." The majority, he held, were *always* fools; but an Emperor *might* be a wise man. Lord Salisbury feared that Progress might be in the wrong direction—from the *régime* of the Girondin to that of the Jacobin, and thence to that of the Hébertist. So also Samuel Butler said that people who call themselves Liberals "flirt with Radicals, who flirt with Socialists, who flirt with Anarchists, who do something more than flirt with dynamite." Lord Acton, an advanced Liberal and admiring friend of Gladstone, admitted that the ignorant classes could not understand affairs of State and were "sure to go wrong." Thomas Hardy thought that Democracy might possibly be the utter ruin of Art and Literature. Sir Henry Maine said it was "apt to lead to cruel disappointment and serious disaster." He claimed that "the prejudices of the people are far stronger than those of the privileged classes; they are far more vulgar; and they are far more dangerous." Sir James Stephen prophesied that in a pure Democracy "the ruling men will be the wire-pullers and their friends." Mr. Winston Churchill, who has himself been an active democrat, has deplored Democracy's want of continuity in policy; and this was certainly felt in our foreign policy until Lord Rosebery succeeded to the Foreign Office. Both Gladstone and Lord Oxford, at the close of their careers, lamented Democracy's extravagance.

In the period under review few public men were bold enough to offer a direct opposition to the extension of the Franchise. Their opposition was oblique, like that of the Whigs in 1866; or in the nature of a demurrer, or of a delaying action, like that of the Tories in 1884. The Tories, in their hearts, have always hated such extensions. So did the Whigs, as long as they survived.

Sometimes, in his private moments, an eminent democrat has expressed his real opinion of popular intelligence. Lord Oxford wrote in his diary that Mr. Lloyd George and Mr. Winston Churchill "can only think talking. Only the salt of the earth can think inside, *and the bulk of mankind cannot think at all.*" A lady member of the Labour Party, after losing her seat at the last General Election, complained that "the average elector, like the child in Standard V, thinks in pictures."

But, as a rule, the democrat has felt no doubts about the rightness of his cause, and has gloried in its advance. "The great tide of Democracy is rolling on," exclaimed the Radical Sir Wilfrid Lawson exultingly in the Franchise debate of 1884, "and no hand can stay its triumphal course."

It may however be contended that "the bulk of mankind," "the average elector," does none the less arrive at a right conclusion; not by ratiocination, but by instinct. But, even so, can a Democracy, a Nation of Voters, really express its opinions by its votes? Or, as Sir Henry Maine put it: "In what sense can a multitude exercise volition?" Is it only an *emotion* that sometimes sweeps through the mass of voters? "A profound argument," wrote Lord Salisbury, "must commend itself to each man's individual reason, and derives no aid from the congregation of numbers. But an emotion will shoot electrically through a crowd which might have appealed to each man by himself in vain." This emotion, as we shall see, may often be manufactured, or at least organized and exploited, by the Caucus or Party Machine. Then, for its full and accurate expression in a Bill, recourse must be had to the Parliamentary draughtsman. Maine considered that four-fifths of every legislative enactment should be attributed to "the accomplished lawyer who puts into shape the Government Bills." There is a character in Anthony Trollope's *The Prime Minister*,

Mr. Prime or " Constitution Charlie "—" the Bill, if passed, would be mainly his Bill, and yet the world would never hear his name as connected with it." Unfortunately all draughtsmen are not as skilful as " Constitution Charlie," and judges often drive coaches-and-four through Acts of Parliament that are meant to embody the Will of the People.

These are problems that arise generally from any enquiry into democratic government. There are certain special questions that may be asked concerning our British Democracy, as it manifested itself in the years between the Second Reform Act and the Great War, and to which some answer has been attempted in the following pages :—

(1) Has public life deteriorated since 1867 ?

(2) How far did Gladstone check or guide or promote Democracy ?

(3) How came it that the Tories were in power during more than half of this increasingly democratic period of 47 years ?

(4) What was the meaning of Tory Democracy ? Lord Rosebery called it " an imposture." Thomas Burt said that a Conservative working-man must be " either a fool or a flunkey." Liberals sneered at the expression as a contradiction in terms ; and so it is, for a Tory supports the Monarchy and the House of Lords, both of which institutions are anti-democratic.

(5) Can a Democracy govern an Empire ? Lord Randolph Churchill put this question to a public meeting in 1887 ; Sir Herbert Samuel repeated it recently in the House of Commons. More than 2,000 years ago Cleon, the Athenian demagogue, answered the question with a negative.

(6) How did our Democracy face the almost certain prospect of a great European War ?

Many may have lately asked themselves another question —" Was the result of the General Election of 1931, as shown in the willingness of our Democracy to make great pecuniary sacrifices, a complete if tardy vindication of the democratic principle ? " If so, that result must be equally a condemnation of the democratic leaders of all political Parties, whose extravagance had made these sacrifices necessary.

To such questions different persons, perhaps according to their prepossessions, will give different answers. But

about certain political developments, which took place in these years, there can be no question. The landed and aristocratic influence was greatly weakened. The Whig Party expired. Political Nonconformity, always active and seemingly very strong in the Parliament of 1906, had really passed the zenith of its power. The Labour Party grew, and before the end of the period was exercising a force quite out of proportion to its Parliamentary numbers.

History, according to Lord Acton, has to do not with persons but with things. But in politics, said Disraeli, " the great thing is the personal." As to the personal element, there were, in these years, three political tragedies—those of Dilke, Parnell and Lord Randolph Churchill ; each of these was, in its way, a check to the democratic tide. But for a divorce suit Dilke the advanced Radical, but for his ill-advised and precipitate resignation Churchill the Tory demagogue, would certainly have become Prime Ministers. The downfall of Parnell was a disaster not only to Home Rule, but indirectly to the cause of Progress, though for Progress Parnell himself cared nothing at all.

This Essay ends as the War begins. The younger generation looks back on pre-War politics with distaste, if not with contempt ; to them the old conflicts over Home Rule, Education, Local Veto, Free Trade, Disestablishment, are

" as a tale,
" Told by an idiot, full of sound and fury,
" Signifying nothing."

In 1868, in 1880, in 1906, the friends of Progress expected an advance towards a Millenium. No one is so hopeful now ; disillusionment is complete. The one thing now desired is a solution of economic problems. Democracy is looked on askance ; in many countries it has quite failed. And has Socialism ever succeeded, where the experiment has been made ?

The after-effects of the War have been even more catastrophic in other countries than in our own. Where is Kingship ? Sir Lionel Cust (in *King Edward and his Court*) gives a list of Kings and Royal Princes who attended the funeral of King Edward the Seventh in 1910. Then he notes their fates—one has abdicated, three are in exile,

three more have been deposed, three have been assassinated, one has committed suicide. Has Democracy fared better? Dictators now rule in Russia, Italy, Germany, Poland, Yugo-Slavia, Hungary, Roumania, Bulgaria.

But in England our King still sits securely on his throne, and our system of government is still democratic. Even our Monarchy has a democratic outlook—though the Monarch preserves his own peculiar position. As it was said of Charles the Second that "he lumped all non-royal persons together," so also of Queen Victoria that "everybody great and small was on one level with relation to herself." If Democracy has failed in other countries, it may very well be because their characters are not suited to democratic institutions, or because there is no counterbalancing element in their political systems. Democracy, it is true, is no longer belauded as it was forty years ago. We hear little now of "the great heart of the People," and if a Parliamentary orator were to dilate upon "the tide of Democracy rolling on in its triumphant course," even the Labour benches would scarce forbear to smile. But does any sane person imagine that for our own country any other system of government can be substituted for the democratic? A Monarchy with Divine Right? An Eighteenth-century Oligarchy? A government by the Middle Classes, sometimes called "a Business Government," which means a Government by Financiers and Employers of Labour? A Scientists' Fascism as proposed at the British Association in 1932? A Dictatorship? In times of stress, such as the Great War or the General Strike, we have given our Ministers extraordinary powers, but only while the stress lasted—only "for the duration." In a terrible crisis Great Britain might conceivably accept a Dictator—though not with that name; but a Dictator could never dictate to the British Empire. A development which is more insidiously dangerous, and which is attractive to doctrinaire Socialists, is the extension of Bureaucracy with its tendency to oust the jurisdiction of the Courts. For more than two hundred years our Judges, from the Lord Chancellor to the Justice of the Peace, have been almost always independent and incorruptible; they stand for Liberty and Right, and Democracy should be very jealous of any curtailment of their functions:

"Therefore still bear the balance and the sword."

It has been the aim of this Essay to show how the democratic system grew in Great Britain, and how it was accepted and extended by both the great political Parties. The system may be fraught with all the difficulties and dangers and illogicalities which Lowe and Maine and Stephen feared; but we are committed to it, for self-government is now the very life-blood of our whole body politic. Government by representatives of the votes of all adult men and women is now carried on not only in Parliament, but in every County, City, Borough, Urban and Rural District, and Parish. Those who, themselves taking no part in public life, grumble at the mistakes made by Members of Parliament and Municipal Councillors, would be wiser if they exerted themselves to influence voters; Disraeli said "we must educate our masters," and their need of education is constant. Our Democracy is nearly always ready to listen to argument; if speakers are shouted down, the damage generally recoils upon the shouters. The mistakes of Democracy are too often due to bad advice given by those who have not the courage to tell the truth. "My working-class friends," said Mr. Ramsay MacDonald during the last General Election, "I wish people would take courage and say hard things to you in honesty, rather than to say smooth things to you to keep their popularity. . . . They come and say smooth things when you are on the edge of trouble, and then go out and put all the cost and trouble on your shoulders in the end. The older I get, the more do I see that as a great defect in popular Democracy."

Lord Haldane, looking back to the Great War, recorded his belief that a Democracy was better suited to hold out for a long struggle than an Aristocracy. There is much to be said for his view, though we do not forget the stubbornness of our Aristocracy in the much longer Napoleonic War. No one can deny that, during our protracted War-struggle, our Democracy held out valiantly; but, if it had been better advised before the war and so better prepared, the struggle, even if it could not have been averted, would have been less prolonged.

REFORM IN 1866 AND 1867

The Reform Act of 1832—Reform revived 1851—Gladstone's pronouncement 1864—"Fancy Franchises"—"Bare Degradation"—Household Suffrage feared—The Bogey of "Democracy"—The Bill of 1866—Support of Trades Unions—Lowe's opposition and prophecies—Whig tactics—The Bill killed by Dunkellin's Amendment—A settlement desired—Varying proposals of Disraeli's Bill 1867—The Compound Householder to be excluded—Gladstone becomes his champion—Hodgkinson's Amendment to abolish Compounding—Disraeli's dilemma—He accepts the Amendment—Indignation of Lowe and Cranborne—The Bill becomes Law—Wrath of Gladstone—The new voters support him—Compounding revived.

THE Vote is the means by which constitutional politicians gain their ends. Since the Reform Act of 1832, certainly since 1852, there had always been advocates of further extension of the Franchise. Many quite sincerely looked to this as a cure for all the country's ills. Some made their reckoning that, as champions of an extension, they would earn the gratitude of the new voters as soon as the extension was consummated. Others, who secretly hated any change, said to themselves: "Well, the Bill is sure to be passed sooner or later. Where shall we be *then*, if we oppose it *now*? Our canvass of the new voters will be a very uphill job, and a very unpleasant one."

In public this latter class of politician dares not go beyond arguing that, though the measure may be just, the time is not propitious, or that the existing Parliament is too stale, or that Redistribution of seats should come first, or that the country has given no mandate. These arguments, or one or other of them, have been used in 1867, in 1884, in 1918 and in 1926. But they have deceived nobody.

For about twenty years the Act of 1832 held the field. A rental value of £50 or an ownership annual value of 40*s*. in the country, and a £10 annual value in the towns, gave a right to vote. The enactment worked illogically—for instance, in towns where rents were high votes were proportionally numerous; Londoners were said to enjoy something like Household Suffrage. But it was accepted, and the rural Fifty Pounder and urban Ten Pounder came

to be regarded almost as pillars of the new British Constitution.

However, in 1851, Lord John Russell, no longer the "Finality Jack" of 1837, submitted a new Reform Bill to the Cabinet, and the fat was again in the fire.

It is not necessary here to recapitulate the Bills sponsored by Russell or Disraeli in 1854, 1859 and 1860, or to tell of the fates that befell them. The story is told very luminously and ably by Lady Gwendolen Cecil in her *Life of Robert Marquis of Salisbury.*[1]

These various proposals in time produced a morbid political atmosphere. "We cannot afford," said Gladstone, (March 29th, 1859), "to fritter away the principal part of each Sessions, in debating the question of Parliamentary Reform. I say too, over and above the loss of time, it is a dangerous habit for the country to fall into. . . . No individual can be constantly watching the state of his own health without injuring it." In May 1864 he caused a great sensation in the House of Commons by this utterance:

"I venture to say that every man, who is not presumably incapacitated by some consideration of personal unfitness or of political danger, is morally entitled to come within the pale of the Constitution." It is obvious that the saving phrase about personal unfitness or political danger was a qualification very artfully composed, and to be interpreted afterwards as might be required. So, when Palmerston took him to task, Gladstone replied:

"I agree in your denial 'that every sane and not disqualified man has a moral right to a vote.' But I am at a loss to know how, as you have read my speech, you can ascribe this opinion to me. My declaration was, taken generally, that all persons ought to be admitted to the Franchise, who can be admitted to it with safety," and so forth.

Even Lord Morley was constrained to describe his hero's mind as "a busy mint of logical counterfeit," and to admit that "he would never have given an undertaking in which he could not discover, if need be, some ambiguity which permitted an escape."

At any rate Gladstone was now convinced that a considerable extension of the Franchise was just and necessary, and that many more persons than already possessed it had

a *right* to the vote. Disraeli, on the other hand, described the vote as a *privilege* to be earned, not a *right* to be claimed.

Tens of thousands of voteless men began to claim the vote as a *right*, almost as one of the Rights of Man. Of course this was ordinary Radical doctrine. " The vote was a right, and not a privilege, and every man, not a criminal, ought to possess it."[1]

In the earlier 'Sixties there was much disagreement as to the extent to which the Franchise should be lowered. But, whatever the extent, it was generally held—and by men of both Parties—that there should be some special and balancing franchises (" fancy " franchises as they were called), to tell in favour of education and property. Otherwise the suffrage would suffer a process then termed " a bare degradation "—a phrase which sounded rather uncomplimentary to the newly-to-be-admitted voters, but which only meant a simple extension unsurrounded by safeguards.

Household Suffrage, even with the exclusion of non-ratepaying householders, was then regarded as an extreme and almost a revolutionary proposal. In 1863 W. E. Forster stated that not fifteen Members of Parliament would support it ; in 1867 John Bright declared that three-fourths of his own party were opposed to it.[2] Some politicians considered it to be as subversive (in kind if not in degree), as Manhood Suffrage or Adult Suffrage. Disraeli wrote to Lord Derby of General Peel (February 7th, 1867) :

" You will find him very placable, except on the phrase ' Household Suffrage,' when his eye lights up with insanity. He evidently annexes no idea to the phrase, but told me that the whole of our back benches would rise and leave us, as one man, if the phrase remained. I believe in three months time they will unanimously call for it." (A good forecast.)

The great problem was how to admit a " portion " of the working classes, a portion not too large to swamp the educated classes. They were to have a *share* of political power, but not to be the predominant partner. The thing to be aimed at was called " Participation without Predominance." An exact parallel might be found in the attitude of the Liberals towards Labour at the latter part of the century. A certain number of Labour M.P.'s would be welcome, and would prove a salutary infusion ; but

there was a great fear lest there should be too many. In both cases the attempt to draw the line proved perfectly futile.

Disraeli precisely stated the difficulty :

" Could they secure the franchise for a certain portion of the working classes who, by their industry, their intelligence and their integrity, showed that they were worthy of such a possession, without at the same time overwhelming the rest of the constituency by the number of those whom they admitted ? " The vote was to be a reward given to a limited number of deserving artisans.

For if this problem were not solved, if a *preponderance* of the working-classes were to be admitted as voters, it was manifest that a dreaded thing would happen. The uneducated would outnumber the educated, the poor men the rich men.

And this would mean Democracy.

In 1831 the Whig Macaulay observed with pleasure that " by the provisions of the Reform Bill, the most industrious and respectable of our labourers will be admitted to a share in the government of the State." But, he proceeded, if power were granted to the bulk of the working classes, this would result in their being governed " according to the doctrines which they have learned from their illiterate, incapable, low-minded flatterers." This would be democratic government, a terrible form of government and savouring of mob-rule and the French Revolution. In 1831 elderly men could well remember the horrors of the Revolution ; the men of thirty years later had been indoctrinated by their fathers with the same horror of democratic excess. Between these two generations had happened the overturns of 1848. Thomas Carlyle (*Latter Day Pamphlets* 1850) saw that " Universal Democracy, whatever we may think of it, has declared itself as an inevitable fact of the days in which we live." But our grandfathers still hoped that for England the deluge might be stayed, and that by keeping the Franchise high we might stay it. In 1859 Disraeli objected to lowering the Borough Franchise on the ground that it would be an advance towards Democracy. In 1865, for the same reason, he hoped the House would " sanction no step that has a tendency to Democracy, but that it would maintain the ordered state of free England in which we live." In introducing his own Bill in 1867

he hoped that it would never be the fate of the country to live under a Democracy.

The word Democracy in those days still called up the picture of a nation that had broken all laws human and divine, had deposed and murdered its king, was living licentiously and brutally, but was destined soon to fall under the sway of a military despot. Most statesmen would still have agreed with Burke that "a perfect Democracy is the most shameless thing in the world."

And yet, only twenty years later, we find a great jurist, Sir Henry Maine, writing of popular political opinion :

"In this country . . . Democracy is commonly described as having an inherent superiority over every other form of government. It is supposed to advance with an irresistible and pre-ordained movement. It is thought to be full of the promise of blessings to mankind."[1]

How came there to be such a change of opinion? Was it because during those twenty years Democracy had been tried, and really proved a boon? or was the new view simply a reflection of the views of the new electorate?

The death of Palmerston, which took place immediately after the Election of 1865, removed a statesman of European fame, but one who was by no means *persona grata* to earnest Radicals and votaries of Progress. He had been a sportsman, a racing man, a society man and an admirer of the fair sex. He had been denounced by virtuous John Bright as "that aged charlatan, that hoary sinner"; "a man who has age, but with age has not the gravity of age." Now that he was gone, Liberals and Radicals looked for an advance, and for this their eyes naturally turned to Gladstone, who had become leader of the House of Commons. The new Ministry was of a more Liberal composition than Palmerston's.

It has also been said that the victory of the Federals over the Confederates, the triumph of the Republican cause in the United States, had been an encouragement to British Liberals. About this war Gladstone had made a mistake. He had pronounced in 1862 that "Jefferson had made a nation." Lord Salisbury would have called this "putting your money on the wrong horse."

But Gladstone's declaration about admitting every citizen "within the pale of the Constitution" had marked him

out as the sponsor of the new Reform Bill. This, which he introduced on March 12th 1866, with an acknowledgment that "the limbo of abortive creations was peopled with the skeletons of Reform Bills," was not so extreme as had been expected. The County qualification was to be reduced from £50 to £14, and the Borough qualification from £10 to £7. The Bill, it was estimated, would have added less than 400,000 voters; in the Counties about 170,000, in the Boroughs about 205,000. Gladstone asserted that the non-working-class electorate would still outnumber the working-class, an assertion calculated to soothe the nerves of those who feared Democracy.

What measure of support or enthusiasm was accorded to the Bill in the country? There were not the same fantastic expectations as in 1832. This time it was not believed that the Bill would reduce the price of beef and mutton to a penny a pound, and of ale to a penny a quart. But hopes of a different kind were raised. The Trades Union leaders who supported the agitation "promised freely, as the fruits of the extended suffrage, higher wages, the provision of land for all who wished for it, and the certainty of employment for all who wanted it; and these promises were apparently accepted by their audiences with unquestioning faith."[1] A great deal of feeling was excited; a huge demonstration was held on Primrose Hill in May (in which Charles Bradlaugh took part); and after the Government was defeated, 1,400 yards of Hyde Park palings were pulled down by the masses who wished to assemble within them. But the North of England showed more fervour than the South. In June, Russell reported to the Queen on "the general apathy of the South of England to the subject of Reform."

Direct opposition to the Bill was led by Robert Lowe. Lord Bryce has described Lowe as "the last *advocatus Diaboli* against Democracy" and his speeches as "the swan-song of the old constitutionalism."[2] He also says that the issue of principle has not been raised since, and not even by the Tories in 1884. Here I think he goes too far, though it is true (as will appear later) that this issue was then raised only faintly.

The following are typical passages from one of Lowe's famous philippics.[3] They are the frank expression of the sentiments of the '*Advocatus Diaboli* against Democracy,'

sentiments doubtless shared by many who did not themselves venture to avow them :—

"The burden of proof is in favour of existing institutions."

"I shall say exactly what I think. Let any Gentleman consider—I have had such unhappy experiences, and many of us have—let any Gentleman consider the constituencies he has had the honour to be concerned with. If you want venality, if you want ignorance, if you want drunkenness, and facility for being intimidated ; or if, on the other hand, you want impulsive, unreflecting and violent people, where do you look for them in the constituencies? Do you go to the top or to the bottom ? "

"You may look for more bribery and corruption than you have hitherto had. This will be the first and instantaneous result."

"The working-men of England will awake to a full sense of their power. They will say, 'We can do better for ourselves. Don't let us any longer be cajoled at elections. Let us set up shop for ourselves.' " (This was a true prophecy.)

"Demagogues who compensate for want of money by pandering to popular passions."

"If you lower the character of your constituencies, you lower that of the representatives, and you lower the character of this House."

"Would they (the new constituencies) be more tolerant of the opinions of the honest and able man who does not follow the whim of the moment ? "

"Practice will never conform to theory until you have got universal suffrage and equal electoral districts."

Lowe (wrote Bryce) predicted the following dire results from the Bill :—

(1) A rapid increase in corruption and intimidation at parliamentary elections.

(2) The quality of the House of Commons would decline,[1] because money would rule, and small boroughs would no longer open a path to talent.

(3) Members of Parliament would be either millionaires or demagogues, and more subservient to their constituents.

(4) Universal suffrage at an early date.

(5) A Democratic House of Commons would not retain power over its Executive.

(6) The House of Lords, the Church and the Bench would be overthrown.

Bryce maintained that none of these predictions had come true except (5) ; but he admitted the correctness of Lowe's prophecy that Democracy would be as prone to War as any other kind of government.

Bryce wrote in 1903. If he had survived till 1932, his estimate of Lowe as a prophet might have been higher. Bryce was right as to (1). As to (2) the quality of the House has varied with different Parliaments, but it could not be claimed that the average Member of the 1929-31 Parliament was equal in quality to the average Member of Lowe's day. As to (3) a good deal might be said in support of Lowe being a true prophet. (4) has come to pass, including Women's Suffrage. As to (6) the House of Lords has now only a time-limit Veto. The Church in England has been in no danger of Disestablishment and Disendowment since 1886, till recently—when the threat has come from herself. The Bench has never been seriously threatened, but Bureaucracy has usurped some of the jurisdiction of the Courts.

Lowe promised that, if the Conservatives would stand firm, he would muster enough Liberals to ensure a majority of 50 against " any Bill that would lower the franchise by one sixpence ; " but, in the end, the Bill was defeated by less straightforward action. (Disraeli, by the way, once accused Lowe of having himself been at one time a Six-Pounder !)

The Whig Lord Grosvenor, seconded by the Tory Lord Stanley, was responsible for a typically Whig motion—that the Franchise should wait until the Government had declared their intentions about a Redistribution of Seats. On April 27th, after eight nights of debate, this motion was only lost by five votes. Gladstone denounced the Whig and the Tory as " aristocrats who were combining to defeat an act of justice to the general community." Later, in the House of Lords, Earl Grey condemned the violent Government attacks made against Lord Grosvenor and his family for having proposed this resolution. This Lord Grosvenor, twenty years later, being then Duke of Westminster, broke finally with Gladstone on his Home Rule policy, and removed his portrait from the wall of Eaton Hall.

Another still more characteristically Whig Amendment was moved by Lord Dunkellin on June 18th, and proved fatal to the Government. This was " to leave out the words ' clear yearly ' in order to insert the word ' rateable,' " i.e. to substitute the principle of a rating franchise for that of net rental. As a rateable value is generally less than the rent, Dunkellin was at once accused of designing to raise the limit of the Franchise.

John Bright said that the Amendment, if carried, would raise the limit from £7 to £9. He said that Cave, who seconded it, had frankly admitted that he gave his support for this reason.

Bernal Osborne asked, " Was it not patent to everyone in the House that this motion was levelled with this very object, and, under the specious pretence of discussing the subject, the real object was to get rid of the Government and the Bill ? "

Dunkellin's Amendment was carried by 315 to 304, and the majority included 44 Government supporters. So Gladstone's Bill was killed, and Gladstone resigned. Derby came into power.

The Whig professions of sympathy with the Bill deceived nobody. The tactics which they used for preventing it from being passed were immediately successful, but were neither forgotten nor forgiven by reforming Liberals and Radicals.

Two things were noticeable in the months that followed. Firstly, there was a growing agitation for Reform, no doubt heightened by the rage and disappointment of the democratically-inclined who had seen Gladstone's Bill so disingenuously frustrated. In the House of Commons itself, wrote Matthew Arnold, there were not twenty Members who were sincere about Reform ; but, out of doors, there was the affair of the Hyde Park railings, which reduced the Home Secretary to tears ; there were demonstrations, at which violent language was heard, in Birmingham, Manchester, Leeds, Glasgow and Dublin ; Radical orators grew louder and louder. Carlyle wrote in his Journal (September 26th, 1866) :—

" Country very base and mad, so far as I survey its proceedings. Bright, Beales, Gladstone, Mill and Co., bring on the Suffrage question, kindling up the slow *canaille* what they can. This, and ' Oh, make the niggers happy ! ' seem to be the two things needful with these sad people."

Secondly, quite apart from popular feeling, there was a general desire that the Reform question should be settled. Matthew Arnold, writing to his mother in March, 1867, hoped that Derby and Disraeli " will take heart of grace " and bring in a good measure of Reform. " Quite a passionate desire to get the question done with is springing up, and is gaining all the better Conservatives themselves." It was Lord Derby's own opinion, very soon after he assumed office, that Reform must be dealt with, and Queen Victoria thought the same. Even Lord Cranborne recognised that some measure was inevitable. It was clamoured for by the Tories because it was necessary " to satisfy the popular demand."[1]

The Queen's speech at the opening of Parliament in 1867 expressed a hope that the Franchise would be " freely extended," but that the balance of political power " would not be unduly disturbed." That is to say, there was to be Participation but still without Predominance ; and, unless we remember the importance attached to this principle, the kaleidoscopic changes in the Tory Reform proposals, both before and after the introduction of the Bill (March 18th), will be quite unintelligible.

The following are some of the expedients, which successively found favour with the Tory leaders, in the winter of 1866 and spring of 1867 :—

Postponement of Reform.

Resolutions to be followed by Enquiry and Legislation.

Resolutions to be followed by Legislation without Enquiry.

(Before the end of January.) Household Suffrage for Ratepayers, with Plurality of Votes. Plurality of Votes meant that the Householder was to have a number of Votes in proportion to the Assessed Value of his house.

(February.) " Fancy " Franchises to be substituted for Plurality, i.e. votes for persons who had Savings Banks Deposits, or paid direct taxes, or were educationally qualified. Two, three, or four votes according to their qualifications. Disraeli had now decided, and had told Cranborne, that Plurality based on Assessed Value " would not do."

A £5 limit for Voters.

A £6 limit.

The " Ten Minutes " Bill (February 24th) :—£6 Borough Rating. £20 County Rating. Fancy Franchises.

Franchise for Ratepaying Householders with residence of three years.

The Bill (introduced March 18th) :—Dual Vote for Income Tax Payers. (Before the Bill went into Committee a promise was given that this would be withdrawn.) "Fancy" franchises, educational, fundholding, etc. Vote for two-years residents who paid their own rates. All this was supported by a Party meeting on March 15th, 1867.

Perhaps these varying proposals have not been here set down in their exact sequence. Though differing from one another, they had a common significance—they were all aimed at limiting or balancing the vote of the Householder *qua* Householder.

Policy gradually concentrated on the enfranchisement of the Ratepaying Householder, to the exclusion of his "Compound" neighbour. This exclusion was deemed all-important; it almost seemed as if thereon hinged the safety of the State.

The Compound Householder became, in those existing weeks, an outstanding personage; at any rate he was the principal character in a very strange political comedy. When the curtain fell, he expired; but, as he soon revived, and as millions of Compound Householders still flourish, it may be as well to explain that he was a tenant whose rates, under the provisions of the Small Tenements Act and other local Acts, were collected and paid by his landlord. This saved the rating authorities a great deal of trouble and retrieved them from loss by defaulters, in consideration of which the landlord was granted a reduction of twenty-five per cent. of the rates. He naturally added the rate to the rent, but he did not share with the tenant the benefit of the twenty-five per cent remission.

"Compounding" was a convenient arrangement. But the tenant, who in effect paid his rates to his landlord for transmission to the collector, must have felt aggrieved at being considered for that reason unworthy of a vote. In some towns the practice of Compounding was almost universal; in others non-existent. Why should the householders of Birmingham, for instance, be deprived of a citizen's right, which the householders of Sheffield were to enjoy?

The Conservative Party met, and approved of enfranchising only the direct ratepayer. Lord Malmesbury called this

"Household Suffrage properly counterpoised." Walpole's motto was "no Compound Householders on any account." Even the Liberals preferred a rating Household Suffrage to a £5 qualification.

Disraeli assured the Queen that personal rating was really popular in the country. In the House he lauded the dignity and status of the ratepaying householder: "An individual who lives in a house and fulfils public duties . . . who is rated to the financial arrangements of the community of which he is a member."[1]

Of course the real reason for excluding the Compound Householders was obvious. They were very numerous and their disqualification would cleanse the Bill from any democratic taint. They were estimated to number two thirds of the newly-admissible householders. Graves, M.P. for Liverpool, wrote to Disraeli: "That's the real thing; rating is better than any money qualification. There are 10,000 Parliamentary voters now in Liverpool who do not pay their rates—and never will."

So Disraeli was able to reassure the Queen. He wrote to her secretary, General Grey, that "the principle of the Reform Bill is that the Franchise should be founded on rating." He said that at present there were 1,367,000 Borough Householders of whom 644,000 were enfranchised, leaving 723,000 voteless. Of these 723,000, 237,000 might possibly qualify under the Bill, but, after deductions in respect of pauperization and migration, it was probable that only 115,000 would pass the test. True it was, added Disraeli, that any householder might qualify himself for the vote by paying his rates, but "my own opinion is that not 50,000 will ever ultimately avail themselves of the provision."[2]

As a matter of fact, if the Compound Householder wanted a vote, it was provided that he must first pay his rates in full, and should only be allowed to deduct the compounded rate from the rent. This was, no doubt, intended to discourage him.

If Disraeli expected that public opinion would approve of the Compound Householder being left in the position of a political helot, he was soon undeceived. At Easter mass meetings demanded his enfranchisement. The eloquent voice of Gladstone was raised on his behalf. His diary of May 9th records: "Spoke earnestly and long for Compound

Householders, in vain. Beaten by 322-256." One who heard this speech said : " It seemed as if the souls of all the Compound Householders in England had entered into him."[1] In the debate of May 17th he denounced the proposal as " Household Suffrage attended, in my opinion, with restrictions of a nature most unjust, most vexatious, and most certain to lead to that which we all desire to avoid—prolonged agitation till they are swept away. . . . The principle is, choose between the franchise and the composition."

And now the situation developed in a most extraordinary manner. It was a development that might have been foreseen by any astute Parliamentary observer, and it is quite possible that Disraeli himself was not taken by surprise. He had indeed told the Queen that comparatively few householders would be likely to qualify themselves *voluntarily*. But might not the possibility of a *compulsory* qualification have occurred to him ?

On May 17th, in a thin Committee of the House, Hodgkinson, the Liberal Member for Newark, proposed an Amendment to the Bill, that " no person other than the occupier shall, after the passing of this Act, be rated to parochial rates in respect of premises occupied by him within the limits of a Parliamentary Borough." The effect of Hodgkinson's Amendment (of which John Bright is said to have been the real begetter), was to sweep away the Small Tenements Act and other Local Acts, and elevate all householders to the proud position of direct ratepayers—and consequently of qualified voters.

Here was a dilemma to try a leader's nerve.

Could Disraeli oppose the Amendment ? It was not alien to the principle of the Bill, for personal rating would still be a necessary qualification ; only, personal rating would now be universal. Disraeli had, for his own purpose, extolled the direct ratepayer as a responsible citizen who took a worthy part in public life—at any rate in the matter of paying his own rates. Hodgkinson was merely proposing to create hundreds of thousands of these good men. Perhaps Disraeli might have defeated the Amendment on the ground that the repeal of the Small Tenements Act was not germane to a Franchise Bill, but this would have been too transparent an insistence on the limiting character of his Bill. He knew how strong was the feeling against the

exclusion of the non-ratepayer; and he was sincerely anxious that the Bill should be a real settlement.

On the other hand he had promised never to introduce Household Suffrage *pur et simple*. He had given the Queen assurances that only about 50,000 would be added to the Register. He was leader of a Party that had made concession after concession, and by which the exclusion of the Compound Householder was now regarded as the last safeguard of the British Constitution. If this were surrendered, the citadel of the Franchise would be stormed and entered by an enormous and *preponderating* crowd of new voters, who would become the citadel's masters. (They did, in fact, enter in by virtue of the Amendment, to the number of about half a million). He had to think of colleagues who insisted on Household Suffrage being "properly counterpoised," of others who "would not have Compound Householders on any account," of Gathorne Hardy who sat beside him, of Cranborne on his flank, and of his Government being in a minority of seventy.

If he accepted the Amendment, he would have to perform the dangerous manœuvre of changing front in face of the enemy, a manœuvre which calls for instant decision, courage and skill; the fate of the Bill, and of his party, and his own political fortune were at stake, and he had little time for conference with his friends. But Disraeli did not hesitate. He coolly remarked that Hodgkinson's proposal was not opposed to the principles of the Bill. As to Gladstone's accusation "that we had fixed on this foundation for a Franchise in order to reap the advantage which the Rating Acts would give us in restricting the Suffrage, Sir, that has been an entire mistake. . . . I need not say that as far as the spirit not of the Amendment but of the proviso of the Hon. Gentleman is concerned, His Majesty's Government can have no opposition whatever to it. It is the policy of their own measure—a policy which, if they had been masters of the situation, they would have recommended long ago for the adoption of the House. In the month of May the House on reflection, and after experience and observation, have arrived at a conclusion which I should have been glad to have seen them arrive at in the month of March." He added: "I have no doubt there are individuals who, having long tried with what may be called blundering hands to settle this question, may be exceedingly

annoyed that those who have been their rivals in the enterprise have been more successful."

Some of the Parliamentary comments on this daring *volte face* are worth recording :

Bernal Osborne : " I always thought that the Chancellor of the Exchequer was the greatest Radical in the House. He has achieved what no other man in the country could have done. As I have said before, he has lugged up that great omnibus full of stupid heavy country gentlemen (Oh ! Oh !) I only say ' stupid ' in the Parliamentary sense. It is a perfect Parliamentary word. He has converted these Conservatives into Radical Reformers. The Ministry could not exist a day without him, and all the rest who sit near him are most respectable persons on the board, their opinions not being worth a snap of the fingers."

Viscount Cranborne : " Of this policy I express no opinion ; but I say it is an abnegation of all the principles of his party."

Lowe fired his broadside three days later :

" We have arrived at a point of a complete revolution in our Constitution.

" I say that this is a measure which will, for good or for evil, alter, change—I do not wish to mince the matter—revolutionize the institutions of this country for all time to come.

" As to the new voters, their politics must take one form—Socialism.

" What can possibly become of the House of Peers ? That House can no longer hold its present relations to this House.

" We have instituted two parties of competition, who, like Cleon and the Sausage-seller of Aristophanes, are both bidding for the support of Demos.

" They will not be advocates of principles, but suppliants for a popular favour."

He appealed to the Tories : " You, the gentlemen of England—you with your ancestors behind you and your posterity before you—with your great estates, with your titles, with your honours, with your heavy stake in the well-being of this land, with an amount of national prosperity, happiness, dignity and honour which you have enjoyed for the last two hundred years, such as never before fell to the lot of any class in the world," and asked them if they were " so foolish as to believe that, by diving into

the depths of ignorance and poverty, you can find wisdom and manage the delicate and weighty affairs of this great Empire."[1]

This appeal must have caused deep heart-searchings on the Government benches. But it came too late.

Mr. Punch, though a Liberal and a Reformer, praised Lowe's consistency,

> "In these days of crossings and dodgings,
> "When you never know who's on the square,
> "When coves change their sides, like their lodgings,
> "And there's all styles of fighting but fair."[2]

Disraeli's acceptance of Hodgkinson's Amendment was the turning-point. The Bill was now secure; its Third Reading passed without a division, and it received the Royal Assent on August 15th.

Had Disraeli from the first envisaged the whole series of surrenders, including the admission of the Compound Householder? Sir John Karslake, his Attorney-General, said, "I believe that, during the whole of the debates, he never really understood what a Compound Householder is." This is an exaggeration, as anyone must admit who has read the debates. Yet it may well be that Disraeli all along realized that simple Household Suffrage must come, and that he felt some contempt for his followers' blind reliance upon the limitations he successively dangled before them.

"The Franchise question belonged undoubtedly in his mind to the secondary class."[3] He was determined to free Conservatism from Aristocracy. Toryism, he said, "does not depend upon hereditary coteries of exclusive nobles."[4] As for Hodgkinson's Amendment, "We had sympathised with the Compound Householder by having prepared clauses by which his vote might be facilitated, and if he chose to come forward and commit suicide, and say 'I will no longer be a Compound Householder, but I will give up these privileges and pay rates,' what was our duty?"[5]

The Ten-Pounder was now no more. The Seven-Pounder, Six-Pounder, and Five-Pounder, and the Fancy Franchises and Participation without Predominance, and Household Suffrage "properly counterpoised"—*simulacra*, as Carlyle would have called them—had vanished into the limbo of things impossible and to be forgotten.

And Disraeli had made history. He had succeeded

where Gladstone, partly because of the Whigs, and partly through his own want of political adaptability, had failed. England, whose government had been a Monarchy, at times a Tyranny, for 150 years an Aristocracy, and for 35 years an Aristocracy infused with Middle-Class elements, was now to be a Democracy. The voter "Haves" were at last in a definite minority to the voter "Have-nots."

Disraeli may have felt terrible qualms as to how his followers would regard his action of May 17th. But what did Gladstone think, as he walked home that night? Reform was to be passed, and to be passed by his hated rival and the Tories. He pronounced it "a smash"; an act of "diabolical cleverness."

Nevertheless the Liberals reaped where Disraeli had sowed. Disraeli, says his biographer, "so absolutely incapable of demagogic arts," neglected to use his Act for his Party's advantage; the Liberals continued somehow to credit it to Gladstone and John Bright. "Disraeli," said John Stuart Mill, "goes through the country saying to the working-man, 'Here is my Reform Bill;' the working-man says, 'Thank you, Mr. Gladstone.'"[1] So Gladstone was returned to power.

The crowning irony of this transaction was that two years afterwards the Compound Householder was restored to life by the Liberals, and without any electoral disqualification.[2] For Compounding had been found to be a convenience, and it was believed that those who had been Compound Householders had mainly voted Liberal.

NOTES

REFORM IN 1866 AND 1867

Page 10.
[1] Vol. I, Ch. 6.
Page 11.
[1] H Labouchere in 1885
[2] *Life of Lord Salisbury*, Vol. I, p. 247.
Page 13.
[1] *Popular Government*, Preface, p. vii
Page 14.
[1] *Life of Lord Salisbury*, Vol. I, pp. 187-8.
[2] *Studies in Contemporary Biography*, 1903.
[3] *Hansard*, March 13th, 1866.
Page 15.
[1] Gladstone insisted, in his old age, that "Democracy had certainly not saved us from a distinct decline in the standard of public men." But he put the blame for this upon Disraeli. "He is the grand corrupter." (*Life*, Vol. III, p. 475).
Page 18.
[1] *Life of Lord Salisbury*, Vol. I, p. 239.
Page 20.
[1] *Hansard*, May 17th, 1867.
[2] *Letters of Queen Victoria*, Second Series, Vol. I, p. 407.
Page 21.
[1] Lecky, Introduction to *Democracy and Liberty*.
Page 24.
[1] *Hansard*, May 20th, 1867.
[2] *Punch*, July 13th, 1867.
[3] *Life of Lord Salisbury*, Vol. I, p. 216.
[4] *Mansion House Speech*, 1867.
[5] *Scottish Speech*, November, 1867.
Page 25.
[1] Sir Algernon West's *Private Diaries*, p. 210.
[2] 1869 (32, 3 Vic. C. 41).

GLADSTONE AND DEMOCRACY

Gladstone's unparalleled career—Physique—Fondness for precedents—Career unduly prolonged—Love of power—Oxonian and Theologian—Respect for the Throne—Rift between the Queen and Gladstone—Aristocratic tendencies—A rigid Economist—Bulgarian Atrocities—Home Rule—Opposition of Society—The Newcastle Programme—A great democratic leader—Legislative achievements—Love of Liberty—An Individualist—His popularity—"Pilgrimages of Passion"—Magnetism—Vindictiveness—His war against "the Classes"—Warns the House of Lords—Limitations—A modern view of Gladstone.

THE tremendous career of Gladstone has been recorded by Lord Morley in three large volumes. (For most statesmen two are considered enough, though Disraeli has been given six, and Salisbury is to have five.) Of late years the *Diaries and Letters* of his daughter, Mrs. Drew, have appeared; and his son, the late Viscount Gladstone, has published *After Thirty Years*, from which it may be gathered that the official *Life* was not considered by the Gladstone family as in every respect quite adequate to its subject. A book also has been written about Gladstone's foreign policy and another quite recently about his finance.[1] All the biographies, reminiscences, memoirs and diaries of public men published during the past thirty years—those of Hartington, Campbell-Bannerman, Harcourt, Dilke, Bradlaugh, Parnell, Asquith, Labouchere, Churchill, Chaplin, Disraeli, Rosebery, Balfour, Haldane, Granville, Salisbury, Chamberlain, amongst others—contains copious references to this extraordinary man. He seems to be always present in the foreground or the background, whether loved or hated a dominating and compelling influence. As scholar, churchman, statesman, pamphleteer, orator, financier, conversationalist, he made different appeals to different minds. My present purpose is to observe only how he was concerned in the democratic movement; how far he excited it, and, in his own phrase, "made the kettle boil," how far he was carried along by it.

Disraeli said that in politics "the great thing is the personal." Great political movements are in themselves

impersonal forces, but they have to be managed by persons. A democratic flood cannot be for ever stayed, but it may be checked or guided; it may even be dammed for a time, and then violently overflow the obstruction. The course of the stream, and its rapidity, may depend upon the genius and character, or the idiosyncrasies, of a statesman.

Except for a short and only partial[1] retirement, Gladstone was undisputed leader of the Liberal and Radical party from his 59th to this 85th year, from 1868 to 1894. During those twenty-six years he was Prime Minister four times, his tenure of that office extending over fourteen years. But before he became leader he had already been in politics thirty-five years, and for most of that time in prominent positions—though not till 1859 as definitely a Liberal.

So, if merely on account of his length of service as a Liberal leader, and the high places in which he served, it is interesting to examine what was his relation to Democracy and his attitude to Social Reform, and how these were affected by his education, his religion, his reverence for the Throne and his sympathy with Aristocracy. Then there was his temporary absorption in the Eastern Question, and later his concentration on Home Rule. Neither of these were democratic causes; in fact his devotion to Home Rule ended by irritating democrats who wanted to push forward other measures. But his failure to pass it provoked Gladstone himself into the *rôle* of a demagogue.

After his resignation in 1894 Liberalism took on a different colour, both in home and foreign politics. In home politics, mainly because he was no longer in the field to fight for economy, economy went out of fashion. "But when Mr. Gladstone retires," asked Herbert (afterwards Viscount) Gladstone of Haldane (1893), "what will happen?" "Then the deluge," was the reply. In foreign politics he had been a breakwater against Imperialism, aggression, "a spirited foreign policy," and active participation in European rivalries.

Gladstone passed the third Reform Bill in 1884; this was a great step forward in the march of British Democracy. For ten more years he was the outstanding figure in British politics; but from 1885 onwards he was intensely, almost exclusively, preoccupied with Ireland, and it would be vain to contend that Home Rule has ever strongly attracted our democrats. England consistently voted against it,

So the Home Rule struggle delayed the democratic advance.

His political career was of a length unparalleled. As evidence thereof, in the Octagon room at Hawarden were 60,000 selected letters addressed to himself; Lord Morley writes of "exploration in the crowded archives, with the 2 or 300,000 pieces." In his Diary, between July 26th, 1825, and December 29th, 1896, were 25,000 entries.

Only a perfect health and physique could have withstood his labours. Sir Andrew Clark, his physician, said that his frame was "like an ancient Greek statue of the ideal man." In 1882 Gladstone (*aet.* 73) went down to Harrow, and, hearing the School song, *Forty Years On*, remarked of the line

"Feeble of foot and rheumatic of shoulder,"

that it had no application to himself.

And Gladstone could boast not only of a sustained strength, but of a kind of demonic energy. He was "of some higher voltage of power than more recent Prime Ministers."[1] This electric or magnetic quality made him very formidable.

His long record made a tremendous impression on the mass of his followers, and he himself came to believe that length of years in public service and unrivalled experience in public business made him infallible. This experience made him *inter alia* a master of precedents. When a question arose in 1893 as to whereabouts in the House the Liberal Unionists should sit, Gladstone quoted the cases of

(1) The Canningites in 1828,
(2) Stanley and Graham when they left Lord Grey,
(3) Graham in Peel's short Government,
(4) Bright and Cobden when they left Palmerston, and
(5) The Peelites when they left Palmerston in 1855.

It appeared that all these personages took up a position on the second bench below the gangway. "Which" (remarks Sir Algernon West) "appeared conclusive." Denouncing an increased naval expenditure in January 1894, he exclaimed, "The plan is mad; and who are they who propose it? Men who were not born when I had been in public life for years."[2] He said of Balfour that he would be wiser "when he has been fifty-six years in the service of his country." But not only his political foes, amongst whom

must be included Queen Victoria, but those who were closely associated with him, thought that in his old age his judgment, if not his intellectual power, was failing :—

"The worst part of the matter is that, more and more, it is evident that he has entirely outlived his judgment, though his eloquence to a great extent remains, and his passions have become more imperious." (Lord Salisbury to the Queen, during the General Election of 1892.)

"Not only much aged and walking bent with a stick, but altogether ; his face shrunk, deadly pale with a weird look in his eyes, a feeble expression about the mouth and the voice altered." (Queen Victoria's *Journal*, August 15th, 1892.)

"In his dotage pulled this way by one, and that way by another. They don't expect a dissolution till next year, but hope to keep the old man alive like the Tycoon of Japan, even after he is dead." (H. Labouchere, 1891.)

Harcourt (to Dilke, as early as 1876) : "He is played out." At the beginning of 1894, Sir Algernon West records Harcourt as saying that "Gladstone was ruining his party for the second time."

A year previously Lord Rosebery told Sir Algernon that Gladstone's continuance in office was "a tragedy."

Later on in the same year "We (Asquith and Sir Algernon) both agreed that it would have been better for Mr. Gladstone's reputation if he had retired, but it would have been selfish and practically impossible."

"'Tis brutal to put into words," said Asquith to Morley during the Home Rule debate of 1893, "but really, if Mr. Gladstone stood more aside, we might get on better."

There were even provincial Liberals who thought, years before his retirement, that he was on the decline. Miss Beatrice Potter[1] writes to her father from Bacup (October 1886) : "I am glad to say the better class stick to Mr. Chamberlain. The G.O.M. has sadly gone down since I was last here—some good Liberals saying openly that he is in his dotage."

Gladstone compared himself and his last Government to Lady Burdett Coutts and Ashmead-Bartlett, "married to a man of a younger generation."[2] Such unions, besides provoking smiles, are rarely happy.

He must himself sometimes have felt that, like Tithonus, he had "passed beyond the goal of ordinance." At

Swansea in 1887 he spoke of his " deep sense of the violence done to nature in carrying on through old age, especially as it approaches extreme old age, a life of contention."[1] Yet he carried on for another seven years. There is no doubt that an intense love of power and office was a chief compelling cause. Labouchere humorously wrote to Chamberlain at the end of 1885 : " Gladstone already considers that he has been out for very long. He thought so a week after Salisbury came in." And again : " To get into power, I really believe that he would not only give up Ireland, but Mrs. G. and Herbert."

So Democracy was in some measure handicapped by having in Gladstone a leader who was nearly seventy-five when the Reform Act of 1884 consolidated Democracy's power, and who, thereafter lingering too long upon the stage, spent himself for years in a cause with which few, even of those colleagues who remained faithful to him, had any real sympathy. The rest—some of them men of advanced democratic views—left him, and the forces of " Progress " were split asunder and weakened for the next twenty years.

There were other elements in Gladstone which made him an unusual sort of champion of Democracy. First, he was an Oxonian, and intensely attached to his ancient University. This made him suspect to certain Liberals ; the Liberal Prince Consort, for instance, remarked that " as Mr. Gladstone was educated at Oxford, he could believe anything he chose." Throughout his life his deepest interest lay in Theology,[2] and he belonged to the High Church party of the Church of England. Miss Mary Gladstone, who invented many lively expressions, said that her uncle, Sir Stephen Glynne, was noted for " having the Churchums." Gladstone too, like many of his nearest friends, " had the Churchums." They belonged to " the finical and fastidious crew " of High Anglicans, as Disraeli scornfully termed them. He was described in 1851 as " a red-hot Puseyite " ; by his friend Clarendon as " the Jesuit." The truth is that he was an intensely earnest, conscientious, practising Christian, whose Churchmanship was greatly influenced by the Oxford Movement. " He will leave behind him," said Lord Salisbury, " the memory of a great Christian statesman."

On the Continent the men of the Left are not religious.

Theirs is the tradition of hatred of the Priest. *Le Cléricalisme, voilà l'ennemi!* But Gladstone saw the secular struggle not as between Capital and Labour, Wealth and Poverty, Privilege and Oppression, but as between Faith and Scepticism. "The real battle," he wrote to Mrs. Gladstone in April 1874, "is being fought in the world of thought, where already attack is being made, with great tenacity of purpose and over a wide field, upon the greatest treasure of mankind, the belief in God and the gospel of Christ."

But this was by no means "the real battle" as viewed by most of his political friends. Chamberlain was impatient of Gladstone's ecclesiastical preoccupations. He was not interested in his Tract on the Vatican decrees: "An ex-Minister of the first rank, who devotes his leisure to the critical examination of the querulousness of an aged priest, is hardly in sympathy with the robust commonsense of English Liberalism." Lord Acton reminded Gladstone that as Liberal leader he was "the pontiff of a church whose fathers are the later Milton and the later Penn, Locke, Bayle, Toland, Franklin, Turgot, Adam Smith, Washington, Jefferson, Bentham, Dugald Stewart, Romilly, Tocqueville, Channing, Macauley, Mill. These men and others like them disbelieved that doctrine established freedom."[1] It was, as Lord Bryce pointed out, difficult to reconcile Gladstone's "sacerdotal tendencies and his political liberalism." Bismarck disliked him because he was "the incarnation both in foreign and domestic policy of two political forces, both of which he detested equally—Clericalism and Democracy."[2]

And it may be added that in his religious views Gladstone was also separated from the Whigs. Those who wish to know what was "the Whig Religion" may find it described in *The Life of Lord Granville*, Vol. II, p. 154. The Whig Religion was intellectual and ethical, not sacerdotal.

He was equally separated from the Queen, who once remarked to him, "You know, I am not much of an Episcopalian," and who was the first Sovereign to communicate with the Scotch Kirk.

Secondly, his respect for the Throne was, for a democrat, unbounded. "He entered the presence," writes Viscount Gladstone, "with a reverence second only to his reverence when entering a church." Of the Queen he was ever a

champion, both on public occasions and in private conversation. Thus he told Dilke there were two things in which she never failed—her high good manners and her love of truth. "As usual," records Lord Rendel of a certain occasion, "he praised and defended the Queen."[1] At Hawarden, in the year of the first Jubilee, he expressed his special admiration for

(1) "her hearty concurrence in the work of public progress and improvement,"

(2) "the admirable public example which her life had uniformly set," and

(3) "her thorough comprehension of the true conditions of the great covenant between the Throne and the People."

In a Debate on the Royal Grant he voiced this feeling in stately phrases: "I am not ashamed to say that in my old age I rejoice in any opportunity which enables me to testify that, whatever may be thought of my opinions, whatever may be thought of my proposals in general politics, I do not forget the service which I have borne for so many years to the illustrious representative of the British Monarchy."[2] It is the speech of a devoted subject; and one cannot help favourably contrasting its manly tone with the Oriental compliments of Disraeli.

There was a time when Gladstone's relations with the Queen were cordial. At an interview soon after the Prince Consort's death, he sought to comfort her in her grief: Dean Wellesley told him, "You had most entered into her sorrows." According to Lord Morley, a reserve began to grow between them in 1871-2, principally because she resented the pressure he put on her to come out of her seclusion. She was furiously angry with him in 1871 because he proposed to move a Resolution that the Irish Viceroy should be non-political, with a view to the position being taken over by the heir to the Throne. But "personal animosity," says Viscount Gladstone, did not set in till 1876, the year of the Bulgarian Atrocities agitation. The Queen wrote to Princess Louise (November 1876): "Mr. Gladstone, who seems (as you say) to have taken leave of his reason." This animosity, writes Viscount Gladstone, was greatest in 1879-80 and in 1886. After February 1877 the Queen "had not a good word for him or—and this is important—for the Liberal Party." In 1880 the Queen

told Lord Beaconsfield that she never wrote to Gladstone except on formal official matters.[1]

It may be that, amongst other things, they differed about the position of the Prince of Wales. Gladstone wanted to employ the Prince. He condemned "the repressive relations of the Queen to the Prince—he called it in plain terms once 'jealousy.'" He thought the Queen should have allowed her son £50,000 a year for discharging her social duties for her.[2] Disraeli, on the other hand, has been accused of keeping the Prince in the background, lest he might share his influence with the Queen.[3] But the chief actions of Gladstone which gave offence to the Queen were undoubtedly his Bulgarian agitation and his advocacy of Home Rule for Ireland.

Viscount Gladstone says that the Queen's coldness towards his father "cut him to the heart." He goes so far as to state that, when writing about him, "her impartiality and accuracy were not to be relied upon." The simple fact is that the Queen firmly believed that Gladstone's policy was disastrous to the nation. She writes to Goschen (January 27th, 1886): "He will ruin the country if he can, and how much mischief has he not done already!" This was with reference to Home Rule. But, apart from any particular *measure*, she, the soul of straightforwardness, had long distrusted what she regarded as his tortuous and oblique *methods*. "The old stagers," wrote Dilke in 1882, "like Lord Granville and Mr. Gladstone, waste a good deal of their time on concocting stories for the Queen, who is too clever to be taken in by them, and always finds out exactly what they are doing." But let it not be forgotten that she gave Gladstone credit for good and sincere intentions, and so she wrote him (May 6th, 1886):

"In conclusion she wishes to add that she fully believes that Mr. Gladstone is solely actuated by the belief that he is doing what is best not only for Ireland but for the whole Empire." She wrote in her *Journal* after Gladstone's death: "He was very clever and full of ideals for the bettering and advancement of the country, always most loyal to me personally, and ready to do anything for the Royal Family; but alas! I am sure involuntarily, he did at times a great deal of harm. He had a wonderful power of speaking and carrying the masses with him."

On his side Gladstone could always be trusted to do

everything possible for the material advantage of the Royal House. He had no patience with Republican attacks on Royal expenditure. He was very angry with Dilke about his Motion for Civil List Returns in March 1872. Even his passion for economy was quenched, when it was a question of maintaining regal ceremony :

" I, however, must say . . . that I am averse to all economy which would not only affect the dignity, but which would impair the splendour of the Court. In a society constituted as this society is, the Court ought to be a splendid Court."

" He was far more of a Cavalier than a Roundhead," wrote Miss Mary Gladstone. " In everything except essentials a tremendous old Tory," was Balfour's judgment. (The qualification is rather important.)

Thirdly, this leader of Democracy had not the slightest feeling against Aristocracy ; on the contrary, he was strongly attracted by great English nobles. In this he resembled Disraeli, though he did not express his admiration in Disraeli's flowery language. He himself was of the middle class. The discerning and witty Emily Eden imputed " parvenuism " to him in his younger days. " Something in the tone of his voice and his way of coming into the room that was not aristocratic." Disraeli said he was " never a gentleman," but Disraeli said many hard things of Gladstone—as did Gladstone of Disraeli. But in his old age his manner must have been charming—" not merely good, but perfect, and those of a very great gentleman, somewhat of the old school."[1] " He was much the finest gentleman I ever met," said one who met him at Oxford in 1890.[2]

Dilke suggests that he showed " a Scotch deference to Aristocracy," and Lord Morley said it was curious that, " with the exception of Mr. Bright, he found his most congenial adherents rather among the patrician Whigs than among the men labelled as advanced." According to Bryce, his followers thought that he overvalued the political influence of " the great families." Perhaps he really liked Whigs for their position in the world. Rendel wrote of Gladstone's fondness for the Duke of Westminster and his brother, Lord Richard Grosvenor (Lord Stalbridge) :

" He knows and admits that neither of the brothers is

of any true personal importance apart from circumstances of birth and wealth. But he sincerely likes them both."

This reminds one of the Eighteenth-Century Duke of Newcastle's reason for promoting men of " great titles, great estates, great property," but " very little sense "—such men it may be very proper to employ in " offices where sense is not much wanted."

In 1886 Gladstone told the Queen " that his own opinions about hereditary Peerage are tolerated by a large part of the Liberal party as the pardonable superstition of an old man." He delighted Ruskin by saying, " I am a firm believer in the aristocratic principle—the rule of the best. I am an out-and-out *inequalitarian*." In the course of his Midlothian campaign, he paid an elaborate and stately compliment to the Duke of Buccleuch, the father of his opponent, Lord Dalkeith, and owner of 430,000 well-administered acres in eight Lowland Counties :

" I cannot forget that his long life has been spent in the most conscientious, laborious, indefatigable endeavours to perform every duty so far as his lights permitted him to discern them—every duty to his family, in his household, in his wide circle of friends, in his high position as a landlord, in the House of Lords, in fact, in every relation of life."[1]

This tribute may have been " Scotch deference to Aristocracy," but it has a pleasanter savour than Mr. Lloyd George's references to Dukes of about twenty years later.

Even when he turned against Aristocracy, and exalted the Masses as superior to the Classes, he never made a coarse or personal attack on any individual. He lamented, in fact, that there were no Dukes, (and only one Marquis), left in his Party, and was at pains to prove that they had deserted him *before* he took up the cause of Home Rule.

There was another matter in which Gladstone was at issue with Democracy, and that was public economy. Lord Rosebery has written of Lord Randolph Churchill's resignation in 1886 :

" He had made another mistake, he sincerely believed in the necessity of rigid economy ; so did Mr. Gladstone ; so did no one else. It is the great disappointment in connection with our new or renewed democratic bodies, parliamentary and municipal, that economy has no friends."

More and more, as he travelled towards the close of his career, must Gladstone, who as Liberal Chancellor of the Exchequer, had between 1860 and 1865 reduced the Income Tax from 9*d.* to 4*d.*, have realized his isolation as an economist. In 1885, when there were still in the Liberal Party admirers of thrift, Lord Acton wrote to him :

" You alone inspire confidence that what is done for the great masses shall be done with a full sense of economic responsibility." But, as the years went on, Gladstone must have felt his struggle for economy to be harder and harder. " Democracy," he told Lord Rendel, " is going to prove a very costly mistress." And at Newcastle (October 2nd, 1891) : " I name next a word that it requires courage to utter in these days—the word economy. It is like an echo from the distant period of my early life." Lord Morley, praising Gladstone for his economy, and for braving unpopularity for economy's sake, sadly admits that " Democracy is spendthrift." It was because he believed that the Naval Estimates were extravagant, that Gladstone finally resigned. What would he have thought of the modern theory, the fallacy of which has only been brought home to certain politicians by the bitterness of experience, that in the State is an almost bottomless reservoir of wealth to be drawn upon, with scarce any limitation, for the relief of poverty ?

Lord Robert Cecil[1] wrote of Gladstone in 1861, " he can only take a hearty interest in one question at one time." This is very true of his championship both of the Bulgarians and the Irish. In the Debates of 1867 " the souls of all the Compound Householders " seemed to have entered into him. In 1876 his zeal and fury on behalf of oppressed Bulgarians were far more intense. And he persuaded himself that all must share his feelings. Driving through London streets before dawn,

" I felt it to be an inspiring and a noble thought that in every one of these houses there were intelligent human beings, my fellow-countrymen, who when they woke would give many of their earliest thoughts, aye and some of their most energetic actions, to the terrors and sufferings of Bulgaria."

He was optimistic in assuming this universality of indignation, though amongst others Queen Victoria was " horrified at the details of the massacres."

It was a humane Englishman's hatred of cruelty that prompted his indignation, and also some sense of personal responsibility. Gladstone was a member of the Government that embarked upon the Crimean War, at the close of which the protection of Christians in Turkey was placed in the hands of five Powers including England.[1] But the Bulgarian Atrocities agitation was not for a democratic cause, it was rather on behalf of the principle of Nationality. The men who supported him on the platform were Professors like Freeman and J. R. Green, writers like Froude and Anthony Trollope ; High Churchmen like Dean Church and Canon Liddon—it was said that resentment against Disraeli's Ecclesiastical Bill impelled them to anti-Turkism ; Broad Churchmen like Stanley ; " innumerable parsons " (as Hartington said in a refusal to address a meeting), " the number of the latter on the list is quite enough for me " ; eminent Nonconformists. Disraeli described them as " the Hudibrastic crew of High Ritualists, Dissenting Ministers, and ' the great Liberal Party,' " also as " infuriate and merciless humanitarians." Then there were publicists like W. T. Stead, who joined in the agitation with an enormous admiration of Gladstone. His intervention, wrote Stead, was " like the descent of an Angel from Heaven." " The line of succession from Hereward to Gladstone was clear." And of the Blackheath meeting in September 1876, " The listener might have imagined that he was hearing the outpourings of one of the prophets who brought the message of Jehovah to the House of Israel." Stead gained no little glory for himself by his activity in this campaign. " What made me," he naïvely remarks, " was the Bulgarian Atrocities."

In addition Gladstone received great popular support. At Blackheath 10,000 persons stood in the rain to hear him. There, says Miss Mary Gladstone, " he gave vent to his boiling feelings. . . . He came back here in a blaze of glory." But in October the agitation weakened. The traditional British hatred of Russia proved stronger than sympathy with Bulgarians. It is quite possible that some of our democrats were under the impression that Bulgarian Atrocities were atrocities committed *by* Bulgarians. For the Bulgarians and Russians themselves were not models of humanity. Derby wrote to General Ponsonby : " I am afraid in this war there is not much to choose between the

two sides. We have not heard as yet of such a thing as a Turkish prisoner." Dilke warned his constituents of the autocracy and tyranny of Russia. He told them that Mouravieff and Kaufmann were as bad as Chefket Pasha, that the Russians also were known to flog women and massacre women and children. He said the Eastern Question ought not to be a party matter.

It is also to be noted that the Treaty of Berlin, the achievement of Disraeli, liberated eleven millions from Turkish rule, as Gladstone himself admitted.[1]

But, to the end of their lives, members of the Gladstone family felt strongly on the Eastern Question. Viscount Gladstone said that his father gave the country a lead that ought to have come from Lord Hartington. Mrs. Drew (Miss Mary Gladstone) made it her test for politicians; in her old age she commended Mr. Lloyd George because he was "sound on E.Q."

Next, what was the relation of Gladstone's prolonged Home Rule agitation to democratic progress? Home Rule, like the Bulgarian Atrocities affair, was a movement in favour of Nationalism, a movement of quite a different kind from the movements in support of a wider Franchise or Free Education or an Eight Hours Day or a Minimum Wage or a Capital Levy—movements such as now agitate, or have at different times agitated, Radicals and Socialists and Democrats.

It is not here necessary to discuss whether Gladstone suddenly advocated Home Rule because he wished to secure the Irish vote in order to confirm himself as the leader of British Democracy. Many well-known men, including politicians who were his supporters, had avowed Home Rule sentiments before the end of 1885. *Fuere fortes ante Agamemnona.* To begin with, Lord Morley; and Sir Edward Grey became a Home Ruler through reading Morley's articles in *The Pall Mall Gazette.* Stead "like John Morley, had been a Home Ruler, out and out, for years."[2] Dr. Pankhurst, the women's champion, made it part of his programme in the Manchester election of 1883; he was the first Liberal candidate to do so. Bradlaugh was a Home Ruler as early as 1873. J. R. Green was a Home Ruler long before Gladstone. So was Lord Acton: he wrote to Gladstone (August 4th, 1882): "With all my

heart I adopt your scheme, Reform, Dissolution, and then, let Politics make way for a still higher and worthier cause."[1] Mr. H. W. Paul, who wrote an Introduction to Acton's *Letters*, says that this meant Home Rule. Labouchere wrote in *The Fortnightly Review* (1884) : "If the Irish wish for Home Rule, why should they not have it?"[2] Home Rule must have been in the mind of the Tory Carnarvon, before Gladstone declared for it. In 1885 Randolph Churchill was said to be "the one pronounced opponent of Home Rule in the Tory Cabinet."[3]

The idea of Home Rule must have long been pondered by Gladstone. He wrote to the Queen in a characteristically guarded way (February 13th, 1882) : "Nothing can be more improbable than that Mr. Gladstone should ever be called upon to advise your Majesty, as a Minister, with reference to the subject known as Home Rule in Ireland," but he proceeded to point out the danger that might arise "should a decisive majority of the representatives of Ireland unitedly demand, on behalf of their country, the adoption of some scheme of Home Rule, which Parliament should be compelled to refuse." Viscount (then Mr. Herbert) Gladstone's address on Ireland at Leeds (February 12th, 1883) might well have been treated as an earlier "kite" from Hawarden, and, before 1885, Gladstone told his son that Ireland must be given a Parliament.

Between 1880 and 1885 Ireland had presented a terrible problem to Liberals who had been taught by Palmerston and Gladstone that it was England's duty to protect oppressed nationalities. Whether or not Ireland was oppressed, she was certainly coerced : for this purpose there were quartered upon her in the early 'Eighties 25,000 troops and 15,000 armed police. This could not be pleasing to Liberals. "Buckshot" Forster sat solitary on the Front Bench, vituperated by the Parnellites and deserted by his colleagues. He resigned. Lord Frederick Cavendish, his successor, sent to Dublin to inaugurate a different policy, was murdered. A Crimes Bill followed.

But if Home Rule were to be granted, what would be the fate of Ulster which was largely peopled by Nonconformists? And of the Protestants throughout the country? Even Lord Acton wrote (October 16th, 1887) : "It is not safe to commit a Protestant minority to such keeping. They would try to boycott them in detail, and take away their

institutions, and injure them in education, in appointments, socially, etc., etc. This peril ought to be provided against. No such provision is made by the Liberals, because they deny the danger." And of the Irish landlords? Campbell-Bannerman admitted to Lord Spencer (January 8th, 1886) that "no feasible or sufficient mode has been suggested of preventing the spoliation of the landlord under Home Rule." Chamberlain told Dilke (December 27th, 1885) that he would rather see the Tories in for the next ten years than "agree to what I think would be the ruin of the country." Gladstone's Irish Scheme was to him "death and damnation."

So Gladstone had to make his choice between the evils of Coercion and the perils of Home Rule. In 1885 the choice became all the more imperative; for the Reform Act of 1884 had increased the voters of Ireland from 200,000 to 800,000, and these had sent eighty-six Parnellites to Parliament. The House of Commons threw out his Home Rule Bill in 1886, and the Unionists came into power. But it is remarkable that between 1886 and the winter of 1890 the Gladstonians gained sixteen seats. They would probably have gone forward to a decisive victory at the polls with consequences difficult to calculate, had not Parnell's divorce case done them irremediable harm.

What measure of support did Gladstone receive in his Home Rule adventure? He incurred the strong displeasure of the Court. "Society"—the Aristocracy, the Landed Gentry, the Services, the Professions—was almost unanimously against him. In "Society" the very name of "Gladstonian" was a term of reproach, and Gladstonians were few and far between. There is a story in the *Life* of Lord Granville of a certain gentleman who said of a neighbour that he was certainly not a Home Ruler, as had been falsely reported, "because, you know, he is a gentleman."[1] "It cannot be pretended" (said Gladstone) "that we are supported by the dukes, or by the squires, or by the established clergy, or by any other body of very respectable persons."[2]

Lord Morley writes:

"Political differences were turned into social proscription. Whigs who could not accept the new policy were specially furious with Whigs who could. Great ladies purified their lists of the names of old intimates. Amiable magnates

excluded from their dinner-tables and their country-houses once familiar friends who had fallen into the guilty heresy, and even harmless portraits of the heresiarch were sternly removed from the walls. At some of the political clubs it rained blackballs."[1]

And Wilfrid Blunt observes of the Season of 1888 :

"Nothing can be conceived more dispiriting than the attempt at social entertainment made that spring in London by the few Liberal peers who had declared for Home Rule, unwilling followers of Gladstone."[2]

And, as for the intellectual classes, an eminent Nonconformist admitted that "there is no doubt an extraordinary consensus of opinion amongst the leaders of the intellectual world against Mr. Gladstone."[3]

"We are all against Gladstone's present policy," wrote Matthew Arnold to his sister (March 20th, 1886), "but the mass of middle-class Liberalism on which it relies is so enthusiastically devoted to him, and so ignorant, that I am not sure of his being frustrated till I see it happen." Gladstone's middle-class followers, of whom three quarters were probably Nonconformists, were always loyal to him, and especially when they saw him opposed by "the Classes." But what were the feelings of the working-class Liberals about Home Rule? This is a question difficult to answer. There was nothing democratically attractive about the Irish leader, who referred to his Parliamentary supporters as "my rabble" and to his position with regard to them as a "kingship." Parnell loathed appearing on a platform and every kind of publicity. The National Liberal Federation, which must be taken to have been in some degree representative of the Liberal working-man's opinions, declared for Gladstone, and Schnadhorst and Hudson were moved from Birmingham to London. A choice had to be made between Gladstone and Chamberlain, and Gladstone was still the man most indispensable to the Party. (Chamberlain however retained the mastery of his own Birmingham Caucus.) The astute Mr. Labouchere, a political realist, considered that "the electors may be divided into people who think about the question of Ireland, and those who don't." He cynically suggested that for "those who don't" a more material attraction might be found :—"for the latter a cow might be invented." And it was on an Amendment which, in effect, recommended that the

agricultural labourer should have a cow and three acres, that Gladstone's first Home Rule Administration came into power. "I would coerce the Irish," (wrote Labouchere) "grant them Home Rule, or do anything with them, in order to make the Radical progress possible. Ireland is but a pawn in the game."[1]

After the Irish split in 1890, the long Newcastle Programme was constructed which included many proposals more palatable to Democracy than Home Rule, Home Rule being in fact the powder in this Newcastle jam. In December 1892, when the Liberals were again in office, Morley told Sir Algernon West that none of the Ministers cared for Home Rule except Gladstone, Asquith and himself. Asquith's fondness for Home Rule was not lasting.

The fact that the Tories were in power for much the greater part of the twenty years that followed Gladstone's conversion, goes to show that Democracy cared little for Home Rule. And the absence of popular indignation, when the Lords threw out the Bill of 1893, is also significant.

Upon Irish gratitude Sir Algernon West makes a mournful comment: "It is sad to think, after all Mr. Gladstone did for Ireland, that they would not accept what we offered them for a monument in Dublin."

But though Gladstone spent himself and the energies of his Party on many causes which seem not to have had a direct democratic appeal—Irish Disestablishment, Home Rule, the protection of the Turk's oppressed subjects, and though he lingered too long upon the political stage, there can be no doubt about his having been a great democratic leader and hero. He was a devoted Monarchist; he was fond of his Whig Aristocrats; he was a High Churchman with ritualistic leanings; but for all that he was the idol of Nonconformists, and "the People's William."

He was sophistical and subtle and ambiguous, so much so that he was considered disingenuous. But he was also curiously simple. A very simple man, said Benjamin Jowett, "the simplest who has ever been in so exalted a station." Only a very simple man could have made this observation upon Parnell figuring as a co-respondent: "It surely cannot have been always thus; for he represented his diocese in the Church Synod." Dilke said that at a Cabinet meeting Harcourt described O'Shea as the husband

of Parnell's mistress; and Mrs. O'Shea, who had many interviews and a considerable correspondence with Gladstone, asserted that for ten years he had known of her intrigue with Parnell. But it is just as likely that Gladstone regarded her simply as the wife of O'Shea, who was also a recognised intermediary between Parnell and the Government. As for Harcourt's alleged description of O'Shea, Gladstone's ear—at the Cabinet and elsewhere—would certainly have been deaf to any conversation about illicit sexual relations.

The Democracy which he led was in a sense more serious and more restrained than the Democracy which was afterwards captivated for a time by Mr. Lloyd George; it was a Democracy whose aims could be idealistic and which was not yet wide-awake to all the possibilities of benefiting itself by taxing the rich and comfortable classes. The reforms he accomplished were not connected with "bread-and-butter-politics." Besides his Irish legislation and his Budgets his principal achievements were the Ballot, the Cheap Press, the Extension of the Suffrage, the Abolition of Church Rates and of Purchase in the Army, and the Education Act of 1870. The people looked to him, not as a dispenser of doles, but as their champion against Prerogative and Privilege, the House of Lords, the Church and the Squirearchy. He was for Liberty rather than for Democracy, which latter indeed is not always Liberty's friend. "I was brought up to distrust and dislike Liberty; I learned to believe in it. That is the key to all my changes." An individualist and economist, he recognised that his retirement marked the end of an era:

"Another period has opened and is opening still—a period possibly of yet greater moral dangers, certainly a great ordeal for those classes which are now becoming largely conscious of power, and never heretofore subject to its deteriorating influences. . . . Now is the time for the true friend of his country to remind the Masses that their present political elevation is owing to no principles less broad and noble than these—the love of liberty, of liberty for all without distinction of class, creed or country, and the resolute preference of the interests of the whole to any interest, be it what it may, of a narrower scope."[1]

A warning note indeed!

Chamberlain wrote to Dilke (April 1893): "Mr.

Gladstone has no real sympathy with the working-classes, and a perfect hatred for all forms of Socialism." Haldane made the same charge—that "he was not interested in newer ideas of social reform." It is true that he was not a Social Reformer in the sense that the Webbs are Social Reformers. He never became a statistical expert on Housing or Health or Employment; he would have fought to the last gasp against setting up new and expensive Ministries with large and costly staffs, in order to organize what are called Social Services. He sought rather, and as a religious duty, the reform of persons. He went out at night into the West End of London, and tried to reclaim the street-walkers. So that even in his contribution to social reform Gladstone was an individualist. "He will leave behind him," said Lord Salisbury in a valedictory speech, "the memory of a great Christian statesman." The methods of Socialism and Christianity are poles apart.

If popularity is the measure of greatness for a democratic leader, Gladstone was great indeed. He was known as "the People's William"[1] long before he received the title of "the Grand Old Man." On educated Liberals his serious, conscientious character made a deep impression. In the cartoons of *Punch* he is depicted as the weather-beaten Pilot, or the Captain of the ship of State, or as an Arthurian Knight in armour, unwearied in the strife; Disraeli often appears in the same paper as an acrobat or actor or conjuror. He was an Incorruptible. Mrs. O'Shea (Mrs. Parnell), who in the end had no reason for partiality, acknowledges that he "never to my knowledge of him all those years made an appointment from motives of private favour." Though he could earn considerable sums by his pen, he made it a strict rule to refuse all contributions to the Press whenever he was in office. This integrity of character made him *persona grata* to Nonconformists. Spurgeon wrote: "You do not know how those of us regard you, who feel it a joy to live when a Premier believes in righteousness." Dr. Clifford: "the hearer felt he was witnessing a fight for righteousness, for humanity, for God."

He had an extraordinary vogue with the working classes. "Thousands of humble people had his portrait on their walls, or a little plaster bust of him on their mantelpieces."[2] Elderly people can remember how frequently these used to be found in the cottages of Liberal working-men. Excur-

sionists came in crowds to Hawarden, "with umbrellas, haunting the house all day, hoping for a glimpse. They all go to Church and worship his seat." "In their desperate struggles to get near enough for one to touch his hand they simply seem as if they would give up body and soul for it."[1] They were allowed to watch him in his shirt sleeves felling trees, and begged for, even paid for, twigs therefrom as mementoes of the great statesman. Even the faithful Mr. Punch thought that all this detracted from his dignity :

> "Aught stagey you could never brook,
> But garments chucked at random
> And garnered chips—do they not look
> A little *ad captandum?*"[2]

His admirers, in fact, were as enthusiastic and as hysterical as the "fans" of a cinema star.

There were still more extraordinary schenes when he went on his oratorical tours—his "Pilgrimages of Passion," as Disraeli called them. Miss Mary Gladstone tells of "two miles of gigantic crowds all on tiptoe of excited rapture"; "the storm of mad enthusiasm was quite overpowering"; "the air shook and thrilled with frantic cheers"; "we were told the Queen has never had anything approaching to it"—and this would naturally not be very pleasing to her Majesty. One of these progresses (September 1876—January 1877) included Staindrop, Langton, Dundee, Berwick, Alnwick, Jervaulx Abbey, Castle Howard, Liverpool, Bristol, Wells, Taunton and Frome. At any station where his train stopped he would speak from the window of his carriage to admirers gathered on the platform. (On one occasion a Tory newspaper gleefully recorded that "the train whirled out of the station before its illustrious occupant had said all he intended to say.") After one Midlothian speech he "passed down rows of torch-bearers drawn up to illuminate the streets in his honour." Or again, "the route lay through the villages of Ratho, East Calder, West Calder, and Bell's Quarry, in all of which triumphal arches had been erected." At Gorebridge the ladies of Midlothian crowned him with flowers.

Lord Randolph Churchill, whom it ill became to criticize such triumphs—*Quis tulerit Gracchos*—said of Gladstone :

"He seats himself on thrones of green and gold in Leeds and Hull; he runs hastily after addresses in gold boxes,

proffered to him by obsequious and by servile Lord Mayors. . . . He is escorted through the streets by multitudes of well-drilled caucuses waving torches and shouting loud hosannas—and, like King Herod upon his throne, he may imagine that his glory is almost immortal."[1]

England had known nothing like it since the days of Sacheverell.[2]

Disraeli never went on the stump, and rarely even made a public speech ; even his severest critics[3] acquitted him of the charge of demagogy. Lord Salisbury refused all demands for speeches *en route*, when he was travelling. At Carlisle, in 1884, " he wouldn't so much as put his head out of the window, but sat touching his hat with a ghastly grin in the furthest corner—and it was that dreadful old travelling wideawake ! " In June 1885, when travelling to visit the Queen, he took refuge in a third class carriage.[4] But he was obliged to have recourse to platform oratory. Between 1880 and 1886 he spoke more than seventy times to audiences of thousands.[5] Democracy had begun to insist that eminent public men should be both seen and heard. But neither Salisbury, nor any other statesman of the later Victorian era, lent himself to political advertising as did Gladstone ; in this art (as Churchill truly said) the old man excelled Holloway, Colman and Horniman.

But if Gladstone was worshipped, he was also detested. Of the violence of that detestation only those who lived in his day can have any conception ; and it was shown mainly by " the Classes." " The Classes " in the end had good reason for hating him. This hate began in Palmerston's time, when he declared for Universal Suffrage. Irish Disestablishment, the Abolition of Army Purchase, the Ballot and other measures of his first Administration accentuated it ; the surrender after Majuba and the death of Gordon inflamed it. But with Home Rule this hate became furious.

Did he also excite a personal hate ?

Gladstone's character had two sides, and it was said that each in turn might be reflected in his countenance. " It was a contenance " (wrote Lecky) " eminently fitted to express enthusiasm, pathos, profound melancholy, commanding power and lofty disdain ; there were moments when it could take an expression of intense cunning, and it often darkened into a scowl of passionate anger."[6] Lecky also says that " he had a wonderful eye, a bird of prey eye—fierce,

luminous and restless." It is curious that this eye made the same impression on Mrs. Parnell (then Mrs. O'Shea): "How like a beautiful bird of prey the old man was, with the piercing, cruel eyes belying the tender, courteous smile, and how, relentless as an eagle, men like this had struck and torn their victims!"[1] Then Lecky says that vindictiveness was "a quality by no means wanting to his nature." Disraeli, too, accused him of vindictiveness; and Manning said Gladstone was the most revengeful man he ever knew.[2]

This ruthlessness broke out against all those who baulked his policy—especially his efforts to pass Home Rule. The frustration of these efforts drove him more and more into the path of the Demagogue. We can certainly agree with Lecky that "the Demagogue in his nature steadily grew."

Long before his advocacy of Home Rule, Gladstone began to feel a political antipathy to "the Classes." During his anti-Turk activities he wrote to Madame Novikoff (October 17th, 1876) that the Metropolitan Press was "in the main representative of the ideas and opinions of what are called The Upper Ten Thousand. From this body there has never on any occasion within my memory proceeded the impulse that has prompted, and finally achieved, any of the great measures which in the last half century have contributed so much to the fame and happiness of England." It was a charge against him that he was the first statesman to use the platform for political purposes. Viscount Gladstone defends him on the ground that the larger electorate of 1868 made the platform a necessity; he also maintains that the agitations which Gladstone encouraged were spontaneous. In his 15th Midlothian speech (Pathead, March 23rd, 1880) he complained of the zeal and unity of the Conservative Party—"a very grave state of matters. We must fall back upon the broad, the incorruptible power of natural liberty; that we decline to recognize any class whatever, be they peers or be they gentry, be they what you like, as entitled to direct the destinies of this nation against the will of the People." At West Calder (April 2nd, 1880) he told his hearers that there were ranged against them the Aristocracy, the Clergy of the Established Churches of England and Scotland, Wealth, Rank and Close Corporations.

A few months afterwards (August 9th, 1880) Granville

was impressing upon the Queen that "it has been a great blessing to the country, and a great support to the country, that the Liberal Party has always had so large a portion of the peers and country gentlemen identified with it." But, towards the end of his Ministry (July 14th, 1884), Gladstone wrote to her that "he perceived with pain that the tendency of the House of Lords to separate from the People becomes very marked with the lapse of years." The Queen at once sensed the underlying assumption that the People were always right and the Lords were always wrong, and she replied that "the existence of an independent body of men acting solely for the good of the country, and free from the terror which forces so many Commoners to vote against their conscience, is an element of strength in the State, and a guarantee for its welfare and freedom." She sarcastically suggested that Gladstone might like to have a Radical House of Lords, to complete his Radical House of Commons, and pass all his Radical measures. About this time she was bitterly complaining of his stump oratory, "so unworthy of his position—almost under her very nose." Gladstone had tactlessly made an oration at Ballater.

But in the Home Rule campaign the opposing hosts became more and more Plebeian and Patrician. The line that separated the Parties grew much more horizontal, and much less vertical. Gladstone, most unreasonably, threw the blame on Hartington for the severance of its aristocratic and landowning section from the Liberal Party. "He had vitiated his traditions and injured the cause of his own order." But Hartington was singularly faithful to his Whig traditions. Gladstone lamented that the Liberals had now only some forty Peers, and only a very few of them—Breadalbane, Hothfield, Spencer—were large landowners, "in fact, probably nine out of ten acres in the United Kingdom were now in Tory hands." (This divorce of Land from Liberalism was a sign of the times; at the time of the 1832 Reform Bill the Whigs were believed to be bigger landowners than the Tories). Gladstone now became more and more severe on his enemies the Classes, both on the platform and in the House of Commons:—

"The adverse host consists of Class and the dependents of Class." (May 1st, 1886.)

"We do not undervalue or despise the forces opposed to us. I have described them as the forces of Class and its

dependents. You have power, you have wealth, you have rank, you have station, you have organization. What have we? We think we have the People's heart." (House of Commons, June 7th, 1886.) "You are opposed throughout the country by a compact army, and that is a combination of the Classes against the Masses." . . . "The resolute banding of the great, and the rich, and the noble, and I know not who, against the true genuine sense of the People." (Liverpool, June 28th, 1886.)

But the Masses, the great majority of Great Britain and Ireland, in 1886, 1895, and 1900, and the majority of Great Britain in 1892, these repositories of Truth, Justice and Humanity, voted against him and Home Rule.

As for Queen Victoria, she wrote that she was "sorry that Mr. Gladstone repeats the cry against the wealthy and educated classes of the country, which does not appear to rest on any foundation."[1]

His last speech in the House of Commons (March 1st, 1894) was a warning to the House of Lords, which had made serious Amendments to the Government's Parish Councils Bill. He spoke of the differences between the two Houses, "differences not of a temporary or casual nature merely, but differences of conviction, differences of prepossession, differences of mental habit, and differences of fundamental tendency." And he ended this swan-song on a truly democratic note :

"The issue which is raised between a deliberative assembly, elected by the votes of more than 6,000,000 people, and a deliberative assembly occupied by many men of virtue, by many men of talent, of course with considerable diversities and varieties, is a controversy which, when once raised, must go forward to an issue."

The issue was reached seventeen years later.

How was it that Gladstone, a scholar, a Churchman, a landowner who emphasized "the general duty to promote the permanence of families having estates in land," came to make these attacks upon Birth, Wealth, Land, Education, and Church Establishments? He really believed, or persuaded himself, that the Many had sounder and juster political instincts than the Few. But the intensity of this belief was in part due to his anger at being unable to pass his Bills ; for he was avid of power. As he rushed from

platform to platform, received everywhere with deafening applause, did he realize, towards the close of his career, whither he was tending? By the Ballot and the Franchise he had cleared the way for the activities of Democracy; but would he have applauded all those activities, if he had survived to witness them?

He denounced the House of Lords, for, in his view, the six millions were fitter to decide than the six hundred. The six millions were to have the power. Was he quite sure they would use it wisely? We were entering on a period, he admitted, "possibly of yet greater moral dangers, certainly a great ordeal for those classes *which are now becoming largely conscious of power*, and never heretofore subject to its deteriorating influences." A testing time was coming for those whom he had set free to

> "Rise, like lions, out of slumber,
> "In unvanquishable number."

Would Gladstone, for instance, have voted for Old Age Pensions and Payment of Members? The latter he had had to swallow, with Local Veto and Scotch and Welsh Disestablishment, as an item of the Newcastle Programme; but he had swallowed with a wry face. He must have realized, in his old age, that Democracy was about to enter upon perilous, certainly upon expensive adventures.

If he was dubious about the tendencies of British Democracy, did he understand whither the *world* was tending? "A Liberal leader," wrote Matthew Arnold, "should see clearly how the world is going, what our modern tendencies and needs really are, and what is routine and fiction in that which we have inherited from the past. . . . His (Gladstone's) perception and criticism of modern tendencies is fantastic and unsound, as his criticism of Homer is fantastic and unsound,[1] or his criticism of Genesis." In other words, he was a visionless mediævalist—"spiritually rooted in the past."[2]

"Not a statesman properly so-called," wrote Matthew Arnold, "but an unrivalled publicity leader and manager." But to manage men, and wield the weapon of publicity, are necessary for a democratic leader. These talents irritate the cultured, and Gladstone had many such bitter critics in his day. The present generation cannot realize how violently the Classes hated him and how fervently the Masses

adored him; but it disclaims any illusions about his greatness:

"He stands revealed, it is true, for that which he was; an austere and formidable machine, a kindly master of intolerable platitudes, with a genius for finding the inevitable phrases in which to clothe the most banal thoughts, albeit his sentiments were invariably expressed with an appearance of pompous sincerity that seems now to have been imbued with an underlying and perhaps unconscious hypocrisy."[1]

Shades of Morley and Rendel! But even this estimate, so typically modern in its irreverence, unconsciously pays tribute to Gladstone's democratical power. To be "formidable," to be a "machine," to be a master of "inevitable phrases," and to be able to convince your hearers of your sincerity—all these faculties are useful, if not indispensable, to political leaders. And on platforms even platitudes sometimes come not amiss.

But there was more than this in Gladstone. He was more than a master of phrases and of platitudes, more than a formidable machine. For good or for evil he was a tremendous force that actuated British politics for the greater part of two generations. It may be that he himself scarcely realized the consequences of the passions he excited; but there was something great and heroic in his composition.

NOTES TO
GLADSTONE AND DEMOCRACY

Page 27.

[1] *Gladstone as Economist and Financier* (F. W. Hirst). Since this chapter was written there has also been published more of Gladstone's correspondence with the Queen.

Page 28.

[1] Disraeli's biographer, Mr. Buckle, said of Gladstone's retirement in 1874 that "all from which he retired, after the first few months, was the leadership." In 1874 he attacked the Scotch Patronage Bill, in 1875 Northcote's Sinking Fund proposals, in 1876 the Suez Canal Scheme and the Imperial Titles Bill. Sir Henry Lucy described him in February, 1876, as "uncommonly regular in his attendance at the House" and "singularly ready to fling himself into debate." (Disraeli's *Life*, Vol. VI, pp. 55-6).

Page 29.

[1] *A Victorian Peep-Show* (E. F. Benson), p. 104.

[2] *Private Diaries of Sir Algernon West*, p. 255.

Page 30.

[1] Now Mrs. Sidney Webb.

[2] Sir Algernon West's *Private Diaries*, p. 351.

Page 31.

[1] In 1892 he told Rosebery, "I am simply waging a daily and hourly battle against Nature" (Rosebery's *Life*, Vol. II, p. 397).

[2] His biographer, on the other hand, was "a man to whom all the problems, the ideas, the literature of religion are indifferent and unknown" (*Letters of Lord Acton to Mary Gladstone*, p. 179).

Page 32.

[1] Morley's *Gladstone*, Vol. III, p. 361.

[2] Granville's *Life*, Vol. II, p. 208.

Page 33.

[1] *The Personal Papers of Lord Rendel*, p. 78.

[2] *House of Commons*, July 25th, 1889.

Page 34.

[1] Gladstone on his part "regarded the Queen's reign as an admirable one up to 1874 and as having after 1880 suffered marked and permanent change." After 1880 "she looked more and more abroad and to her Continental and Imperial position and relations." (*The Personal Papers of Lord Rendel*, p. 147).

[2] *The Personal Papers of Lord Rendel*, p. 138.

[3] *The Tragedy of King Edward the Seventh* (W. H. Edwards), p. 78.

Page 35.

[1] Lord Rendel gives this as the opinion of the best judges (*Personal Papers*, p. 48).

[2] Those who, as undergraduates, heard the lecture he gave on Homer at the Union during this visit, will not easily forget the impression he made of dignity and wisdom.

Page 36.

[1] At Corstorphine, March 18th, 1880. He, however, then did pick a little quarrel with his Grace about faggot-voters.

Page 37.
[1] Lord Robert Cecil became Lord Cranborne on the death of his brother in 1865, and succeeded his father as 3rd Marquis of Salisbury in 1868.

Page 38.
[1] *The Personal Papers of Lord Rendel*, p. 64.

Page 39.
[1] *Fifty Years of Parliament* (The Earl of Oxford and Asquith), Vol. I, p. 51.
[2] *Life of W. T. Stead* (Frederic Whyte), Vol. I, p. 217.

Page 40.
[1] *Letters of Lord Acton to Mary Gladstone*, p. 126.
[2] *Radicals and Whigs* (*The Fortnightly Review*, February, 1884).
[3] *After Thirty Years*, p. 402.

Page 41.
[1] Granville's *Life*, Vol. II, p. 494.
[2] At Liverpool, June 28th, 1886. But he claimed some support from what he called "the open professions," Medicine and the Bar.

Page 42
[1] *Life of Gladstone*, Vol. III, p. 321. "The political ostracism over Home Rule began all over again in 1914." (*The Autobiography of Margot Asquith*, p. 139).
[2] *My Diaries*, Vol. I.
[3] *Mr. Gladstone and the Irish Bill, a Nonconformist View* (Revd. J. Guinness Rogers, *Nineteenth Century*, June, 1886).

Page 43.
[1] Labouchere to Chamberlain, March 31st, 1886 (*Life of Labouchere*, A. L. Thorold), p. 290.

Page 44.
[1] Letter to Sir John Cowan, March 17th, 1894 (Morley's *Life*, Vol. III, p. 535).

Page 45
[1] Carlyle refers disparagingly to "People's William" in 1870. (*Life in London*, Vol. II, p. 399). At least three persons have claimed to be the inventors of the title "Grand Old Man"—Bradlaugh, Labouchere and Sir Stafford Northcote.
[2] *The Public Life* (J. A. Spender), Vol. II, p. 76.

Page 46.
[1] *Mary Gladstone* (*Diaries and Letters*, pp. 125, 325).
[2] *The Talking Oak* (*Punch*, June 14th, 1884).

Page 47.
[1] *Speeches*, Vol. I, p. 52.
[2] Sir Edward Carson created as intense an enthusiasm in the North of Ireland in 1914. "Crowds followed him muttering prayers for his preservation; women kissed his hand and held children up to him to touch them against illness." (R. D. B.'s *Diary*, 1887-1914, p. 240).
[3] Bryce, for instance (*Studies in Contemporary Biography*, p. 68).
[4] *Life*, Vol. III, p. 135.
[5] *Ib.*, p. 3.
[6] Introduction to *Democracy and Liberty*.

Page 48.
[1] *Charles Stewart Parnell*, Vol. I, p. 275.
[2] Disraeli writes to Lady Bradford (February 1st, 1878): "I am glad you had time to read Gladstone's speech. What an exposure! The mask has fallen, and, instead of a pious Christian, we find a vindictive fiend." There is a rather baleful portrait of Gladstone in one of the volumes of Queen Victoria's *Letters*.

Page 50.

[1] *Letters of Queen Victoria*, 3rd Series, Vol. I, p. 154. Gladstone wrote to the Queen of his 1892 majority that it was "returned against the sense of nearly the entire Peerage and Landed Gentry, and of the vast majority of the upper and leisured classes." The Queen replied: "He seems to condemn the powerful social circle, to whom his views are imperfectly known, for opposing him in their ignorance" (*Ib.*, Vol. II, pp. 173, 181).

Page 51.

[1] Jowett's opinion of Gladstone as a Homeric scholar was expressed with his usual acidity: "Gladstone has six theories about Homer; they are impossible singly and mutually destructive of each other, but he holds them all." (*Herbert Warren of Magdalen*, p. 99).

[2] *The Nadir of Liberalism* (*Nineteenth Century*, May, 1886).

Page 52

[1] Preface to *Victoriana* (Margaret Barber and Osbert Sitwell).

THE LIBERAL PARTY

" The British Liberal Party came into being in 1868 for the purpose of preventing stagnation. Its aim was to adapt the British system to the needs of the nineteenth century. . . . Its aim was to hasten the process of transforming Oligarchy (the rule of a few) into Democracy (the rule of the many)."—Hamilton Fyfe, *The British Liberal Party*.

What is Liberalism ?—Liberalism of Gladstone, Morley, Acton, Chamberlain, Campbell-Bannerman, Chamberlain, Mr. Lloyd George—Intellectuals mostly Liberals—Radicals—Republicans—Liberal " Programmes "—The Parliament of 1868—Education—The New Press and the newly-educated—The Parliament of 1880—Bradlaugh and the Oath—The Dilke-Chamberlain Alliance—The Caucus—Liberal Disunion after 1880—The Home Rule split—Harcourt v. Rosebery—Rosebery, Harcourt and Morley retire—The Liberal League—Reunion on Free Trade—Tory discipline contrasted.

At political meetings one often hears an orator exalt in glowing words " those great principles to which we are all attached." Generally a cheer follows, because people like to feel that they are supporters of great principles, and then there is a vagueness about the phrase which commits them to nothing definite. And no doubt thousands of ardent Liberals so cheered during the administrations of Gladstone and Rosebery and Campbell-Bannerman and Asquith, and the periods when they were in opposition. What then were the principles that animated these Liberals, and how far were they clearly defined in the minds and in the speeches of their professors ? In other words, what *was* Liberalism, and especially Gladstonian Liberalism ? For Gladstone's Liberalism was a distinct advance upon the Whig-Liberalism that preceded it. He " made Liberalism a working principle, and created the Liberal Party as it existed from the year 1868 onwards."[1]

Gladstone, in his Midlothian campaign, claimed that " emancipation and enfranchisement have been the mottoes of the Liberal Party ; progress qualified by prudence ; trust in the People above all, qualified only by avoidance of violent change,"[2] also that " the Liberal Party has striven for equality of civil privilege " irrespective of religious professions."[3] He likewise claimed that the forty-eight millions of America, and the enormous majority of the

people of Christendom favoured the action of the Liberal Party,[1] and this must have made an impression upon the 2,947 voters of Midlothian. The principal point of his Midlothian speeches was that Liberalism stood for righteousness. In 1889, at his Golden Wedding celebration in the National Liberal Club, he said :

" An internal and undying energy belongs to the cause itself : and you may rest assured that, under the favour of Providence, as it has advanced, so it will advance, and generation after generation will be its rejoicing witnesses." Five years later, in a letter of farewell to his constituents, he wrote of his sixty years of public life, as

" A great legislative and administrative period—perhaps, on the whole, the greatest in our annals. It has been predominantly a history of emancipation—that is of enabling man to do his work of emancipation, political, economical, social, moral, intellectual."[2]

Gladstone's Liberalism was also extra-national. He recognized the Soudan Dervishes as " a people rightly struggling to be free." The Afghan made the same appeal : " Remember that the happiness of his humble home, remember that the sanctity of life in the hill villages of Afghanistan among the winter snows, is as inviolate in the eye of Almighty God as can be your own."[3] Lord Morley used " the mighty word " (Liberalism) " in its large, far-spreading, continental sense." Characteristically he dates its history back to the French Revolution of 1830 ; Gladstone to the English Reform Bill of 1832. The connection between these two events was probably not so present to Gladstone's mind as it would have been to Morley's. To Morley Liberalism meant respect for the dignity and worth of the individual ; pursuit of social good against class or dynastic interest ; the subjection to human judgment of all claims of external authority ; in law-making it attends to the higher characteristics of human nature ; in executive administration it does not forget mercy, " though judge, gaoler, and perhaps the hangman will be indispensable."[4]

There were men of great eminence who almost worshipped Liberalism. To Lord Acton, the profoundly learned friend of Gladstone (of whom Matthew Arnold said that " Gladstone influences all around him but Acton ; it is Acton who influences Gladstone "), Liberalism was " the beginning of real religion, a condition of interior Catholic-

ism." To Acton Politics was a branch of Moral Science ; and he believed that the progress of Democracy, though not constant, was certain. Anthony Trollope, in *The Prime Minister*, depicts the Duke of Omnium[1] as a perfect lover to Liberalism : "You are a Liberal" (says the Duke to Phineas Finn) "because you know that all is not as it ought to be, and because you would still march on to some nearer approach to equality, though the thing itself is so great, so glorious, so god-like—nay, so absolutely divine, that you have been disgusted by the very promise of it, because its perfection is unattainable."

These were idealists, and in the Liberal Party there was no lack of idealists, noble-minded men who were ready to make every sort of personal sacrifice--ease, leisure, study and sport, social popularity, fortune, professional ambition—for the sake of this ideal ; for Liberalism which meant Liberty, Progress and an increase of general well-being.

To Joseph Chamberlain, who first became known through his municipal activities at Birmingham, Liberalism was an instrument for securing practical benefits for his fellow-citizens—benefits that cost money. His motto was "High rates and a healthy city." In his celebrated "Ransom" speech at Birmingham (January 5th, 1885) he said : "How to promote the greater happiness of the masses of the people, how to increase their enjoyment of life, that is the problem of the future." He remained a Benthamite to the end. In his very last speech (July 9th, 1906) he applauded "the great Radical aspiration, 'the greatest happiness of the greatest number'—that is what we desire." In his earlier days he made no concealment as to how he interpreted this aspiration. He told Miss Beatrice Potter (Mrs. Sidney Webb), "My aim in life is to make life pleasanter to the great majority ; I do not care if it becomes in the process less pleasant for the well-to-do minority."

Of Campbell-Bennerman Asquith said in a funeral oration : "He had no misgivings as to the future of democracy. He had a single-minded and unquenchable faith in the unceasing progress and the growing unity of mankind." (House of Commons, April 27th, 1908.)

Asquith himself defined Liberalism as "the preservation and extension of liberty in every sphere of our national life, and the subordination of class interests to the interests of the

community."[1] The Liberal Party is "the principal organ and instrument of political and social progress."[2]

According to Mr. Lloyd George, "the tradition of Liberalism is to help the lowly and stand up to the mighty when they abuse or misdirect their power."[1]

Palmerston said that what every man, and every woman, had a right to, was to be governed under just laws. But Palmerston was now dead, and his death was the end of a chapter. From the definitions and glorifications of Liberalism above quoted it may be gathered that, down to about the retirement of Gladstone, the word stood first of all for a love of liberty. Liberty was bound up with the extension of the Franchise; a corollary of the Franchise was the Ballot, which was believed by many Tories to be incompatible with Monarchical institutions. International friendship, and the championship of backward races (especially if they were subjects of the Queen), were parts of the creed. Privilege of every kind was to be abolished—a presage of danger to the House of Lords. Trust in the people was a cardinal article of the faith—government "of, for and by the people." "Popular government," said Asquith *ore rotundo*, "is in our view the best and the only hopeful means by which the organized action of the community can achieve social progress." "Emancipation" was embroidered on the Liberal standard—"emancipation," said Gladstone, "that is enabling man to do his work of emancipation" (a definition rather like Bardolph's definition of "accommodation").[3] Liberalism meant legal and administrative reform, and a greater humanity in executive government; it stood for great faith in Democracy, which was to take a notable part in promoting Progress, and generally hastening on a sort of Golden Age. It was still an individualist creed except for the municipal Socialism of Chamberlain, whose doctrine that the rich should pay a "ransom" for their wealth caused an alarm far more intense than was excited twenty years later by Mr. Lloyd George's Limehouse outburst.

At the end of this period, Liberty having been ensured, more material objects were aimed at. "Man's inalienable right to the pursuit of happiness" began to be claimed. The giant Demos was emancipated, and Gladstone himself was a little doubtful as to how the giant would behave.

Would he gratefully co-operate, and co-operate *economically*? Or might he not be vengeful for his long slavery? Chamberlain once, while expounding his Unauthorized Programme, quoted a grim verse:

"There was a poor blind Samson in the land,
Shorn of his strength, and bound in chains of steel,
Who may in some grim revel raise his hand,
And shake the pillars of our commonweal."

Chamberlain did not enter the House of Commons till 1876. In 1868, writes Dilke's bigrapher, the Liberal Party still "consisted mainly of that governing class which Lord Melbourne had in mind when he said that 'every English gentleman is qualified to hold any post which he has influence enough to secure.' This element was accompanied by a fair sprinkling of manufacturers and other business men, for the most part Nonconformists."[1] The writer gives, perhaps, too much predominance to the Whigs, a separate and aristocratical wing of the Liberal Party, who acted together and always considered themselves entitled to a share of office disproportionate to their numbers. They hated the Radicals, and were hated by them; and they disliked and suspected Gladstone who was the first non-Whig leader of the Liberal Party. In the 1868 Parliament, and during Disraeli's administration (1874-1880), the Whigs were often discontented, and in 1880 their defections began; in 1886, over Home Rule, they broke up completely and ceased to exist as a political force. The Nonconformists were numerous, and powerful in the Party; many of them were very wealthy. There were also, in and out of Parliament, the literary and philosophical Liberals—Grote, Spenser, Mill,[2] Fawcett, Morley. In 1868 E. A. Freeman unsuccessfully stood for Somersetshire, and Anthony Trollope for Beverley. Matthew Arnold must be classed as a Liberal and Gladstone gave him a pension; but he frequently attacked Gladstone with his pen, and he was attracted and complimented by Disraeli;[3] of Liberal Nonconformity he was a merciless critic. Generally speaking, the British *intelligentsia* of the 'Sixties, 'Seventies and 'Eighties was Liberal in politics.

In 1868 the Radicals in the House of Commons were still looked on askance as dangerous extremists. Dilke acted with them on becoming a Member, their interests being urban and Nonconformist. Prominent amonst them were

Peter Rylands (Warrington), Henry Richard (Merthyr Tydvil), George Anderson (Glasgow), Llewellyn Dillwyn (Swansea). Sir William Harcourt and Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice were also classed as Radicals, but they had great Whig connections; Harcourt at times acted as an anti-Radical Whig. Some Radicals, including Dilke and Peter Taylor, were theoretical Republicans. In 1880 Dod classified as Radicals Chamberlain, Sir Wilfrid Lawson, Dilke, Bradlaugh, Stansfeld, T. B. Potter and Burt. When Dilke, Fawcett, Chamberlain, Mundella and Courtney had all accepted office, Lawson described himself as "the last of the Radicals." He must have forgotten Labouchere who, in a later year, boasted that he himself was the real leader of the Radical Party. Labouchere was a Radical *sui generis*, for English Radicalism rested mainly on humanitarian sentimentalism; Labouchere's was a French brand, based on Reason.[1] He was the *gamin* of the Liberal Party, and a curious ally for strict and staid Nonconformists. In the 'Sixties his headquarters were at Evans' Hotel, Covent Garden. In his younger days he had "starred" in an American circus as "the Bounding Buck of Babylon," wearing pink tights and a fillet round his head. He had also proved his courage by fighting a duel. He was quite without reverence for Gladstone; "you have to get up a cheer for the G.O.M. by dwelling upon his noble heart and that sort of trash"—"the public do not know the object of their adoration as we do"—"but when did our venerable friend ever take the direct method?" etc., etc. He regarded Gladstone as Martin Chuzzlewit regarded Mr. Pecksniff.

There were also "Labour" men in the Party, Burt, Broadhurst, William Abraham ("Mabon"), Alexander Macdonald; they voiced the working-man, and especially the miner, but were classed as Liberals.

All these—Whigs, Liberals, Radicals, Labourites, Republicans—took common shelter under what was known fifty years ago as "The Grand Old Man's Umbrella."

In the early 'Seventies a certain amount of Republican feeling manifested itself in the country. It was said to have been stirred up by French Communist refugees, and partly to have arisen from sympathy with the French Republic. About this time Queen Victoria was unpopular. She persisted in her secluded life, and was believed to be unduly interfering in foreign affairs. Dilke and Chamberlain came

out as Republicans, and in after years their record of Republican utterances proved embarrassing to both. Queen Victoria pleasantly remarked that, when Dilke was a little boy, "she remembered having stroked his head, and supposed she had stroked it in the wrong way." He may have contracted the sentiment in Chelsea. "We were all Republicans in Chelsea when young Charlie Dilke came among us first," said an old supporter. At Newcastle, in 1871, Dilke lectured about the Queen's savings and her immunity from Income Tax. "If you can show me," he said, "a fair chance that a Republic here will be free from the political corruption that hangs about the Monarchy, I say, for my part—and I believe that the middle classes in general will say—let it come!" Chamberlain wrote that he had read this speech "with interest and agreement. . . . The Republic must come, and, at the rate at which we are moving, it will come in our generation." Dilke opposed the dowry of Princess Louise (Duchess of Argyll) and the annuity of Prince Arthur (Duke of Connaught). He was known as "Citizen Dilke."[1] In the House of Commons, on March 19th, 1872, in moving for Civil List Returns, he had to apologize for having implied that the Queen did not pay Income Tax.[2] *Punch* made great fun of this speech and of Dilke's aristocratic supporters; in *Punch* (February 24th, 1877) Dilke is depicted wearing a Phrygian cap. When Dilke took office in 1880, Gladstone had to explain to the Queen that these Republican views "did not affect the old-established Monarchies, but only new States, like those in America, or like France, where there was no longer anyone to look to," and Dilke reassured Granville in the same strain with a reference to the constitutional behaviour of "the illustrious occupant of the Throne," which was no doubt reported to the proper quarter. On becoming President of the Local Government Board and a Cabinet Minister, in 1882, Dilke made a further recantation: "There were opinions of political infancy which, as one grew older, one might regard as unwise or might prefer not to have uttered."

In 1871 both Chamberlain and Fawcett were members of Republican clubs. In those days Chamberlain had rather a dire repute as a provincial Republican. But in November 1874, while he was Mayor of Birmingham, the Prince and Princess of Wales came there to a civic luncheon,

and the Mayor's speeches were "couched in a tone of courteous homage, manly independence, and gentlemanly feeling." Mr. Punch reported:

"Republican Mr. Chamberlain, the Mayor of the City of Hardware,
Like a gentleman he comported himself in this glare of the Princely sun;
He said just what he ought to have said, and he done what he ought to have done;
He put his red cap in his pocket and sat on his Fortnightly article,[1]
And of Red Republican claws and teeth displayed not so much as a particle."[2]

Two and twenty years later the Prince, who with W. T. Stead was being entertained to lunch by Lady Warwick (a curiously-assorted trio), recalled this Birmingham visit: "I remember him when I went down to Birmingham, he was then Mayor and a terrific Socialist then, quite the kind of man whom, if you mentioned his name at a dinner-table, it was like as if you talked of Tom Mann or someone like that. Yes, but he was very nice, and we got on very well; they think no end of him at Birmingham."[3]

When Chamberlain took office in 1880, Gladstone had to make the same sort of apology for him to the Queen as in Dilke's case. He assured her that she would like him "as he was very pleasing and refined in feelings and manners," and that he had never spoken against her or the Royal Family, or had expressed Republican views. (Here Gladstone must have been misinformed.) The Queen co-operated with Dilke on the Housing question; in the discussion of foreign affairs she found him a welcome relief to Granville. With Chamberlain also she got on well. She was very angry at a stupid and tactless remark he made at Birmingham in 1883, at the celebration of John Bright's twenty-five years service as a Member of Parliament for the City—"at the Birmingham festivities there were no Royalists, and no one had missed them." But in 1884 she finds Mr. Chamberlain "very sensible and very reasonable about the question of Egypt, which he thought most distressing and almost hopeless. I think him decidedly pleasant and more unobtrusive in manner than Sir Charles Dilke." In 1887, on a visit to Birmingham, she was pleased,

and surprised, at demonstrations of loyalty " in that very Radical place, amongst such a very rough population."

Auberon Herbert declared himself a Republican when supporting Dilke's Civil List Motion in 1872. He was a Republican of aristocratic descent—educated at Eton and Oxford, an officer in the Cavalry and a sportsman. He was also a teetotaller and a vegetarian, a supporter of Joseph Arch and Bradlaugh, and of Stead in his " Maiden Tribute " campaign.

Richard Pankhurst was a Republican and an orator of the Manchester Republican Club. He denounced the Crown as " the shelter of privilege, the centre of vested and sinister influence." The Royal Family enjoyed " large emoluments without rendering service." He held up John Bright to odium for his anti-Republican views—" Captive to the Philistines of hereditary influence, he is now grinding in the Conservative mills."

Charles Bradlaugh was a Republican. In 1871 he published *An Impeachment of the House of Brunswick*. In the autumn of that year he lectured on behalf of the London Republican Club, his subject being " The Prince of Wales " —" neither his intelligence, nor his virtues, nor his political abilities . . . can entitle him to occupy the Throne of Great Britain. I am equally opposed to his ever being Regent of England. I trust he may never sit on the Throne or lounge under its shadow."

In some of these Republican outbursts there is a sort of reminder of the valiant oratory of Mr. Sim Tappertit or of Mr. La Fayette Kettle.

Mr. J. M. Robertson ascribes the Republicanism of those days to three causes : (1) some only wanted a Republic to help Ireland, (2) there was a persistent feeling against the Prince of Wales and his reputed character, (3) the expense of the Monarchy. On the other hand he agreed that the age and popularity of the reigning Sovereign prevented the agitation from being serious. " Recent tests have shown " (writes Mr. Robertson) " that in the average working-class Liberal or Radical Club, when the question is plainly raised, there is virtually no feeling in favour of the retention of Monarchy. The old devotion to the Monarch as such has almost completely passed away, and now subsists only among their weaker brethren, and in the middle and upper classes."[1]

This was written in 1894 and is an admission that the feeling for Republicanism was then of a very negative character. The Dilke-Chamberlain Republicanism of 1871 received a severe check from the Prince of Wales' serious illness in December of that year; there was great public anxiety while he lay ill, and immense enthusiasm when he recovered. Republicanism has never thrived in English soil, and has never worried English statesmen. In 1874 Disraeli described Mr. W. H. Smith to the Queen: "A Mr. Smith of Westminster, a rich and most respectable, clever man, who always maintained that the working classes were *not* Republican." The Republicans and semi-Republicans were reduced to gratifying their anti-monarchical feelings by objecting to Royal Grants and expenditure on Royal yachts and parks and palaces, and to the trappings and ceremonies of Royalty, not disdaining to notice such items of expense as the warming and lighting of Kew Palace. In this warfare Labouchere distinguished himself for many years. "Radicals" (he wrote) "do not approve of the furs and feathers of a Court, and they regard its ceremonies with scant respect, for they are inclined to think that they conduce to a servile spirit, which is degrading to humanity."[1] He would have liked to suppress the Train Bearer, the Purse Bearer and the Clerk to the Petty Bag. In 1885 he objected to the expense of installing our present king as Knight of the Garter. Such topics no longer excite public interest.

Mr. Robertson predicted (1894) that the abolition of Monarchy "may or may not come about during the next generation." That period is now complete, but a British Republic seems to be further off than ever. The war, which broke so many dynasties, has left the British Monarchy unscathed. "In the crash of Thrones, built, some of them, on unrighteousness, propped up in other cases by a brittle framework of convention, the Throne of this country stands unshaken, broad-based on the people's will."[2]

Nor is there any Republican feeling in the Labour Party. Keir Hardie, it is true, avowed "I owe no allegiance to any hereditary ruler," forgetting that he had taken the Oath of Allegiance on entering Parliament. But the Abolition of the Monarchy never finds a place in a Labour Programme. Mr. J. H. Thomas recently impressed on 2,000 school children that the King and Queen had endeared themselves

to the Nation more and more every day. "How proud therefore we all must feel," he added, "that, with all the difficulty and turmoil that is taking place in the world, this old Constitution of ours is on more solid ground than ever."[1]

"Per damna, per caedes, ab ipso
Ducit opes animumqua ferro."[2]

Such then was Liberalism, and such the different exponents of the Liberal faith—some inclining to the Right and some to the Left. By what sort of legislation did Liberals propose to put their ideals into practice? Help in answering this question may be sought from an examination of the Programmes, official and unofficial, which the Party after deliberation, or leading Liberals and Radicals on their own responsibility, singly or in groups, from time to time offered to the Liberal voter.

The reader may first be reminded of the Chartists' demands, (1) Universal Suffrage, (2) Secret Ballot, (3) Payment of Members, (4) Equality of Constituencies, all of which have since been granted except (4). Equality of Constituencies is difficult to attain, for the population of Constituencies is constantly changing.

Elaborate Party Programmes were an outcome of the Caucus; in the earlier part of our period a list of desired measures was generally compiled and put forward by adventurous individuals, or by two or three aspiring politicians acting together. So items in the Election Addresses of prominent men are worth remarking.

Dilke, as candidate for Chelsea in the autumn of 1867, advocated Triennial or Annual Parliaments,[3] Payment of Members, the Abolition of Flogging and of the Purchase of Commissions.

Bradlaugh (Northampton 1868) supported Gladstone, but demanded *inter alia* Compulsory National Education, Reform of Land Laws, Abolition of Primogeniture and Entail, Security for Improvements, Economy ("Public Departments must cease to be refuges for destitute members of so-called noble families"), Changes in Taxation to favour the poor, Labour and Capital to be equal in Law, Separation of Church from State, removal of Bishops from the House of Lords, Abolition of the Whig Party, formation of a National Party.

Mr. Turnbull, a rather extreme Radical in *Phineas Finn*

(1869), supported Progressive Reform in the Franchise with Manhood Suffrage as the acknowledged end, Equal Electoral Districts, the Ballot, Tenant Right for England as well as for Ireland, Reduction of Standing Army—till there should be none to reduce, Free Trade in everything except malt and the absolute extinction of a State Church.

Chamberlain's policy in the 'Seventies :—Free Schools, Free Land, Free Church.[1]

Main objects of Radical group (1873) :—(1) Extension and Redistribution of voting power, (2) Universal system of Compulsory Education controlled by Elective School Boards.[2]

Radical Programme of Chamberlain and John Morley (1873) :—Free Land, Free Church, Free Schools, Free Trade, Free Law.[3]

Early in the 1880 Parliament Chamberlain wanted (1) no Franchise disqualification except for crime and non-payment of rates, (2) Equal Electoral Districts, (3) Payment of Members.

A Radical group (1882) which included Chamberlain, Shaw Lefevre and John Morley :—Home Rule all round, Abolition of the House of Lords, Manhood Suffrage (Dilke also advocated Womanhood Suffrage), Payment of Members, Decent Housing for all, "Ransom."[4]

Dr. Pankhurst's Programme (Manchester 1883) :—Adult Suffrage for both sexes, Payment of Members, Disestablishment and Disendowment, Free Compulsory Elementary Education, Nationalization of Land, Home Rule for Ireland, International Tribunals.

W. T. Stead's Programme (New Year's Day 1884) :—(1) New Empires beyond the seas, but (2) restrain violence of immigrants, (3) training of subject Nations for Self-government, (4) Suffrage for all Householders male and female, (5) improvement of the lot of the poor.

Chamberlain's campaign of 1885 alarmed Whigs and moderate Liberals almost as much as Conservatives. At Birmingham, on January 5th, he expounded the doctrine of Ransom, which was based on the theory that private ownership had wrongfully substituted itself for National or Communal Rights. Ransom was the special tax which Property was to pay for its survival. He particularized the Game Laws as an encroachment of Property. At Ipswich (January 14th) he described the new tax on wealth

as an Insurance. "What Insurance will wealth find it to its advantage to provide against the risks to which it is undoubtedly subject?" He advocated Free Education, Housing, Allotments, Compulsory Purchase of Land, Taxation of Property for local purposes, Graduated Income Tax, Differentiation between Earned and Unearned Income. At Birmingham (January 29th) he advocated Labour Representation, Payment of Members, Abolition of Plural Voting (with a suggestion that perhaps the poor man should have more votes than the rich); at the Eighty Club (April 28th) an extension of the functions of Government. At Hull (August 5th) he urged the better provision of Hospitals, Schools, Free Libraries, Art Galleries, Baths, Parks; he supported Land Registries and the Abolition of Entails,[1] Fair Rents for farmers to be fixed by impartial tribunals, Cottages and Allotments for labourers, the taxation at full value of unoccupied and sporting land. "It is, perhaps, enough for one night," was his remark at the conclusion of this Hull speech.[2]

His celebrated Unauthorized Programme was first expounded at Warrington on September 8th. The Editor of his Speeches (Mr. C. W. Boyd), says that it was the work of a number of hands, and that Chamberlain, "though of course in sympathy, disclaimed responsibility." But naturally the Programme was regarded as Chamberlain's Programme, and it earned for him the title of "Jack Cade." The principal items, most of which have already been mentioned in summarizing his former speeches, were:— Right for Local Authorities to purchase land compulsorily for public purposes; Right to let it for Allotments, Dwellings and Small Holdings; Free Schools; Graduated Taxation; Taxation of sporting and unoccupied land, ground-rents and mineral royalties; reform of Game Laws; Enquiry into Public Endowments. At Glasgow on September 15th he added National Councils for England, Scotland, Ireland and Wales.

Joseph Arch's Programme, at the General Election of December 1885, when he won North-West Norfolk by 640 votes (and so became the Parliamentary representative of the Prince of Wales), included Free Trade for all articles of food, County Local Government, Reform of Land Laws, Abolition of the Law of Distress, Compulsory Purchase of Land, Disestablishment, Free Secular Education, Sunday

Closing except for *bona fide* Travellers, Abolition of Perpetual Pensions, and Arbitration before War.

Dilke's speeches in 1891 advocated the Compulsory Acquisition of Land, destruction of slums without Compensation, Limitation of Working Hours, Compulsory Education up to Sixteen, Death Duties up to twenty-five per cent., Adult Suffrage, Abolition of Plural Vote.[1]

The Newcastle Programme of 1891 was constructed after the fall of Parnell. Lord Oxford gives the reason : " The setback in the electoral prospects of Home Rule in Great Britain, caused by the Parnellite split, was deemed to make it incumbent upon the managers of the Liberal Party to widen the area of their appeal." It is said to have had its origin from a pamphlet called *Wanted a Programme* by Mr. Sidney Webb, printed for private circulation among leading London Liberals.[2] Mr. Webb (now Lord Passfield), who was then connected with Liberal and Radical Associations, pointed out that Mr. Gladstone " with true political prescience, announced that the conflict was between the ' Classes ' and the ' Masses.' " The middle-class Liberal " hailed the declaration with joy, forgetting that he himself was one of the ' Classes.' " " Four out of five of the adult male population are engaged in manual labour for weekly wages. The aristocracy, the professions, the manufacturers, the farmers, the shopkeepers and all others put together, do not make up one-fifth of the population."[3] If the claim made by the author of *The Firm of Webb* is well-founded, the Newcastle Programme, which Gladstone by no means relished, was partly the outcome of his " Classes v Masses " harangues. That Gladstone did not relish it is clear to anyone who reads his speech at Newcastle on October 2nd, 1891, and he was careful afterwards to claim that he was not committed to promoting any one particular reform before another.[4]

The Newcastle Programme (1891) was Home Rule, Taxation of Land Values, Abolition of Entail, Extension of Small Holdings, Rural Cottages, Payment of M.P.'s and of their Election expenses, Parish Councils, Local Veto, Disestablishment, Reform of the House of Lords.

The actual Liberal Programme for 1892 was Home Rule, Local Option, Parish Councils, Land Tenure Reform, Enquiry into Poor Law, Welsh and Scotch Disestablishment, greater powers for the London County Council.

In 1892 Chamberlain (now a Liberal Unionist) published another Unauthorized Programme, which included Old Age Pensions, Workmen's Compensation, Housing Reform, Eight Hours Day for Miners, Legislation for Shop Assistants.

At the Albert Hall Meeting of December 21st, 1905, just before the General Election which gave the Liberals such an enormous majority, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman announced his policy to be—a Veto on employment of Coolies in South Africa, adhesion to the Entente Cordiale, friendship with Germany, less expenditure on the Army and Navy, Home Rule ("as and when opportunity offers"), Land Reform, Amendment of the Law so as to favour Trade Unions, Free Trade. Dr. Macnamara, following him, indicated a Repeal of the Education Act of 1902. Licensing Reform and Welsh Disestablishment were also to the fore in this Liberal Programme.

In the following year Sir Charles Dilke revived the Radical Club whose Programme was :—an understanding with the Irish, male and female Adult Suffrage, payment of M.P.'s and of their expenses, a Single Chamber or restriction of the power of the Lords, the taxation of Land Values, reversal of the Taff Vale decision and an Eight Hours Day for Miners.

Here may be added various proposals made in the 'Eighties for the Reform of the House of Lords :—

(1) Abolition.
(2) A chamber of Peers to be nominated for life.
(3) Power to the Crown to select a limited number of existing Peers.
(4) Power to the House of Lords to do this.
(5) A Second Chamber of experienced executive officers.
(6) Constitution of a Senate representative of different districts of the country.[1]

It is clear that, as time went on, these Programmes became more and more Radical. Let us return to the Gladstonian Ministries of 1868 and 1880 when Liberalism was in its heyday. Gladstone's ministry of 1886 was short, and preoccupied with Home Rule ; that of 1892-5[2] was weak and distracted by the impending resignation of Gladstone and by the quarrels that followed on his departure. The Liberalism that came into power in 1906 was a different thing ; it was now permeated with Socialist ideas.

The ministry of 1868, though it experienced much trouble, was decidedly more prosperous than that of 1880. Its *personnel*—Gladstone, Hatherley (to whom, as Lord Chancellor Selborne, in Dilke's opinion "a High Church Tory," succeeded in 1872), Lowe, de Grey, Kimberley, Bruce, Clarendon, Granville, Cardwell, Argyll, Childers, Bright, Hartington, Goschen, Chichester, Fortescue—was predominantly Whig-Aristocratic. The Party, too, was mainly of the "governing" class. Dilke said of the House of Commons that he was the only Radical there. Many prominent men had been defeated at the General Election—Roebuck, Milner-Gibson, Bernal Osborne, Horsman. But a great many ardent young Liberals had entered the new Parliament, and the new electorate of urban householders were looking for change. It was in recognition of the artisan vote that Mundella, Member for Sheffield, was chosen to second the Address. Mundella was the son of a political refugee, had been employed in a printing office and apprenticed to a hosiery manufacturer; but he was supposed to speak for "the Party of the working-men." Certainly it was thought that a new era had opened. Acton said that the Party "has entered on a new phase of its existence. And it follows a wise and resolute leader, at whose call the nation has arisen, for the first time in history, to the full height of its imperial vocation." Harcourt's biographer writes: "It was the first Parliament elected after the Reform Bill, and it exhibited a profound change in the social tone of the House. The supremacy of the governing families had gone."[1] But at present the demand was for political, not for social, change. Matthew Arnold complained that there was an "absence of policy." But the Government, as yet unhampered by an independent Irish Party, did succeed in passing its measures of Reform—Irish Church Disestablishment, Irish Land Reform, Army Reform, Abolition of Purchase in the Army and of Tests in the Universities,[2] the Ballot, Elementary Education.[3] The most important of these was Elementary Education; but it was not till the educated children grew to be adults that its rather unexpected effects made themselves apparent.

Gladstone's interest in Education was, said Morley, "the interest of a Churchman." He had voted against the abolition of University Tests for Dissenters. He opposed the introduction of a School Board at Hawarden. On

Education he was quite out of sympathy with his Liberal and Radical supporters.

In 1869 there were 1,300,00 children in State-aided Schools ; 1,000,000 in Schools that were neither State-aided nor State-inspected, and therefore quite inefficient ; 2,000,000 who did not go to any School. There was a general agreement that Education must be provided for those who had none. The Churchmen wanted higher grants for their Schools, and in the end they were doubled. This of itself irritated the Nonconformists extremely. The religious question was a terrible crux. The Nonconformists (wrote Gladstone to Bright January 27th, 1874) " have not as a body made up their minds whether they want unsectarian religion, or whether they want simple secular teaching, so far as the application of the rate is concerned."[1]

Unsectarian religion won the day. The Cowper Temple clause provided " that no religious catechism or religious formulary, which is distinctive of any particular denomination, should be taught in any School provided out of the rates." Gladstone, Salisbury and Disraeli all perceived the impossibility of an undogmatic religion. Disraeli said of Cowper-Templeism :—" The Schoolmaster could not teach, enforce and explain the Bible without drawing some conclusions, and what could there be but dogmas ? " Does not Christianity itself imply the Divinity of Christ ? and is not this a dogma ?

A significant feature of these Education disputes was that Dilke and Chamberlain and the advanced Radicals favoured simple secular teaching. Chamberlain, whose first public interest was educational, had become Chairman of the powerful National Education League of Birmingham in 1868, and he entered into a crusade against Forster's Bill of 1870 " with its tempering of the wind to ecclesiasticism." He criticized the Bill because not all districts would have School Boards and because the Bill would not ensure compulsory attendance ; he was against the payment of School fees by parents. Much later, in 1885, he was still complaining that " we have made Education compulsory, but we have omitted to make it free." This fault was finally amended by the Tories in 1891 when Sir William Hart Dyke, in introducing a Free Education Bill, admitted that " the corollary to compulsion by Statute was relief from

payment of fees." (Some Conservatives denounced this concession as a surrender of Conservative principles.)

The Education League, which stood for admitting no religion into any Schools but Sunday Schools, developed into the National Liberal Federation, one of whose first activities was to send a deputation to Lord Hartington upon the subject of Education. Secular Education was always a part of the Radical Programme.

Gladstone, in an interview with the Queen, attributed the Liberal defeat of 1874 to Liberal dissensions on Education,[1] and these dissensions have always been an embarrassment to the democratic cause. No doubt both the Liberal who favoured undenominational religion in the Schools, and the Liberal who thought that no public money should be spent on any sort of religious teaching, were agreed in believing that universal compulsory Education would aid the cause of Progress and that the children would grow up with enlightened minds, and with inclinations to support the Party that had conferred this boon upon them. It is therefore worth while to examine what use at first they made of it.

By the middle 'Eighties the vast majority of English boys and girls, men and women, could read; a very large proportion of those that had acquired this accomplishment liked to read. But *what* did they want to read? What were they capable of reading with pleasure? Elementary Education did not equip them for studying Philosophy or Science; comparatively few cared for Poetry or History. They wanted a literature that made no strong demands on their intellect, something to amuse them after a hard day's work. George Newnes, who has been called the Father of the New Journalism, supplied their needs, and the first number of *Tit-Bits* was published on October 10th, 1881. Alfred Harmsworth, says his biographer, "saw what the success of *Tit-Bits* meant; he deliberately aimed at taking advantage of the changed conditions brought about by the teaching of everybody to read."[2] He catered for "a nation which for the first time in its history had been through school."[3] He had a gift "for exploiting the mass of people who could just read."[4] As a rival to *Tit-Bits* he founded *Answers*, which, in addition to anecdotes, extracts from books, and miscellaneous information, offered the attraction of

lucrative competitions—" a pound a week for life shall be secured by the competitor who comes nearest to guessing what on a certain date is the value of the bullion in the Bank of England."

But Harmsworth, besides successfully engaging in this kind of weekly journalism, launched out into daily papers. He resuscitated *The Evening News*. On May 4th, 1896, there appeared the first number of *The Daily Mail*, of which 367,215 copies were sold at a half-penny.

Here was an event in Journalism that was to have important results in politics, and indirectly on the development of Democracy. Mr. J. A. Spender declared that Harmsworth and his imitators influenced the common mind " more than all the Education Ministers put together." Lord Salisbury contemptuously characterized *The Daily Mail* as " a journal produced by office-boys for office-boys," but those who had had the office-boy's education were the great majority of the nation, and Harmsworth shrewdly concluded that they wanted in their newspapers something different from that which had interested the Middle Classes. Till now there had been only the Sunday papers for the working-classes, and if the New Press were accused of sensationalism, it might be answered that the old Sunday Press was mainly concerned with Crime. As for the respectable Daily Press " everything, in a word, was sacrificed to politics."[1] Sir Henry Maine wrote enthusiastically of his countrymen's interest in politics—" the enthralling drama which is enacted before them every morning and evening. A ceaseless flow of public discussion, a throng of public events, a crowd of public men, make up the spectacle."[2] So, with much foreign news, long speeches in and out of Parliament were reported, to a great extent *verbatim*. On one occasion *The Morning Post* accorded Lord Randolph Churchill three columns for a speech on a County Council Election. The Golden Age of the political journalist, wrote Kennedy Jones (at one time an active lieutenant of Harmsworth), was from 1855 to 1880, and the blow struck at the Irish Education Bill of 1873 by *The Daily News* was a high-water mark of such influence. He added that by 1881 leading political articles had begun to lose weight. The Harmsworth enterprise (he said) tended " to reduce parliamentary proceedings and the speeches of politicians to their right proportions in the daily prints."[3] Asquith bore witness to

this tendency in 1909 : " I suppose for one person who reads the report there are thousands who read the summary and the sketch."[1]

It would seem then that this newly-educated Democracy was not disposed to take an interest, as the Middle Classes had taken, in the utterances of the great political leaders. Parliamentary proceedings were not " good copy."[2] The orations of Salisbury, Balfour, Hartington and Chamberlain still attracted large audiences, but were not reported at any length in the new Daily Press, whose readers demanded, (or were supposed to demand), a larger space for quite different topics. " Love," Crime, Sport, Food were—in the view of Northcliffe and Kennedy Jones—the things that " mattered." Kennedy Jones, discussing what best sells a paper, decides on (1) War ; agreeing with Dr. Johnson, who said, " a bloody battle makes a vendible narrative." (The Boer War increased the circulation of *The Daily Mail* from half a million to more than a million.) (2) A State Funeral. (More than two million copies of *The Daily Mirror* were sold when King Edward VII was buried.) (3) A First-Class Murder. (4) Any big public pageant such as a Coronation.[3] Democratic readers were also believed to demand a " Society " page. Harmsworth once rang up a News Editor at 7 a.m. to know " what he is doing about Lady Diana Cooper's skirts." Mr. Hamilton Fyfe writes that " he played skilfully on the inbred snobbishness of English men and women."

The Editor was in a less independent position. He became the mouthpiece of his Proprietor, whose views might suddenly change ; it was then necessary for the Editor likewise to change his views—or go. Lord Northcliffe executed a sudden *volte face* from his hostile attitude towards Mr. Lloyd George's Budget, because he was advised that it was popular. The really important person on the paper came to be the Advertising Director, and advertisements were expected to show proper results. And so the Advertising Director had to make the profits, and therefore " the great thing is to persuade the people that all is well, that they can spend money with an open hand."[4]

There was another unexpected development. Lord Randolph Churchill in 1884 complained that two-thirds of the Press was Liberal, and he made it his business to encourage Toryism—especially in the local Press. The

successful New Press made, apparently with success, an appeal to Conservatism, Unionism and Imperialism. The Introductory Leader of *The Evening News* preached "the Gospel of Loyalty to the Empire and faith in the combined efforts of the people under the British Flag. While strongly and unfalteringly Conservative and Unionist in Imperial politics, *The Evening News* will occupy an advanced democratic platform on all social matters." *The Daily Mail* gave twice as much space to Imperial topics as any other paper. W. T. Stead, whose standpoint was in nearly all respects the opposite of Harmsworth's and whose politics were mainly those of a Nonconformist, in his own peculiar way promoted Imperialism. His *Review of Reviews*, "a periodical circulating throughout the English-speaking world, read as men read their Bibles, not to waste an idle hour, but to discover the Will of God and their duty to men," voiced an Imperialism "whose aim was to do something in the way of producing union among our scattered English family."

It is therefore arguable that, by making Elementary Education almost universal, Gladstone's first Administration could boast of a definite achievement, the effects of which were far-reaching and not altogether what had been expected. This Administration, as is always the case with Administrations, became more and more unpopular as it neared its end, but acted with a fair degree of harmony. The Liberal Party, of course, exhibited the usual differences between the Right wing and the Left, and the Education question had proved vexatious; but there was no very definite rift.

The Cabinet of 1880 was again Whiggish, for it included Selborne, Spencer, Argyll, Harcourt, Granville, Kimberley, Hartington and Northbrook; but it also included Bright, Forster and Chamberlain.[1] Dilke wrote to Mrs. Pattison of Chamberlain's admission: "The charmed circle has been broken and a new departure made which is an event in English History." But it was no more of a new departure than was Bright's admission in 1868. The Republican, or ex-Republican, Dilke was himself not made a Cabinet Minister till late in 1882, but he was given office and was acting in the closest amity with Chamberlain. The Tories had suffered their severest defeat since 1832, and *Punch* had a full-length cartoon showing Gladstone as an exulting warrior standing on a shield which was upheld by

Hartington, Granville, Harcourt and Bright. Again there were hopes of a new era :

" All the schools of movement, and especially the school of peace, were confident of the speedy dawn of a Second Advent, and those who knew too much of parliamentary business and its devious ways, though not confident, were still hopeful."[1] Labouchere wrote of this Election : " A Radical has been defined as an earnest Liberal. . . . The last General Election was the result of this earnestness. All previous Liberal Administrations had been *gangs*."[2] There was certainly something new in the political atmosphere. Gladstone recognized it : " What is outside Parliament seems to me fast mounting—nay, to have already mounted—to an importance much exceeding what is inside."[3] The Liberals had come in on a cause that might be called sentimental, the Eastern Question, but Salisbury warned Balfour that the Liberal majority had aims other than sentimental or academic : " It seems to me to be inspired by some definite desire for change. . . . It may be the beginning of a serious war of classes."[4]

Alas for " the schools of movement ! " The dawn of the Second Advent proved to be still far distant. In the troubles that followed in Ireland, Egypt and South Africa, " while half the Cabinet were ransacking the past for weapons of Executive authority, others were groping dimly towards a vague Utopia."[5] Chamberlain made his disturbing influence felt in the Cabinet, with the powerful Dilke behind him. Outside it Gladstone had to be constantly contending not only with the Conservative Party, but now also with the Parnellites and with Churchill's Fourth Party. Viscount Gladstone adds that his father had a fourth antagonist, Queen Victoria, who after 1877 " had not a good word either for him or—and this is important—for the Liberal Party."[6] Another Minister, Granville (once quite a favourite), never succeeded after 1880 in breaking through her formal manner.[7] No one who has read the Queen's Letters and Journals of these years can deny that the Queen's attitude was an impediment to the Government and to Liberalism. She resented having had to part from Beaconsfield, and, while he lived, still sometimes consulted him—and this was condemned as unconstitutional on her part and also on Beaconsfield's. These troubles and difficulties soon produced a sense of disappointment. " We

are all living from hand to mouth," wrote John Morley, "without chart, compass or creed: Mr. Gladstone is an opportunist of one sort; Mr. Chamberlain an opportunist of another sort. We are all at sea."

The first session of this seeming-powerful Government produced as its first legislative effort the Hares and Rabbits Bill, a Bill very well calculated to irritate the Squirearchy; but it was felt to be an anti-climax. There was also a Burials Bill, and a Compensation for Disturbance Bill which antagonized Irish landlords and was rejected by the House of Lords with the help of Liberal Peers. In the year 1880 another dire embarrassment, destined to continue till 1885, began to afflict the Liberal Party—Bradlaugh's demand to make an affirmation instead of taking the Oath of Allegiance, and—on this being refused—his demand to take the Oath, and the violent scenes consequent thereon.[1]

The first demand raised an old principle of Liberalism, freedom of thought and the right of conscience. The second excited very angry feelings, for Bradlaugh had stated that an oath was not binding on his conscience. John Bright, as a Quaker, was allowed to affirm by statutory right, but this right was not extended to atheists. There were agnostics and men of heterodox opinions who had not boggled at the oath; John Stuart Mill in 1865 had sworn "on the true faith of a Christian"; John Morley made no trouble about the oath in 1883. But Bradlaugh's blank negation of a Supreme Being was another matter. "You know, Mr. Speaker," said a Member of Parliament, "we all believe in a God of some sort or another." The orthodox regarded Bradlaugh as a monster of iniquity. "I can congratulate you heartily, Brethren" (preached a certain Vicar), "that that blackguard Bradlaugh has been expelled from the floor of the House." Then, as we have seen, he also held Republican views, and had written a Tract against the House of Brunswick; in the House of Commons this alleged disloyalty was put forward as an additional reason for his expulsion. Moreover he had been persecuted for advocating Malthusian practices; at one of his trials Lord Chief Justice Cockburn had remarked that the fear of pregnancy was the only real safeguard of female virtue.[2] Bradlaugh was therefore triply stigmatized as atheist, as disloyal, and as immoral; all this and his rather forbidding countenance with its long upper lip made him a sort of

Bogey Man to respectable Englishmen of fifty years ago.

In his confrontation of this issue Gladstone, as Morley rightly claims, was " at his sincerest and his highest." " I have no fear of Atheism in this House," he said in one of his speeches. " Truth is the expression of the Divine mind . . . and we may be sure that a firm and courageous application of every principle of equity and justice is the best method we can adopt for the preservation and influence of Truth." As for the argument that " we must believe in a God of some sort or another," he reminded the House of the careless pagan gods and quoted those six splendid lines of Lucretius which proclaimed their indifference to the virtues or vices of mortal men.[1] Labouchere, speaking with his customary picturesqueness at Northampton of Gladstone's generous attitude to Bradlaugh, reported : " And, men of Northampton, that Grand Old Man said to me, as he patted me on the shoulder, ' Henry, my boy, bring him back, bring him back ! ' " (It is extremely improbable that Gladstone ever in his life addressed a grown man as " My boy ! ")

John Bright also sounded a true Liberal note : " But one thing is essential for us, the House of Commons representing the English people, which is, to maintain as far as we can the great principles of freedom—freedom of political action and freedom of conscience." In another speech he quoted against Bradlaugh's attackers the lines,

" Bigotry may swell
" The sail he sets for Heaven with blasts from Hell."

Mr. J. M. Robertson accuses Morley of failure to give Bradlaugh support, and states that *The Pall Mall Gazette* only gave prominence to hostile utterances. Parnell, after some hesitation and after visiting Bradlaugh in prison, was adverse ; perhaps he felt obliged to consider Roman Catholic opinion. The Nonconformists were against him, and many of their Ministers denounced him from the pulpit.

The Fourth Party originated and grew by attacking Bradlaugh, and, after differences had arisen between its members, they became re-united in a renewed assault upon him. Morley had good reason to say that the sordid controversy " dimmed the ascendancy of the great Minister," but Democracy was on Bradlaugh's side. Samuel Morley, the philanthropic Liberal Member for Bristol, at

first supported him; but when, owing to Nonconformist clamour, he turned against him, he was called upon by the Bristol Radical Association to resign his seat. It is also to be noted that John Bright told the House of Commons that "to a large extent the working people of this country do not care any more for the dogmas of Christianity than the upper classes care for the practice of that religion." The Conservatives did not find this statement palatable.

The great democratic triumph of Gladstone's second Administration was the Reform Act of 1884, which is the subject of a later chapter. The great democratic force in the Government proceeded from the alliance of Dilke and Chamberlain. Dilke had entered Parliament in 1868, Chamberlain not till 1876;[1] but Chamberlain became a Cabinet Minister two years before Dilke. Dilke was a man of old family and a Baronet; he was educated at Cambridge, and his family owned *The Athenaeum*. Chamberlain was a provincial born and bred, and proud of his origin. "I belong to the middle class, and I am proud of the ability, the shrewdness, the industry, the providence and the thrift by which they are distinguished, and which have in so considerable a degree contributed to the prosperity and the stability of the Empire."[2] Lord Morley describes the remarkable circle that he gathered round him in his Birmingham home, of journalists, politicians, social workers, Nonconformist divines—only the Church of England was unrepresented. (Matthew Arnold would have considered this a fatal omission, and a proof that the host was "not in contact with the main current of national life, like the member of an Establishment.") Then Chamberlain came to London, and Morley introduced him to Fawcett, Courtney and Frederic Harrison, "whose points of view were very different from his tobacco parliament." Nor could Morley refrain from criticizing Chamberlain's favourite doctrine that men have been robbed of their Natural Rights.[3] "Chamberlain's reference to them dismayed me as if I had seen a Deinotherium shambling down Parliament Street to a seat in the House of Commons." Thus Morley hints at Chamberlain's narrow and obsolete political theory, and at his provincialism. But in provincial Birmingham lay Chamberlain's strength

"hic illius arma,
"Hic *Caucus* fuit."

There he developed Municipal Socialism on the German model, and there he perfected his mighty political organization. He was the Birmingham idol. Miss Potter (Mrs. Sidney Webb) wrote in February 1884, "John Bright is received with affectionate and loyal applause. Chamberlain is received with deafening shouts." Miss Potter also wrote of him: "Running alongside of this genuine enthusiasm is a passionate desire to crush opposition to his will, a longing to feel his foot on the neck of others." He was a realist, whose countenance seemed (to Canon Scott-Holland) to be lacking in receptivity: "the compact outline has no suggestions, there seemed to be no inviting problems to be worked out: no attractive obscurities: no ins and outs: no minglings: no fancies: no dreams: you left off at the face—you never got deeper, clean surface repelled inquiry."[1] And he could be ruthless to tried political friends: "If you go into the Cabinet without me" (he wrote to Morley in 1885), "you will have me against you, and I shall smash you." He was a thorn in the side of Gladstone, who however pronounced him to be—after Cobden and Bright —"the finest specimen of the Reformed Parliament." To the Aristocracy and the Squirearchy, down till 1885, he was an absolute terror. Lady Warwick writes that in the years of her girlhood, "I thought Chamberlain must be the Devil, for I used to see country gentlemen become livid with rage at the mention of his name." Then came the Home Rule split with all its results on Chamberlain's destiny. This formidable man, who quite recently had pronounced that English territorial magnates must "ransom" their ill-gotten estates, was entertained at Chatsworth by the Duke of Devonshire, the father of the Whig Lord Hartington, whom the guest had recently called Rip van Winkle. "The flutter among the fine ladies and gentlemen at Chatsworth cannot be imagined. Some of them scarcely expected him to know how to behave at table. We were all assembled before dinner when our host, the Duke, came in accompanied by the dapper, well-set-up figure of Joseph Chamberlain, with the well-known eyeglass stuck in his eye, and looking in no way perturbed to find himself in such company."[2] It would have needed more than this to perturb Joseph Chamberlain.

Such was the effect of the Home Rule schism upon the political and social development of Joseph Chamberlain, a

development which was to proceed still further in succeeding years. A fearful blow to Radical hopes was this desertion (as they considered it). If Chamberlain had succeeded Gladstone as Prime Minister, the Radicals had expected to achieve the abolition of the House of Lords and the Disestablishment of the Church of England, and that England, in all save the name, would be a Republic.[1] Proportionate was their resentment. "He has destroyed for the present" (wrote a journalist) "and perhaps for many years to come, the motive power of Liberalism."[2]

Dilke was quite as advanced a Radical as Chamberlain. Both started as, at least theoretical, Republicans; both made war on the Whigs; both took an interest in Imperial topics. Chamberlain was much the more powerful of the two in home politics, controlling as he did a political machine. Dilke was deeply versed in foreign affairs. He was in France during the Franco-Prussian War; and afterwards, while Chamberlain was the busy Mayor of Birmingham, was often abroad cultivating the friendship of Gambetta and other European statesmen. His biographers say that this friendship with Gambetta came to be of international interest. He was also, later, acquainted with Bismarck, who told him how in 1870 he "cut down a telegram of 200 words which meant peace into a telegram of 20 words which meant war." While Disraeli was still in the House of Commons he told Granville that he considered Dilke to be the only man of note below the gangway.[3] In 1882 Gladstone had come to the conclusion that Dilke would be his natural successor.[4] Dilke, too, was a realist, in the sense that he was a laborious and exact student of politics, with a contempt for laziness, for sciolism, and for mere eloquence. "Mr. Gladstone" (he wrote) "will talk with much charm about matters that he does not understand, or books that he is not really competent to criticize; but his conversation has no merit to those who are acquainted with the subjects on which he speaks." Hartington's prejudices "were those, not of stupidity, but of ignorance; with his stables and his wealth it would be useless to expect him to do serious work." John Bright was an orator who "had not the application necessary to give legislative effect to his aims;" Bright represented "rhetoric, and not business." To his knowledge and unremitting industry Dilke added a great enthusiasm for

Social Reform, and a real sympathy with the poor which he displayed while President of the Local Government Board. Queen Victoria and her ex-Republican Minister were united in their desire and in their efforts to improve housing conditions.

The Dilke-Chamberlain alliance was of enormous strength. Together they were able to impose their own terms on Gladstone in 1880—that both should have office and that one should be in the Cabinet. "Mr. Gladstone," writes Morley, "discoursed severely on this unprecedented enormity"; but he had to give in. The alliance stood firm throughout the Administration of 1880-1885. "I would not put you in a hole," writes Chamberlain to Dilke, "for a King's ransom." In 1885 we find them jointly stipulating that Gladstone's Election address should contain (1) proposals to take land for housing and allotments, (2) Free Education. When at last a difference occurred, we find Chamberlain lamenting (May 1886), "Your letter has greatly troubled me. My pleasure in politics is now gone, and I hold very loosely to public life just now."

J. E. C. Bodley, who had been Dilke's secretary, wrote of this brotherhood in arms: "There never was a similar case of two vigorous and powerful politicians in a Ministry, so completely united in their aims and ambitions, without regard to the collective policy of their colleagues, on whom, however, they exercised an abnormal influence."[1] The dissolution of their partnership was a capital disaster to the cause of Democracy. In the same year that Chamberlain became a dissentient Liberal the Divorce Court claimed Dilke as a victim—as a few years later it was to claim Parnell. In his first Divorce trial Dilke's Counsel (Sir Charles Russell and Sir Henry James) gave him the unfortunate advice not to go into the witness-box. It was believed that Chamberlain concurred; but, in fact, Chamberlain's advice was exactly the opposite. "He pressed strongly that, whatever the legal situation might be, Dilke's position as a public man would be rendered impossible if he did not go into the box and deny on oath the allegations made against him."[2] What other advice could a man give to his friend? While the case was pending Gladstone was forming his third Administration, and regretted that under the circumstances he was prevented

from offering Dilke office. Bodley says that he afterwards thus summed up the situation : " I am sorry for what has happened, but I must say that the existence in my Cabinet of a camarilla such as I never knew in my long experience was very trying." Gladstone's mind was evidently relieved by Dilke's removal, which also seriously weakened Chamberlain's position. Dilke was rejected by Chelsea in 1886, and did not return to Parliament (as Member for the Forest of Dean) till 1892. He changed from an Individualist to a Collectivist, became an unofficial adviser to the young Labour Party, and continued to be a most laborious Member of Parliament. Bodley says that King Edward VII wished him to be included in Campbell-Bannerman's Cabinet, but that Campbell-Bannerman declined to have him ; if so, no doubt the Nonconformist Conscience was the obstacle. Dilke died in 1911. His story shows what mischances may affect Democracy, for he was well-equipped to be Democracy's leader.

The Caucus, or National Liberal Federation, of which Chamberlain was for some years the master, was a significant but inevitable development of our British Democracy. With twenty million voters, even with four or five millions, it is very difficult to know what legislation is desired ; it is also necessary that voters should be organized in each constituency, and then of course the skilled organizers become powerful persons. They are whole-time workers and experts ; the voters—or nearly all of them—are political amateurs. The organizers can put their heads together, and propose—perhaps dictate—the policy of a Party. Sir Henry Maine quotes Sir James Stephen :—

" In a pure Democracy the ruling men will be the wire-pullers and their friends. . . . But under all circumstances the rank and file are directed by leaders of one kind or another who get the command of their collective force."[1] Sir Henry considered that wire-pulling inevitably led to an enlargement of the Franchise. Lord Randolph Churchill, as a democratic Conservative, recognized that the Caucus was the necessary outcome of an enlarged electorate :

" Formerly the organizer had to do with classes and cliques. Now he has to do with great masses, and, moreover, intelligent, instructed and independent masses of electors. These masses cannot be dictated to. They cannot be wire-pulled. They must be argued with and

persuaded. . . . The Caucus, as a form of political organization simply means this—that great masses of people confide the management of their affairs to certain elected persons in whom they have confidence."[1]

But he complained that the Birmingham Caucus went beyond organization to policy.

"Caucus," says Kennedy Jones, is supposed to be a Red Indian word, meaning "one who pushes, or urges, on, others."[2] (Chamberlain was known as Pushful Joe.) In Bartlett's *Dictionary of Americanisms* it is explained to be "a private meeting of the leading politicians of a Party to agree upon the plans to be pursued in an approaching Election."[3] Sir Henry Maine writes: "The agency, by which the representative is sought to be turned into the mouthpiece of opinions collected in the locality which sent him to the House of Commons is, we need hardly say, that which is supposed to be introduced from the United States under the name of the Caucus, but which had very possibly a domestic exemplar in the ecclesiastical organization of the Wesleyan Methodists."[4] He goes on to compare it to a drug which defeats the antidote which would neutralize a poison. Democracy is the poison—"the antidote to the fundamental infirmities of Democracy was Representation, but the drug which defeats it has now been found in the Caucus." From which it would appear that Maine admired neither Democracy nor the Caucus.

Perhaps it was its alleged foreign origin which made the very name of Caucus disliked. "We were in danger," said Lord Cranborne in the House of Commons,[5] "of drifting into a system of nomination Caucuses such as is to be seen in operation in America, and such as would arise wherever there were large multitudes in each constituency. Wherever the multitude was so large that it swamped all local interest, what happened was the introduction of the hard machine of local party managers, men who gave up their lives to the task, not usually men of the purest motives or highest character." In an article in *The Quarterly Review* of October 1867 he wrote: "Elaborate and successful electioneering became one of the attributes of the Party; and that is a species of excellence which, while it leads to brilliant results for the moment, is of evil omen for the moral vitality of the party which has attained to it." Beaconsfield writes to the Queen (August 18th, 1880) of the Conservative

defeat: "The Liberals had worked on that American system called Caucus, originated by the great Radical, Mr. Chamberlain." At a Party meeting held in the next month he spoke of "the new foreign political organization of the Liberal Party."

But there were Caucuses before Chamberlain's. John Bright started a Liberal Association in Rochdale in the early 'Thirties. Dilke claimed that there was a Caucus in Chelsea before the first Birmingham Election Association.[1] Dilke himself, his biographers say, "was an absolute believer in the wisdom of the Caucus system." Disraeli himself took an active interest in Party organization. In 1853 he appointed Markham Spofforth, a solicitor, as Assistant Agent to his friend Philip (afterwards Sir Philip) Rose. Spofforth succeeded Rose as Party Agent and worked for the Party till 1877, but by this time Gorst has become head of the organization.[2] Disraeli was "responsible for starting the first great Party machine, and he reaped the harvest, the victory of 1874."[3] In that year Gorst's machine was in full working order, while the Liberal Caucus had yet to be developed."[4] Gorst's system was much the same as Chamberlain's—Local Associations elected democratically and sending representatives to a Central Association, with candidates chosen by the Local Associations. Candidates thus lost some of their independence; it was probably easier to serve one patron, the owner of a rotten Borough, than the numerous members of an Association. (In 1878 the Radical W. E. Forster declined to submit to the dictation of the Bradford Caucus, following the example of Burke, who told the electors of Bristol: "Your representative owes you not his industry only, but his judgment, and he betrays instead of serving you if he sacrifices it to your opinion.") Gorst's services were not recognized as they should have been, and in 1880 the Conservative machine had become rusty. Lord Randolph Churchill exerted himself to revive it, "feverishly stimulating the organization of the Tory working-men into a ubiquitous electoral network."[5]

It would probably be agreed that the organization of voters and the choice of candidates are legitimate functions of a Caucus. If it goes further, it is looked on askance by the Party leaders. Churchill was soon in trouble with his leaders for setting up the National Union of Conservative and Constitutional Associations against the Central Com-

mittee of the Carlton Club. Lord Balfour points out the danger of transferring all executive power and financial control to an independent body,[1] and Lord Salisbury would never recognize the Machine as an "organ of opinion," while "fully appreciating it as an organ of action."[2] But it is idle to expect that organized electors will not try to make their wishes known, and get them granted. The leaders and agents of the different constituencies are sure to get into touch with one another, and then to agree upon a common policy, and draft a common Programme. This, at any rate, was the course pursued by Chamberlain's Caucus. And the word Caucus always meant the Caucus of Chamberlain, with Birmingham as its original home.

Kennedy Jones says that William Harris, a leader-writer of *The Birmingham Daily Post*, was the real creator of the Caucus, and that he taught Chamberlain the value of publicity.[3] But Schnadhorst was the man whose name the public especially connected with the system. Schnadhorst was Secretary or Chairman of the Birmingham Liberal Association from 1873 to 1886, and of the National Liberal Federation, from 1877 to 1894. His political activity had begun with the Reform struggle in 1864, and he had been active in Education campaigns. A writer in *The Westminster Review* (1887) claimed that Schnadhorst has devoted "almost without intermission or repose twenty years of his life" firstly to the extension of the Franchise and then to securing to constituencies the power to choose their own candidates.[4] But Chamberlain was his master, and the presiding genius of the Caucus. Mrs. Webb says that his tone to Schnadhorst was "you shall, and you go to the Devil if you don't."[5] However, Schnadhorst himself was formidable. Churchill declaimed against "the dark and evil deeds of Mr. Schnadhorst." Mr. Birrell says that "his unattractive name at one time struck terror into the timid ranks of the Tory Party." "On account of his name and devotion to detail," says Mr. Garvin, "he was supposed to be a Prussian genius of preparation, who would prove to be Mr. Gladstone's organizer of victory."[6]

The writer in *The Westminster Review* points out that Schnadhorst's efforts were directed towards making Liberals supreme not only in politics, but on the Town Council, and the School Board, and in parochial Elections. As a fact, Birmingham Conservatives were swept off the Town

Council, and were impotent on the School Board and on Boards of Guardians. Between 1873 and 1886, out of 243 Town Councillors that were elected 232 were Liberals. The Birmingham Liberal Association was chosen on a Universal Suffrage system without any limitation or qualification. Working-class representation was encouraged, both for Parliament and the Town Council; Broadhurst was helped to become Member for Stoke. The writer claims that the National Liberal Federation, which held its first meeting of delegates in May 1877 with the support of Gladstone, was *not* worked by a clique, and that its officers were controlled by the majority of voters. If there was Machinery, the Machinery was always connected with Policy.

"I do not object to your calling the Caucus a Machine," said Chamberlain, "it is a Machine by which force is stored and transmitted." "A Machine does not make the power; it only prevents it from being wasted."[1] "I want to impress upon you that our free, open, representative Liberal Associations are the essential condition of success in the future, as they have mainly contributed to our success in the past."[2] And certainly the success had been striking, for in the 1880 Election out of sixty-seven Constituencies which were equipped with a Caucus, no less than sixty had returned Liberals. No wonder if Chamberlain relied upon his Caucus; when the Reform Act of 1884 had increased the representation of Birmingham and divided the City into separate Constituencies, he provided a Caucus for each and a super-Caucus for the whole under the name of the United Liberal Association for Birmingham, increasing the membership of this central body from eight hundred to two thousand.

It was against this system that Lord Randolph Churchill made war after the Aston Park riots of October 1884, and certainly the violence of the Birmingham Radicals gave him good occasion for his attack. He denounced it as "a corrupt oligarchy," as "Venetian espionage," as "using all the resources and ingenuity of terror and intimidation." He dilated upon the stranglehold in which the politicians kept the Corporation.

"The whole of the governing power of the Borough of Birmingham is almost absolutely in the hands of the Caucus. The patronage disposed of is enormous. The Caucus,

acting under the name of the Corporation, own the gasworks; they own the water supply; they control the Lunatic Asylums; they control the Grammar School; they control some large establishments in the nature of a drainage farm; they manipulate the Borough Funds to the extent of nearly one million a year; they pay something like £80,000 a year in wages; and their number of employees, as far as I can ascertain, is about 25,000. And all these enormous resources are directed principally, not so much to the good of the Town of Birmingham, as to the maintenance of the power of the Caucus. Every one of their employees knows that he holds his office, his position, his employment, upon the distinct understanding that in all political and municipal matters he must blindly submit himself; and upon the slightest sign even of independence—to say nothing of opposition—he will lose his employment; he will be thrown upon the world with all his family, even if it should lead to his ruin or his starvation."[1]

These were very serious charges; Churchill's son and biographer admits that "they were no doubt exaggerated in form." But it was notorious that the Caucus operated municipally as well as politically, excluding Conservatives from all local bodies, and this fact gave colour to the accusations. Chamberlain's local Caucus was a ruthless machine, but it remained faithful to him in the crisis of 1886. Schnadhorst, however, who may possibly have resented his chief's "go to the Devil" style of addressing him, secured the great engine of the National Liberal Federation for Gladstone, and its headquarters were moved to London.

Schnadhorst over-estimated the prospects of his party in the 1885 Election; he reckoned on 366 Liberals for certain and 26 doubtful, whereas only 333 were returned. In 1886 he erred still more in predicting a large Home Rule majority. However, in 1887 he received a present of £10,000 for his services to Liberalism, and the N.L.F. continued to be a great power, though it was accused of "cliquism"—"too much power has remained in the hands of the few,"[2] a danger which Sir James Stephen saw to be inherent in "a pure Democracy." "The machine may control the party and not the party the machine," says a Liberal publicist. "The machine detached from the cause may fall into the hands of unscrupulous men seeking power

for their own ends."[1] It was the N.L.F. that constructed the "Newcastle Programme" in 1891, of which Lord Rosebery said: "It was not the officials of the Party (i.e. the leaders and the whips), who had imposed this Programme upon the N.L.F., it was the N.L.F. which had imposed it upon the officials, with all its consequences, good and evil." To the offices of the N.L.F. came Liberals from the provinces to secure good "carpet-baggers," described by Lord Randolph Churchill as "those gentlemen who come from the towns with their black coats and their tall hats and black bags," and who were drafted to constituencies with which they had not the remotest human connection. Its Presidents were generally strong representatives of Nonconformist feeling. Of Sir William Angus, for instance, (President in 1908), Mr. Spender writes: "He was of the type that the Federation greatly liked, a strong Nonconformist and sincerely religious man, very influential and highly respected in his own locality, eloquent and forcible on the platform." Such men were zealous about Education. Sir Robert Hudson, who had a strong sense of humour, and took his holidays at Monte Carlo, had to receive "six hundred worthies from all parts of England and Wales, who assemble here under my auspices at the Caxton Hall, to denounce the thing (the Education Bill of 1902) lock, stock and barrel."

The N.L.F. suffered from the quarrels that rent the Liberal Party during the Coalition Government of Mr. Lloyd George, and again after the General Strike. Its decline is a sign of the decline of Liberalism, and no indication of a decline in the value of organization. Socialists and Conservatives still have powerful Machines, and no politician can afford to disregard them. Mr. Winston Churchill writes from experience:

"Whatever happens you must hold on to the Machine. The ceaseless changes of the human scene, the ups and downs of politics, the caprice of Elections, the awkward things which crop up from time to time, all wash or foam over the man who clings successfully to the Caucus Rock. . . . As long as he maintains his hold upon the Rock, all in the long run will be repaid him. The gale abates; the waves subside. There he is sprawling and basking in the sunlight, when all the independent swimmers have been drowned."[2]

All those, of whatever Party, who aspire to be leaders of our Democracy, should take these words to heart.

The Liberal Party was strong in organization, but from 1880 till 1905 was continuously weakened by disunion. This disunion was foreshadowed while the Party was in opposition during Disraeli's Administration. Hartington disliked the Bulgaraian Atrocities agitation ; he wrote to Granville after the great meeting at St. James's Hall in December 1876 : " I feel certain that the Whigs and moderate Liberals in the House are a good deal disgusted, and I am much afraid that, if he (Gladstone) goes on much further, nothing can prevent a break-up of the Party."[1] In 1878 he quarrelled with Gladstone over a War Vote. In July 1879 he told Granville that he " had had a row with Chamberlain and the Radicals." Chamberlain took the opportunity of formally disclaiming Hartington's leadership ; the situation was patched up, but it remained (said Granville) " unpleasant."[2] Next year both Hartington and Chamberlain took office under Gladstone. Morley remarks that " the great posts had gone to the patrician Whigs, just as if Gladstone had been a Grey or a Russell." Sometimes all the peers in the Cabinet and Hartington were on one side, all the commoners on the other ; this was the case with the Irish Land Bill in 1880. Lord Acton was of opinion that " Chamberlain and Argyll in one Cabinet is an anomaly sure to tell in time, especially with Argyll discontented."[3] Argyll resigned in 1881. His colleagues held aloof from Forster while he was struggling against Irish disorder ; Forster resigned in May 1882. In 1882, said Dilke, " Lord Granville and Hartington fell out even more than usual." From 1880 to 1885 almost every Minister was constantly threatening resignation. In May and June 1884 there was continuous dissension in the Cabinet about Egypt and the relief of Gordon, besides other subjects. The Whigs wished for an expedition, the Radicals for the immediate abandonment of the Soudan and therefore of Gordon. In May 1885 there was more disunion in the Cabinet with regard to Ireland, Dilke and Chamberlain holding out strongly against Coercion. Then there was Chamberlain's Unauthorized Programme campaign, in which he described Hartington as Rip van Winkle, and Goschen as the Egyptian skeleton. In October 1885

Gladstone, writing to the Queen, classified the differences of opinion in his Party under three heads, viz. the questions of (1) taking land compulsorily, (2) the Disestablishment of the Church of England, (3) the House of Lords.

Then came Gladstone's Home Rule policy, and the Liberals lost Bright, Hartington, Forster, Cowper, Chamberlain, Courtney, Collings, Trevelyan (for a time), Lansdowne, Selborne, James and many other of their leading men. These were indeed heavy losses. In his maiden speech (March 24th, 1887) Asquith resentfully referred to some person who had called the Gladstonians "the intellectual scum of what was once the Liberal Party." "We shall be smashed," wrote Chamberlain to Labouchere, "because the country is not prepared for Home Rule." When, after four years of opposition, the Party was gaining a considerable number of seats and a majority clear of the Irish was confidently prophesied, there fell the terrible blow of Parnell's Divorce suit. Parnell's intrigue with Mrs. O'Shea was fairly well known, though Gladstone's ear was probably deaf to rumours.[1] In February 1887 O'Shea was reported as intending to take proceedings: at the end of 1889 the case was "beginning to be talked of in detail."[2] At last, in November 1890, only a week before the fatal decree was pronounced, Morley went to Brighton and entertained Parnell to dinner, doubtless with a view to discovering how the land lay. At the conclusion of the meal he delicately inquired "whether certain legal proceedings soon to come on are likely to end in your disappearance from the lead for a time." Parnell reassured him: "The other side don't know what a broken-kneed horse they are riding." "I'm delighted to hear that," said Morley, who rather rashly "inferred from his talk of the broken-kneed horse that he meant there would be no adverse decree."[3] It must have been a scene of High Comedy, in which the Englishman was "bubbled" by the Irishman, the latter having made up his mind that whatever happened there was going to be no "disappearance" on his own part.

The Liberal Party held together bravely under this stroke, and Gladstone praised their constancy.[4] They had quite lately exalted Parnell as a high-minded and cruelly-maligned gentleman who had successfully vindicated his character in the matter of the forged letters. Now they were united in denouncing him as immoral and unfit to co-operate with

a respectable Party. Miss Mary Gladstone's letters typically exhibit this change of view. In the Commission Court "he really exhibited all the fruits of the Spirit, love, peace, patience, gentleness, forbearance, long-suffering, meekness." After the Divorce Court, she writes: "and he lived this life of lies all these years. A heartbreaking revelation. 'Blot out his name.'" But the Liberals suffered a double misfortune. Parnell soon died and was no longer a stumbling-block to the Nonconformist conscience; but Home Rule became unpopular because of the Irishmen's quarrels, and those quarrels split the Irish Party in two—the Redmonites and the McCarthyites. The split endured. The Redmonites were a small party, but, even as such their votes could not be counted on; at the end of Lord Roseberry's Administration they either abstained from voting or voted with the Opposition.

When Gladstone became Prime Minister for the fourth time in 1892, a dividing line was at once apparent in his Cabinet; not on Home Rule, but on foreign politics. "The minority showed itself to contain 'the last remnant of the Manchester School: Harcourt and Morley from conviction strong; Mr. G. in a lesser degree. The Old Man is far the most susceptible to new influences.'" Thus an important member of the Cabinet expressed the situation to Morley.[1] It was the issue of Imperialism against Little Englandism. But the Little Englanders too were at variance. "Talked to Asquith," records Sir Algernon West (July 8th, 1893), "as to the terrible differences connected with Harcourt and John Morley, who quarrel on the Front Bench, and refuse to speak to each other." Sir Algernon writes of Morley's "sensitive and almost feminine character, which was so endearing, but not rough enough for daily life." "I did not think him self-seeking," said Lord Rendel to Campbell-Bannerman, "but femininely sensitive in personal matters, and apt to mistake implacability for virility." Owing to these feminine susceptibilities he quarrelled with Asquith, and would not speak to him for three weeks. Gladstone complained of his unparalleled difficulties with Harcourt, Morley and Rosebery. Soon in Sir Algernon's Diary we read the significant words "discussed eventualities," i.e. the terrible problem of who was to be Gladstone's successor. Gladstone discussed it himself, and was for Spencer; Morley was for Rosebery. Harcourt

was considered impossible. "He was daily liable to moods that made him difficult."[1] "To tell the naked truth," wrote Asquith, "he was an almost impossible colleague, and would have been a wholly impossible chief."[2] Campbell-Bannerman described Morley as "a petulant spinster," and Harcourt as "a naughty school-girl." Harcourt himself felt that "anything like party strength and unity was irrecoverable."[3] We have now arrived at a time of differences that were personal and had little reference to political principles; personal ambitions were over-riding Party loyalty.

Rosebery succeeded Gladstone, and his Government was almost immediately beaten on Labouchere's Amendment to the Address. "This of course," writes Morley, "was a demonstration in favour of Harcourt against the new Premier."[4] Morley quarrelled with Rosebery, because he had not been made Foreign Minister. Rosebery offered him India; Morley refused India, and then was angry because he had not accepted. Rosebery described Harcourt to the Queen as "a leader bitterly hostile to himself, and ostentatiously indifferent to the fate of the Government." Throughout his short rule of fifteen months Rosebery found in Harcourt, his second-in-command and Leader of the House of Commons, an implacable and unforgiving foe. On one occasion Rosebery reported to the Queen that the Cabinet was unanimous "with one exception, but the voice of that exception never ceases during the sitting of the Cabinet." What a contrast to the relations between Salisbury and Northcote in the early 'Eighties, when both were candidates for Tory leadership! "The most pleasant personal relations prevailed and . . . they behaved to each other, in many difficult and delicate circumstances, with unquestionable loyalty."[5]

When Gladstone had come into power in 1892 he sent the Queen an important memorandum in which he stated that there was to be seen in the Liberal Party "a large development of democratic opinion. The Liberal Associations now often termed themselves 'Liberal and Radical Associations.' The moderate Liberal is becoming a thing of the past." What would these democrats have said if they had known the extent to which their Parliamentary leaders were immersed in intrigues and intestinal feuds, each playing his own hand and watching for their aged Chief's removal from

the scene? What an exhibition of pettiness, spite, meanness, jealousy and mutual disloyalty! *Tantaene animis— !*

In Opposition these quarrelsome politicians continued to wrangle even more bitterly. Rosebery resigned the leadership in October 1896. Lord Oxford said that Rosebery never rejoined the Councils of the Liberal Party; but he continued his political activity. "The Mightier Personage," was one of Campbell-Bannerman's names for him. "So long as Rosebery is hanging on our flank, with his myrmidons busy, there can be no peace."[1] After his Chesterfield speech in December 1901, on account of Home Rule he ceased all co-operation with the Party. In 1898 Harcourt resigned from leadership in the Commons of "a Party rent by sectional disputes and personal interests . . . a Party that no man would lead either with credit to himself or advantage to the country." In January 1899 Morley followed Harcourt's example and retired "to his little doctrinaire study"—a very fitting retreat. Now the Boer War caused fresh dissension. A "League of Liberals" was formed—of Liberals that approved the War, and in 1900 an Imperial Liberal Council under the guidance of Lord Brassey and Sir Robert Perks. Active "Pro-Boers" in the Commons were Labouchere, Sir Wilfrid Lawson, Hon. P. Stanhope, Cremer, Keir Hardie and Mr. Lloyd George. "The Generals were called 'brutes,'" writes Lord Haldane, "and every sort of accusation against the Army was made."[2] Haldane, Asquith, and Grey strongly disassociated themselves from these attacks; Asquith complained in his Latinized phrases that he and his friends were therefore excommunicated from the Party, "definitely and authoritatively branded as schismatics and heretics, in antagonism with the predominant and authorized creed of the Liberal Party."[3] In March 1902 Asquith abandoned Home Rule, an act which he claimed to be not "apostasy" but "common sense."[4] From 1901 to 1903 the two wings of the Liberal Party were mining and counter-mining each other.[5]

On the 15th of May, 1903, at Birmingham, Joseph Chamberlain sounded what the Editor of his Speeches calls The First Blast. The campaign for Tariff Reform was opened. At Glasgow, on October 6th, he said: "You must put a tax on food. The murder is out." The murder was out indeed. Here at last was an issue on which all Liberals

could reunite. In 1906 they achieved a record majority. But will the historian of the future have to record that Campbell-Bannerman and Asquith were the two last Liberal Prime Ministers of a Liberal Party?

In a Party of Progress there are sure to be cleavages between the men of the Left and the men of the Right. But, during the twenty-five years which began with Gladstone's second Administration and ended with the triumph of Campbell-Bannerman, the Liberal position was further complicated by the emergence of two issues, (1) Home Rule and (2) Imperialism. As to Home Rule, the democrat might legitimately hold an opinion either for or against; unless he were deeply infected with Gladstonian Nationalism, he might consider that the question must be decided not by an Irish majority, but by a majority of Great Britain and Ireland. Or his mind might be swayed by a Nonconformist distrust of Roman Catholicism. As to the second issue, many Radical working-men were Imperialists, like the working-men whom Lord Randolph Churchill had attracted. Campbell-Bannerman, a Little Englander, came into power on a reaction against Imperialism; but, after his death, Asquith's Cabinet was much more imperialistically inclined. Imperialism continued to be an apple of discord to the Liberals.

It cannot be denied that, during these years, the Tories were better disciplined than the Liberals. Gladstone bore a grudging witness to this when he condemned the Parliament of 1874 as "the least independent of Parliaments." He told the Queen, as an explanation of his defeat, that, though he credited his own Party with the greater intelligence, "there was a far greater 'cohesion' in the Conservative Party than in the Liberal one."[1] And, in his Midlothian campaign: "With regret and pain I have to make this affirmation, that never did the Press of this country, and never did the Gentry of this country, rally round the Conservative Party, in the days when that Party was led by Sir Robert Peel and the Duke of Wellington, with the same degree of zeal, or the same overwhelming preponderance as that with which they now rally round Lord Beaconsfield."[2] (What a tribute to the Tory leader!) "On no single issue has the voice of the majority checked the Government in its career."[3] Of his own last Government he spoke in contrast: "Each man seemed to have

his own axe to grind. Men looked out for themselves, first and foremost."[1] And Campbell-Bannerman mournfully asked, "Where are the Conservative 'rebels' compared with Lord Rosebery, Sir Edward Grey, Haldane or Asquith?" On an occasion when Sir Richard Webster, the Tory Attorney-General, had had to correct his previous statement, and his Party had impartially cheered both the former statement and the correction, *Punch's* observant "Toby M.P." put this saying into the mouth of Sir William Harcourt—"That's the best of the Tories, they always stand by their own man."[2]

NOTES

THE LIBERAL PARTY

Page 56.
[1] *The British Liberal Party* (Hamilton Fyfe), p. 16.
[2] Balerno, March 3rd, 1880.
[3] West Calder, April 2nd, 1880.

Page 57.
[1] Stow, March 30th, 1880.
[2] Morley's *Gladstone*, Vol. III, p. 535.
[3] Second Midlothian Speech, Nov. 26th, 1879.
[4] *Recollections*, Vol. I, pp. 20-1.

Page 58.
[1] The younger Duke, formerly Plantagenet Palliser, not the proud exclusive Duke of the Barsetshire novels.

Page 59.
[1] Speech on his resignation, at Greenock, October 15th, 1926.
[2] Paisley, January 28th, 1920.
[3] In a recent letter to *The Manchester Guardian*.
[4] "Accommodated; that is, when a man is, as they say, accommodated; or, when a man is—being—whereby, he may be thought to be accommodated, which is an excellent thing."

Page 60.
[1] *Life of Sir Charles W. Dilke* (Gwynn and Tuckwell), Vol. I, p. 80.
[2] Mill and Tom Hughes won seats in 1865. Mill was defeated in 1868 by W. H. Smith.
[3] Disraeli told Matthew Arnold that he was the only living Englishman who had become a classic in his lifetime.

Page 61.
[1] Preface to *Life of Henry Labouchere* (A. L. Thorold).

Page 62.
[1] Lord Salisbury also was called by his family "Citizen Salisbury," not on account of Republican views but because he disliked the appanages of his rank.
[2] Dilke and Auberon Herbert were Tellers for the Motion; only G. Anderson and Sir Wilfrid Lawson voted for it. Dilke was interrupted by imitations of cock-crowing, an early nineteenth century form of disorder.

Page 63.
[1] An article in *The Fortnightly Review* ("The next page of the Liberal Programme").
[2] *Punch*, November 14th, 1874.
[3] Stead's *Life* (Frederic Whyte), Vol. II, p. 109.

Page 64.
[1] *Life of Bradlaugh*, Vol. II, pp. 166-7.

Page 65.
[1] *The Fortnightly Review*, February, 1884.
[2] Rt. Hon. H. H. Asquith, House of Commons (November 18th, 1918).

Page 66.

[1] *The Morning Post*, May 22nd, 1931.

[2] Lord Crewe writes in his *Life of Lord Rosebery*, Vol. I, p. 251: "This rather crude conception of a *bourgeois* Republic is as extinct to-day as Jacobitism; but fifty years ago it represented a distinct type of public opinion, before Socialism had obtained a footing in England."

[3] At one time S. Carolina (U.S.) had annual Parliaments, Rhode Island and Connecticut had half-yearly elections.

Page 67.

[1] *Fifty Years of Parliament* (Lord Oxford), Vol. I, p. 61.

[2] *Life of Sir Charles Dilke*, Vol. I, p. 164.

[3] *Ib.*, p. 168.

[4] Fyfe, *The British Liberal Party*, p. 98.

Page 68.

[1] Lord Randolph Churchill also denounced "that cramping fetter and chain of entail upon unborn lives." (*Speeches*, Vol. II, p. 226).

[2] At the end of an oration at Glasgow he said, "Like the great Lord Clive, I am astonished at my own moderation."

Page 69.

[1] *Life of Dilke*, Vol. II, pp. 277-8.

[2] See *The Firm of Webb*, p. 10.

[3] *The Firm of Webb*, p. 28.

[4] *Personal Papers of Lord Rendel*, p. 199.

Page 70.

[1] Maine's *Popular Government*, p. 177.

[2] Ponsonby wrote of this Parliament to the Queen (July 20th, 1892): "There is no doubt that the Parliament just elected is far more democratic than the former one, and that the 'Labour Party' though small is powerful, and must have a representative in the Government." (*Letters of Queen Victoria*, 1891-5, p. 130).

Page 71.

[1] *Life of Sir William Harcourt* (A. G. Gardiner), Vol. I, p. 188.

[2] It was said that the abolition of these tests lost Oxford for the Church of England.

[3] The Act of 1870 permitted Local Authorities to frame laws for compulsory attendance. It was not till 1880 that compulsion was made general.

Page 72.

[1] Morley's *Gladstone*, Vol. II, p. 311.

Page 73.

[1] Also to the enmity of the Licensed Victuallers. "I could, of course, not tell him," the Queen wrote in her Journal, "that it was greatly owing to his own unpopularity."

[2] Hamilton Fyfe's *Northcliffe*, p. 14.

[3] *Ib.*, p. 46.

[4] *Ib.*, p. 50.

Page 74.

[1] *Fleet Street and Downing Street* (Kennedy Jones), p. 89.

[2] *Popular Government* (1885), p. 148.

[3] *Fleet Street and Downing Street*, p. 139.

Page 75

[1] *Speech at Parliamentary Press Gallery Dinner*, May 18th, 1909.

[2] For instance, on July 25th, 1931, the business in the House of Commons was a discussion of the Lords Amendments to the Land Utilization Bill. Of this, next day, there was no Report in *The Daily Mail*: *The Daily Express* spared half a column to Parliament, mostly about the wedding of the daughter of the Minister of Health and about Mr. Addison inadvertently addressing the Speaker as "Mr. Lloyd George."

[3] *Fleet Street and Downing Street*, p. 198.
[4] Hamilton Fyfe's *Northcliffe*, p. 288.

Page 76.
[1] Miss Mary Gladstone's opinion was that "the Cabinet is highly respectable, rather aristocratic, with a democratic dash in the shape of Mr. Chamberlain, but on the whole a good working company." (*Diaries and Letters*, p. 196).

Page 77.
[1] Morley's *Recollections*, Vol. I, p. 167.
[2] *Radicals and Whigs* (*Fortnightly Review*, February, 1884).
[3] Letter to Lord Rosebery, September 16th, 1880. (Morley's *Gladstone*, Vol. III, p. 4).
[4] Lord Balfour's *Chapters of Autobiography*, p. 128.
[5] *Life of Lord Randolph Churchill*, Vol. I, p. 269.
[6] *After Thirty Years*, p. 326.
[7] *Ib.*, p. 597.

Page 78.
[1] The chronology of Bradlaugh's long Parliamentary struggle will be found in *Charles Bradlaugh, a Record of his Life and Work*, Vol. II, pp. 203-8.
[2] It is a remarkable sign of changed times that one of our High Court Judges, who died quite recently, frequently preached Malthusianism from the Bench.

Page 79.
[1] "There was a gorgeous Latin quotation from Lucretius, which though gibberish to me I could have listened to for ever—his voice was so splendid." (Mary Gladstone's *Diaries and Letters*, p. 288).

Page 80.
[1] He had contested Sheffield in 1874.
[2] Sheffield, September 23rd, 1873.
[3] "Every man was born into the world with Natural Rights . . . but all these rights have passed away. Private ownership has taken the place of those communal rights" (Birmingham, January 5th, 1885). "I say that men are born with Natural Rights, with the Right to existence and the Right to a fair and reasonable opportunity of enjoying it" (Glasgow, September 15th, 1885). The theory of the *Contrat Social* is that men, originally free and in the state of Nature, unanimously and voluntarily gave up their Natural Rights to the community. (Maine's *Popular Government*, p. 156).

Page 81.
[1] Canon Scott-Holland in *Acton, Gladstone and others*.
[2] *Life's Ebb and Flow*, p. 143.

Page 82.
[1] Thorold's *Life of Labouchere*, p. 206.
[2] "Mr. Chamberlain" (*The Westminster Review*, 1887, Vol. 128).
[3] *Letters of Queen Victoria* (1879-1885), p. 91.
[4] Dilke's *Life*, Vol. I, p. 270.

Page 83.
[1] *Memoir of J. E. C. Bodley* (Shane Leslie), p. 43.
[2] See Sir Austen Chamberlain's Letter to *The Times*, November 23rd, 1929. Sir Austen adds that Asquith, a junior Counsel in the case, was himself surprised at his leaders' advice. The Prince of Wales wrote to the Queen (February 13th, 1886): "But if Dilke is innocent of the grave charges brought against him, why did he not go into the witness-box?" (Queen Victoria's *Letters*, 1886-90, p. 52).

Page 84.
[1] *Liberty, Fraternity and Equality*, p. 239.

Page 85.
[1] Birmingham, April 16th, 1884 (*Speeches*, Vol. I, p. 132).
[2] *Fleet Street and Downing Street*, p. 94.
[3] See Introduction to *Punch*, Vol. 75.
[4] *Popular Government*, p. 93.
[5] May 30th, 1867.

Page 86.
[1] *Life of Dilke*, Vol. I, p. 172.
[2] See an interesting article in *The Times* of September 2nd, 1931 (*Disraeli to an Agent*).
[3] *Life of Disraeli*, Vol. V, p. 186.
[4] *Ib.*, p. 277.
[5] *My Apprenticeship* (Beatrice Webb), p. 177.

Page 87.
[1] *Chapters of Autobiography*, p. 169.
[2] *Life*, Vol. III, p. 197.
[3] *Fleet Street and Downing Street*, p. 94.
[4] "The Organization of the Liberal Party—Mr. Schnadhorst" (*The Westminster Review*, Vol. 128, pp. 104-12).
[5] *My Apprenticeship*, p. 128.
[6] *Sir Robert Hudson* (J. A. Spender), pp. 201, 210.

Page 88.
[1] Newcastle-on-Tyne, January 15th, 1884.
[2] Birmingham, January 5th, 1885.

Page 89.
[1] *Life of Lord Randolph Churchill*, Vol. I, p. 366.
[2] *The Reorganization of the Liberal Party* (*The Westminster Review*, 1887, Vol. 128, p. 395). "The Association," writes the author of the article, "in effect represents, in the true sense of the term, no one at all but the members themselves."

Page 90.
[1] *Sir Robert Hudson, A Memoir* (J. A. Spender), Preface.
[2] *Hang on to the Caucus* (*The Sunday Pictorial*, July 26th, 1931). Lord Rosebery wrote in 1906: "I acknowledge that I did not realize the strength of the Machine—the *ingens Machina*" (*Life*, Vol. II, p. 595).

Page 91.
[1] Granville's *Life*, Vol. II, p. 167.
[2] *Ib.*, p. 182.
[3] *Letters of Lord Acton to Mary Gladstone.*

Page 92.
[1] At a Cabinet meeting in May, 1882, Harcourt referred to Captain O'Shea as "the husband of Parnell's mistress." (Dilke's *Life*, Vol. I, p 445).
[2] Dilke's *Life*, Vol. II, pp. 268, 273.
[3] Lord Morley's *Recollections*, Vol. I, p. 253.
[4] *The Personal Papers of Lord Rendel*, p. 87.

Page 93.
[1] Morley's *Recollections*, Vol. II, p. 78.

Page 94.
[1] Morley's *Recollections*, Vol. II, p. 13.
[2] Lord Oxford's *Fifty Years of Parliament*, Vol. I, p. 221.
[3] Morley's *Recollections*, Vol. II, p. 14.
[4] *Ib.*, p. 22.
[5] Lord Randolph Churchill's *Life*, Vol. I, pp. 227-8.
[6] *Letters of Queen Victoria* (1891-5), p. 174.

Page 95.
[1] Campbell-Bannerman to Ripon (November 17th, 1900), *Life*, Vol. I, p. 302.
[2] *Richard Burdon Haldane, an Autobiography*, p. 138.
[3] National Reform Union Banquet, June 26th, 1901.
[4] Later he had to become a Home Ruler again.
[5] Campbell-Bannerman's *Life*, Vol. I, p. 333.

Page 96.
[1] Queen Victoria's *Letters* (1870-8), p. 323.
[2] *Fifteenth Midlothian Speech*, Pathill, March 23rd, 1880.
[3] *Eighteenth Midlothian Speech*, West Calder, April 2nd, 1880.

Page 97.
[1] *The Personal Papers of Lord Rendel*, p. 138.
[2] *Punch*, April 6th, 1889.

NONCONFORMITY AND DEMOCRACY

Strength of political Nonconformity—Multiplicity of Sects—Separatism of Nonconformists—Effect of removal of University Tests—Their Churches organized for politics—Dr. Clifford, Revd. Hugh Price Hughes, W. T. Stead—Irish, English and Welsh Church Disestablishment—Nonconformists and Education—Bradlaugh—Dilke—Home Rule—Parnell—Food Taxes—Chinese "Slavery"—Strength in Campbell-Bannerman's Government—Disappointed about Education and Licensing—Rally against the Lords—Many grievances removed—Puritanism weakened—Labour Unsympathetic—Reasons for decline of political power.

THE politically-minded Nonconformists, during this period, were responsible for a great part of the democratic advance. At the end of the period they must have realized that the aims of Democracy were not quite the same as the Nonconformist ideals.

Throughout the Eighteenth Century the Dissenters were a bulwark of the Whig Party, to which they owed the Toleration Act of 1689. Wellington was Prime Minister in 1830 when the Test and Corporation Acts were repealed, but the statesman that moved for the Repeal was the Whig Lord John Russell. They continued, even more strenuously, to support Gladstone and the Liberals. Sir Austen Chamberlain has said that there was a time, not so long ago, when "to say of a man that he was a Nonconformist was almost to predicate that he was a Liberal." The Methodists, however, who were probably the most numerous Nonconformist Sect, had an anti-Liberal tradition dating from the time of the French Revolution;[1] a character in *Coningsby* calls them "a preserve of the Tory Party." Lord Morley held the view that the evangelization of the lower classes by Wesley saved England from a Revolution worse than the French. But Greville wrote in 1830 of the "enormous" influence of the Methodists, which was then certainly not enlisted on the Tory side; one of Disraeli's characters, Mr. Tadpole, both in *Coningsby* and in *Sybil*, admits their power.[2] The Duke of Wellington told Croker that the Reform Bill of 1832 had transferred power from "the gentlemen of England" to "the shopkeepers, being

Dissenters from the Church, many of them Socinians, others Atheists." There was, he said, a new democratic influence exercised by new voters, " these are all Dissenters from the Church, and are everywhere a formidable active Party against the aristocratic influence of the Landed Gentry."[1] This influence could be relied upon by the Whigs and Liberals from 1832 to 1867. Nonconformity was very political, and grew more and more so while Gladstone and, after him, Campbell-Bannerman were in power. It was all very well for an eminent Methodist, the Revd. Hugh Price Hughes, to say : " We must not allow our Churches to be identified with Party politics. . . . Our Churches as such must not take sides, must observe a strict neutrality,"[2] and the sentiment was much to his credit. But alas ! those Churches *were* so identified ; their pulpits were " tuned " like the pulpits of the Church of England in Stuart times.

Not that the Nonconformists were entirely absorbed in politics. Their Ministers no doubt were, and are, as devout and self-denying as the Clergy of the Church of England, and many of them were learned. But the multiplicity of their Churches (with their sub-divisions) could not help weakening their appeal. Thus the Methodists were, till recently, divided into :—

1. The People called Methodists.
2. The Welsh Calvinistic Methodists.
3. The Methodist New Connexion.
4. The Primitive Methodists.
5. The Bible Christians.
6. The United Methodist Free Churches (a fusion of three Methodist Sects).
7. The Independent Methodists.
8. The Wesleyan Reform Union, and
9. The United Methodist Church (which itself was a fusion of Nos. 3, 5 and 6).[3]

Dryden wrote, as a member of the Church of England :

" A thousand daily Sects rise up and die,
" A thousand more the perished race supply."

And, as a Roman Catholic :

" In short in doctrine, or in discipline,
" Not one reform'd can with another join."

Here it may be argued that the Nonconformist's constant

participation in disputes about doctrine and discipline proves that his deepest interest was not political. The old-fashioned Nonconformist Minister was pre-occupied, like Wesley, with saving souls from Hell ; this was to him vastly more important than winning Elections. Spurgeon himself preached : " When the damned jingle the burning irons of their torment, they shall say ' For ever ! ' When they howl, Echo cries ' For ever ! ' " An old Minister advised young Price Hughes : " Hell, preach Hell and its fire—that is the only way to impress and save the people." And many, whose memories go back half-a-century, can remember that " Hell and its fire " was preached as vigorously by Evangelical Clergymen of the Church of England. To gain salvation was the prime object of the Puritan ; and so the pleasures and relaxations of earthly life, however innocent, were condemned. The Theatre was " the Devil's Chapel " ; cards were " the Devil's Prayer-book " ; the novel was " the Devil's Bible." Perhaps politics were one of the Free Churchman's few legitimate diversions.

Their extreme Puritanism and their segregation from the National Church, their negations in fact, and such legal disqualifications as still affected them, kept the Nonconformists out of the main stream of English life. They had a sense of social inferiority—an " inferiority complex." Matthew Arnold's aim was " to deliver the Middle Class out of the hands of their Dissenting Ministers," " to sap intellectually the Protestant Dissenters." Arnold spoke from outside their ranks, but Mr. Augustine Birrell, himself a Nonconformist born and bred, has said that it has always been very hard in England to be one—" it demanded an effort, and was felt to be cutting yourself off, not from the fountains of holiness, but from the main currents of secular national life."[1] The biographer of Hugh Price Hughes (his daughter), writes to exactly the same effect : " To be a ' Dissenter,' to quote a phrase which is not now current, has been to put human beings outside the social pale, outside that free intercourse with their fellows and with the national life which a democratic era claims increasingly for all varieties of men and women."[2] (The writer's point is a good one—that this separateness was anti-democratic.) Price Hughes resented the non-inclusion of Nonconformists in State functions.

The Methodists, like the Roman Catholics, sent their

sons to a school of their own : " The sons of the wealthy Methodists, and other Evangelical families, who went up yearly to the Leys, were the future employers of Labour, the future members of learned professions, of Municipal Councils, and of Parliament."[1] The school atmosphere must have reflected the atmosphere of their homes, and they were not fully admitted to the Universities till 1871. It is true that since 1854 they had been allowed to matriculate at Oxford, but not to teach, nor to share in the government of the University. The Act of 1871 abolished all religious tests at Oxford and Cambridge, except for College Headships, Theological Chairs and degrees in Divinity. Here was indeed a notable removal of barriers. The Methodist Price Hughes regarded this University Test Act as a social change as momentous in its way as the passing of the Reform Bill. " Nonconformists must flock from henceforth to the ancient Universities and Methodists among the number."[2] (One of the first arrivals was the future Earl of Oxford and Asquith.) Price Hughes thought that the *Nonconformists* would benefit by this reform. Matthew Arnold hoped that it would benefit the University : " Perhaps the infusion of Dissenters' sons of that muscular, hard-working, *unblasé* middle class—for it is this, in spite of its abominable disagreeableness—may brace the flaccid sinews of Oxford a little."

Nonconformists gained broader views by their University education, made friends and connections at Oxford and Cambridge, and were enabled to exercise more influence afterwards in public life. Their Churches had already given them a training in organization. Thorold Rogers said of Joseph Arch's Agricultural agitation : " I do not believe that the mass of peasants could have been moved at all, had it not been for the organization of the Primitive Methodists." Most of the leaders of the labourers' strike were Methodist local preachers. There can be no doubt about the political power of Nonconformity. One of their leaders, the Rev. Dr. Guinness Rogers claimed that they were " the centre of the Liberal Party." " The Liberals " (wrote Matthew Arnold in 1870) " lean so on the Protestant Dissenters and adopt all their prejudices without believing in them, and simply to get political power by their help." In 1874 he wrote to his sister, Mrs. W. E. Forster : " There will be a great attempt to reconstruct the Liberal Party on

the Nonconformist platform, and from the Nonconformists knowing their objects clearly, and the Liberal Party in general not knowing theirs, the attempt has some chances in its favour." Disraeli professed to believe that his Reform Bill had weakened the political power of Nonconformity.[1] On the other hand he admitted that it was "the traditional and admirable organization of the Dissenters of England" that brought Gladstone into power in 1868. "They saw before them the destruction of a Church. I do not think that, at the next appeal to the people, the Nonconformist body will find that the same result can be obtained."[2] He was severe upon the Nonconformists: "So long as they maintained toleration, so long as they checked sacerdotal arrogance, they acted according to their traditions, and those traditions are not the least noble in the history of England. But they have changed their position. They now make war, and avowedly make war, upon the Ecclesiastical institutions of this country."[3] Disraeli truly prophesied that in 1874 the Nonconformists would not achieve victory; but their whole-hearted support of Gladstone's Bulgarian Atrocities and anti-Turk campaigns contributed to the Liberal victory of 1880. Ten years later, after Parnell's fatal divorce suit, they decided the action of the Liberal Party.

Dr. Guinness Rogers, a Nonconformist leader, in a *Nineteenth Century* article,[4] raised the question whether Dissenters, *quâ* Dissenters, were more political than Churchmen. He answered it, almost on the same page, by laying it down that "every Municipal, every County Council Election should be made a platform for the inculcation of our principles." These were to be specially inculcated on a subject very dear to Nonconformists—Education. "Every Nonconformist," said Sir Edward Russell, "is an Educationist first and last."[5] One cannot help feeling that the Nonconformist zeal for Education was largely concerned with the duty of pressing the claims of Undenominational religious instruction against Denominational. Certainly religious zeal was not to be limited to Parliamentary, but was to extend to Municipal Politics. "Rouse yourselves, young men!" exclaimed Dr. Clifford, "Stand by your County Council! Secure a decisive majority of Progressives at the coming Election! Oh! young men! devote yourselves to the purification and enriching of our

Metropolitan life!" "Politics" (wrote the Doctor to a friend) "are one of the organs and instruments by which true Christians hasten the coming of the Kingdom of God." To him Mr. Lloyd George's Budget was not only great from a fiscal, or from a Social-reform, point of view—it was "a great Christian Budget."

The Rev. Dr. John Clifford, who for many years served a great religious ministry in Westbourne Park where he was associated with every kind of social reform, found time to be an ardent political campaigner. His chief interest was Education. He was said to be the life and soul of the Passive Resistance movement when the Conservatives passed the Education Act of 1902. When the Radicals came into power he was as untiring in the promotion of their own unsuccessful Education Bills. At the time of the Boer War he was President of the General Committee for stopping the War. He was always ready to appear on platforms at meetings where the House of Lords was to be denounced, or Mr. Lloyd George's taxes were to be supported. His interest extended to foreign nations; wherever he thought there was oppression, he lifted up his voice to condemn the oppressor. He considered 1905 to be "a year of manifestation," worthy to rank with 1688 or 1832, because in that year there was revolutionary activity in Russian and Russia was beaten by Japan. Russia was ruled by an Autocrat, so naturally his sympathy was with Japan. In 1920 this indomitable old gentleman, then aged 84, after being knocked down by a taxi-cab, proceeded to attend a Committee at the House to protest against the persecutions of the Koreans—the Japanese now being the persecutors.

The Revd. Hugh Price Hughes was the Head of a Mission in the West End of London. He originated it himself and conducted it with zeal and organizing talent. But, like Dr. Clifford, he could find time for public speaking; religion could not satisfy all his energies. He himself never drank wine, nor went to a theatre; but he was associated with John McDougall's campaign against the London Music-Halls. As he sometimes took the unpopular side, he provided himself at his meetings with "chuckers-out" who also were teetotallers, but muscular and able to use their fists. Before the meeting began, the "Lay Agent" of Price Hughes would address the bodyguard: "Now, hearties, to your posts! Keep a good look-out, and don't

forget your hymn-books."[1] His most effective political speech was delivered at St. James' Hall on the Sunday after the pronouncement of the Parnell divorce decree. The Liberals had not made up their minds what action to take ; Gladstone was at Hawarden, and had not spoken. Price Hughes made a terrific onslaught upon Parnell, " the most infamous adulterer of the century." " His speech that afternoon—reported at length in the Press throughout the kingdom—was considered by the Irish Members and the lobby of the House, generally, to have decided matters and opened the sluice-gates."[2] (It was now that the term Nonconformist Conscience came into use.) But Price Hughes took the opposite side to Dr. Clifford over the Boer War. He was that *rara avis* a Nonconformist-Imperialist, and his Imperialism made his friends very angry, for it was as strong as Chamberlain's or Mr. Kipling's : " Dominion after dominion has come—often without any deliberate effort on our part—into our possession. There has been nothing like it since the beginning of the world, and wherever we go there has been the establishment of order and some kind of justice."[3]

W. T. Stead was the son of a Congregational Minister. It was in journalism, rather than on the platform and in the pulpit, that he became an exponent of the Nonconformist Conscience, though he used the platform[4] also :—and very likely the pulpit when the chance offered. He was Editor of a provincial paper, *The Northern Echo*, when MacGahan's letter to *The Daily News* started the Bulgarian Atrocities campaign. Gladstone took up the cause of the Bulgarians with enthusiasm, and received the support, besides that of Clergymen and Dissenting Ministers, of Harcourt, Chamberlain and Morley. Stead entered on the campaign *con amore*. When Gladstone thundered against the Turk, Stead said " it was as if the High Priest of Humanity were pronouncing the doom which was impending over the guilty Empire." Stead's pro-Bulgarian energy made him known. He came to London in 1880 as Assistant-Editor to Morley of *The Pall Mall Gazette*, and became Editor soon after Morley entered the House of Commons. There can be no question of his eminence as a journalist. Morley himself said that he was " for a season the most powerful journalist in the island." Harold Frederic went still further : " Stead, between the years 1884 and 1888, came nearer to governing Great

Britain than any other man in the Kingdom." Some very able men were on his *Pall Mall Gazette* staff, or contributed to its pages—E. T. Cook, Milner, Sir Henry Norman, Sir Robert Donald. In 1890 he started *The Review of Reviews*, a publication of considerable originality and considerable success; the fact that it largely consisted of extracts from other journals gained it the name of "A Magazine Rifle" or "Fagin's Miscellany." He afterwards ventured on a new daily paper, but this enterprise was unsuccessful.

Stead made a double appeal. Most of his activities were dear to the hearts of Nonconformists. Nonconformists were great admirers of Oliver Cromwell—until perhaps Lord Rosebery reminded them that Cromwell was a patron of the Turf. Stead, in his youth, "felt a far keener and more passionate love for Oliver Cromwell than I did for the divine figure of Jesus of Nazareth." Cardinal Manning called him "the Cromwell of the age." In whatever he was undertaking, Stead described himself as "anxious ever to jog the elbow of the Almighty." He exerted himself in the cause of a World-peace, actually contriving to make personal calls on the Sultan and the Czar with this great object in view; his interview with the Czar was probably arranged by his (and Gladstone's) friend Madame Novikoff. He took a part in the movement for the repeal of the C.D. Acts which was brought about in 1886. He backed up E. D. Morel's Crusade against Congo slavery. He was as fond as John Bright of the inhabitants of the United States—"already at one and twenty an ardent preacher of Anglo-American brotherhood." In 1896 he opened a great Anglo-American Arbitration Campaign. He was always eccentric and nearly always rash. "Un type assez original" was the verdict of Mrs. Crawford's French maid. The French Ambassador to London reported: "The person in question is dangerously indiscreet, and feared by his friends for his indiscretion." The offices of *The Pall Mall Gazette* were described as "the Mecca of the Crank"; they were "bombarded by the oddest set of creatures 'outside Bedlam.'"[1] Stead's own brain was fertile in quaint ideas. One was of a "new Catholicity" dawning upon the world, with the Pope in the Van of Progress. He was addicted to circularizing eminent men *de omnibus rebus et quibusdam aliis*. Thomas Hardy replied to one such communication: "I

am unable to answer your enquiry as to 'Hymns that have helped me.'"[1] Stead's greatest indiscretion, in the view of most of his contemporaries, was the publication in *The Pall Mall Gazette* in 1885 of the articles entitled *The Maiden Tribute of Modern Babylon.*[2] As to these, and the part he took (for which he was imprisoned) in the mock seduction of a young girl, his sincerity was unquestionable; and he was successful in raising the "age of consent" from fourteen to sixteen. Many Clergymen of the Church of England and some Roman Catholic priests approved his action. His Nonconformist friends, after some hesitation, decided not to condemn him. For the most part they did condemn his *Letters from the Vatican*, and his "new Catholicity" propaganda. Sir Herbert Warren of Magdalen said he was "a blend of St. Paul and Barnum."

On other activities he could not have expected anything from Nonconformists but opposition, for Stead was a Militarist and an Imperialist. He was in favour of universal military Service for women as well as for men.[3] Arnold-Forster took counsel with him in 1884 over the agitation about the weakness of the Navy. Stead himself went to the Admiralty and called on Lord Alcester, who told him that so bad was the state of things that, if we went to war with France, within twenty-four hours "Sir Cooper Key and I and all the rest of us at the Admiralty would be swinging by our necks from the lamp-posts in front of Whitehall, where we should be strung up, every man Jack of us, by the Nation whom we had betrayed, and it would serve us right too."[4] He supported the "Two Keels to One" naval agitation. In April 1889 he made friends with Cecil Rhodes, who was convinced that the English-speaking races, British and American, were best fitted to promote Justice, Liberty and Peace. Rhodes therefore intended "to paint as much of the map of Africa red as possible." Amongst the inferior races of the world Rhodes placed the Portuguese, the French and the Germans. Stead, "an impassioned Imperialist,"[5] whose Imperialism was "Imperialism plus common-sense and the Ten Commandments," found much to admire in Rhodes. (He called Kipling "the Banjo Bard of the Empire," but praised *The White Man's Burden.*) But he could not stomach the Jameson Raid. He told the Prince of Wales that, according to Lord Chief Justice Russell's summing-up in the trial of Jameson and his colleagues,

Rhodes " ought to be arrested the moment he puts his foot on British shores." " I suppose that is so," said the Prince.[1] A few years later Stead began to feel that his confidence in the English-speaking peoples had been excessive ; he did not like our supremacy in India, and he came to believe that no one race was marked out for World-leadership. Rhodes, on his side, lost trust in Stead's judgment, and removed his name from his Will because of his " extraordinary eccentricity." Stead went on in his hopeful way. In April 1912 he started " The National Men and Religion Forward Movement " : in the same month he was drowned in the *Titanic*. Lord Fisher's epitaph on him was that " he possessed the insanity of genius." Possibly he was thinking of Stead's pre-occupation with the supernatural. Not long before his death " a high spirit called Hilarion " had sent him a message. Whether or not he was fortified by this message from Hilarion, Stead met his death bravely.

It will be seen from this account of the sayings and doings of some prominent Nonconformists that their common object was to make the Liberal Party an organ of " righteousness." They were convinced that under Gladstone, " a Premier who believed in righteousness," the Party *was* identified with righteous policies, though Gladstone was rather slow—almost wanted " gingering up "—in disowning the co-respondent Parnell. Lord Rosebery was a Peer and given to horse-racing, so from the point of view of " righteousness " he was not ideal. Campbell-Bannerman quite regained their confidence ; he was not a sportsman—in fact he gave up shooting because of his humanitarian feelings. Moreover he was a Presbyterian and a Scot, and the Nonconformist liked a " dour " Scot. Asquith again was of Nonconformist stock. Mr. Lloyd George was a Nonconformist, and a doughty champion of Welsh Disestablishment. The Nonconformists were against the Church of England and all Established religions, against any rate-support of Church of England Schools, against War, against Sport ; most of them were against a strong Army or Navy, and against Colonial expansion. The biographer of Hugh Price Hughes notes that he was a member of many " Anti " societies. The majority of Nonconformists were teetotallers, and were against the sale and consumption of excisable liquors. They were seen neither in taverns nor music-halls

nor theatres, and were against them all. Their congregational cohesion and preaching talents enabled them to push many of their "Anti" measures, which were really unpopular, into the forefront of Liberal Programmes, and even to pass some of them through Parliament. They were not Socialists; they were fond of acquiring property. They were neither Republican nor in any way subversive; they admired the Queen for her domestic virtues. For nearly the whole of the period, with which we are concerned, they were powerful; but they had an innate weakness—they were really out of touch with the Nation. They were not "good mixers." Price Hughes lamented that Methodism "had ceased to be the Church of the people, to express and to respond to their needs." Yes, it was not only that Nonconformity was far apart from the Church and her adherents; it made no appeal to those who never attended Church nor Chapel—the working-men of the towns, mostly Radicals, who earned weekly wages and were beginning to demand that those wages should be higher and their hours of work shorter.

The strongly-held opinions of the Nonconformists, both positive and negative, were enforced by a consistent and continuous political activity from 1867 to the Great War. "It was" (said Disraeli) "the traditional and admirable organization of the Dissenters of England that effected the triumph of the Right Honourable gentleman"—i.e. the Disestablishment of the Irish Church. Mr. Augustine Birrell, himself a Nonconformist born in a Manse, has deplored the fact that the Irish Church was disestablished "rather from a desire to please the Dissenters in England than to do justice to Ireland." But the Irish Church was an "alien" Church, not native to the soil. The Church of England is a very different institution, with all her faults the Church of the Nation, associated for centuries with the Nations' life and government. Nevertheless, in these years, the Church was thought to be in great peril. The long fight over Church Rates was "at first looked upon both by attackers and defenders as only the preliminary stage in an inevitable and almost successful assault upon the endowments of the Church as a whole."[1] In 1871 and 1872 Edward Miall moved three times in the House of Commons for a Committee on Disestablishment. The votes for these Motions were respectively 89, 96 and 61; but Miall exercised

great influence with Nonconformists in the country. He had himself been an Independent Minister. He established *The Nonconformist* journal in 1841, and in 1844 The Anti-State Church Association afterwards better known as The Liberation Society. And he must have had wealthy supporters ; for in 1862 they gave him £5000 and a service of plate and in 1873 10,000 guineas.

In 1884 Lord Randolph Churchill thought it a proper time and place to make an eloquent defence of the Church at Birmingham, where Disestablishment was always popular: " I cannot, and will not, allow myself to believe that the English people, who are not only naturally religious, but also eminently practical, will ever consent, for the petty purpose of gratifying sectarian animosity, or for the wretched object of pandering to infidel proclivities—will ever consent to deprive themselves of so abundant a fountain of aid and consolation, or acquiesce in the demolition of an institution which elevates the life of the Nation, and consecrates the acts of the State."[1]

Disestablishment figured frequently in the Election Addresses of prominent Radicals, in Bradlaugh's (1868), Labouchere's (1880), Pankhurst's (1883), and Joseph Arch's (1885). In a Magazine article Labouchere reckoned the annual income of the Church to be £5,000,000. He proposed that £4,000,000 might be taken from her for Education, and £1,000,000, which represented recent endowments, left. Nine Liberals out of ten, he said, were in favour of both Disestablishment and Disendowment.[2] It was part of the Programme of Chamberlain and John Morley in the 'Seventies. In 1885 it was very much to the fore. It was said to be supported by 374 Liberal candidates, by two-thirds of the Liberal candidates for England and Wales and four-fifths of those for Scotland.[3] Chamberlain was in favour. He told Dilke he would like the Tories to be in for a couple of years, and then " I should go for the Church." On Disestablishment Gladstone hedged, saying that the time was not opportune. In Acton's opinion " Mr. Gladstone's authority will be able to keep it down for a time, but no more."[4]

The 1885 Election was, on the whole, a disappointment to the Radical Party. Afterwards—it is rather difficult to say for what reason—Disestablishment ceased to be a prominent " plank " in the Party platform. It never came

within the sphere of "practical politics." Probably it was crowded out by Home Rule; there would have been no room for two such tremendous measures together, and Home Rule chronically blocked the way. The Bishops became less unpopular, less majestical, less aloof, more approachable, in closer personal touch with their people. Bishop Fraser of Manchester created a new Episcopal, almost a new Ecclesiastical, type[1]—the type of Bishop who travelled 3rd Class or in an omnibus. The Clergy more and more devoted themselves to alleviating the miseries of poor parishes. Disestablishment found a place in the Newcastle Programme of 1891, but only Scotch and Welsh Disestablishment were part of the Liberal legislative Programme of 1892. Mr. Lloyd George in 1903 included the Church in his attack on Trusts and Monopolies.[2] He alleged an alliance between the Church and the brewers. If you attack the Church, you find in every parish-road in the Kingdom brewers' drays full of barrels to buttress up the falling Church." He added a menace: "I am putting the Parsons on the Black List." If he had thought there would have been any prospect of success, Mr. Lloyd George would long ago have started his campaign against the Church of England; but, when Campbell-Bannerman came into power, the hostility of his Party was directed not against the Church, but against Church Schools. The attack was made on the Welsh Church only.

John Morley secured the official adoption of Welsh Disestablishment by the Liberal Party, and this adoption was endorsed by the National Liberal Federation at Leeds in 1886 and at Nottingham in 1887. This was a measure on which Gladstone's views developed. In 1870 he had said: "The separation of the Welsh Church from the Church of England would leave behind 'a bleeding and lacerated mass.'" In 1891 he approved the Newcastle Programme, and in 1892 would have supported the Motion for Disestablishment, had he been in England. The extension of the Suffrage had produced a Young Wales Party, and Rendel, known as "The Member for Wales," had advised a concentration on Welsh Disestablishment. Asquith had the conduct of the Bill in 1895. He pointed out that the principal part of the Endowment was the tithe, but that the Church also had the benefit of pious offerings, and owned lands, rent-charges and money, which were "in the strictest

and truest sense of the word National property," having been given when Church and State were co-extensive. Property acquired during the last two hundred years was not to be touched ; but Prescription ought not to apply to "funds originally intended and left for the benefit of the community at large" and "diverted into particular and private hands."[1] This limitation of the time-honoured theory of Prescription was called by the Conservatives "robbing God" and caused great indignation. Chamberlain voted for the Second Reading of the Bill. Welsh Disestablishment was enacted on September 18th, 1914 ; but was suspended by Order in Council and did not come into force till after the War.

As to Education, it must be admitted that Nonconformist earnestness showed itself in a stubborn and not very generous opposition to any plan that included State-aid for Anglicans or Roman Catholics. Disraeli told the Queen (August 3rd, 1876), "It is no use attempting to conciliate the Dissenters. They take all you offer, and, the very next moment, will fly at your throat." They were furious about the grants given to Church Schools by the Act of 1870. Chamberlain voiced their anger at a meeting of Nonconformist delegates (January 22nd, 1872) : "For years we have served the Liberal Party ; we have been hewers of wood and drawers of water ; we have been very patient under somewhat contemptuous toleration very difficult to bear ; we have accepted, meanwhile, every act of justice as a favour, and every instalment of rights as a singular and almost unmerited grace." As for the Priests—"they may enjoy yet a little longer whatever support a Liberal Government may give them, but the hands are moving swiftly round the dial, and the knell of priestly domination and sectarian rule has already rung."[2] It was Nonconformist opposition that obliged Gladstone to throw over Concurrent Endowment in his Irish University Bill of 1873 ; Disraeli said that he mistook the clamour of the Nonconformists for the voice of the Nation. But no Education Bill excited so much Nonconformist wrath as the Unionist Education Bill of 1902. It could not be denied that Denominational Schools had long received grants from the Taxes ; but it appeared intolerable that they should benefit from the Rates. Dr. Clifford leapt into the fray ; a campaign of Passive Resistance was inaugurated. The goods of the Doctor, and of many

another leading Dissenter, were seized and sold for non-payment of the Rate. In Norwich, between 1904 and 1911, 1350 summonses were issued for non-payment. A Mr. Edward Harris was imprisoned fourteen times. Lord Rosebery was severely criticized for encouraging the movement. He told the Nonconformists: "I am not myself in favour of the refusal of the payment of Rates, but then I am not in your position." He considered that the political existence of the Nonconformists depended upon their opposition. This sectarian enthusiasm gradually waned; Passive Resistance came to an end. Mr. Lloyd George gave the reason: "Most of their great leaders passively resisted, but how many Passive Resisters were there? Not many thousands and why? Because of the habit of submission to law."[1]

It is to be noted that some Liberals, whose interest in Education was real and lifelong, believed that the Bill marked a great advance. They were not horrified at the idea of Church Schools benefitting by the new County Education Rate; they were hopeful of the larger administrative Education-areas and the better organization thereby made possible, and of the new prospects for Secondary Education. Haldane and Sidney Webb (now Lord Passfield) supported Balfour's Education Bill. Haldane feared that on Education (and on other subjects) his own Party was "devoid of any large ideas." Balfour went out, and Campbell-Bannerman came in; but, in spite of their enormous majority, the Radical Education Bills were fiascoes. And why? "From the first it was clear" (writes Lord Haldane) "that the Nonconformist insistence on getting rid of the Church School system blocked the way."[2] For it would have been manifestly absurd to build new State Schools all over the country to take the place of the Church Schools; and to acquire these Schools compulsorily, on any equitable basis of purchase, would have been to put too heavy a load on the tax-payer. It was therefore necessary to make them part of the Educational system—that is, to aid them from public funds. This has always been a stumbling-block to the Nonconformist Conscience.

In a previous chapter some mention has been made of the part taken by Nonconformists in the Bulgarian Atrocities campaign, in the matter of Bradlaugh, in the great

Liberal schism over Home Rule, and in deciding the political fate of Parnell. The Nonconformists could not forgive adultery; Dilke after his divorce case, was denounced as strongly as the Irish leader.

Here it may be added that, following on the Bulgarian agitation and Gladstone's "bag and baggage" declaration, Nonconformist votes were the main factor of Gladstone's return to power in 1880. The Election, wrote Miss Beatrice Potter (Mrs. Sidney Webb), "turned almost entirely on an emotional, even a religious, view of foreign affairs." In the case of Bradlaugh many Nonconformists voted against the relieving Bill of 1883, many abstained from voting. Some preached fervently against "the Infidel." The Wesleyans attacked him. The position of Samuel Morley, which has been mentioned in the previous chapter, was interesting, for he first supported "the Infidel," and then (according to Bradlaugh's biographer) wrote "a pitiful letter of recantation," whereupon the Bristol Radical Association called upon him to resign his seat. This was a highly significant clash of Radical secularism with Nonconformist piety.

The Gladstone family must have been as much disappointed with Dilke as afterwards with Parnell. Parnell, Gladstone remembered, had once represented his diocese in the Church Synod. At Hawarden Church Miss Mary Gladstone noted Dilke's "devout and most attentive behaviour, also that he said the Creed with great decision." Gladstone was not greatly embarrassed by Dilke's troubles; he was not sorry to have an excuse to leave him out of his Ministry in 1886, for Dilke and Chamberlain had been thorns in his flesh. The Nonconformist Stead was pitiless in his attacks on Dilke. He renewed them in 1890 when Dilke was trying to regain his seat in the House of Commons. Dilke wrote to Bodley: "Stead has sent a most ferocious series of documents to every elector of the Forest."

Gladstone was perfectly successful in winning over the great bulk of the Nonconformists to the cause of Home Rule. On May 9th, 1888, at a meeting at The Memorial Hall, Dr. Clifford presiding, he received an address from 3730 of their Ministers approving his Irish policy. Replying he thanked them "for the courageous manner in which they had not scrupled to associate their political action and intention with the principles and motives of their holy religion."[1] In the succeeding year the confession and suicide of Pigott

made Parnell a hero. But in 1890 he was declared an adulterer. Politicians waited anxiously for the pronouncement of Irish Roman Catholic Bishops and Nonconformist Divines. The Bishops soon showed their power. Although on the day after the decree a National League meeting in Dublin supported Parnell, and although, two days later, at the Leinster Hall, a resolution in his favour proposed by Justin McCarthy was carried unanimously, within a week or two the majority of his colleagues were in full cry against him. There was never any doubt as to the Nonconformist attitude. Hugh Price Hughes delivered his Sunday philippic at St. James' Hall. A Roman Catholic Priest pleaded with him not to "separate the Irish leader from the people." He was answered, "What is morally wrong can never be politically right." Stead wrote to Gladstone that he knew "his Nonconformists" well and that they would never more tolerate the sinner. He posted a pamphlet, condemnatory of Parnell, to every Roman Catholic Priest in Ireland, to every Member of Parliament and to dignitaries of the Church of Rome.[1] Gladstone was not long in making a correct "Appreciation of the Situation." When Rendel went to meet him at Euston on the Monday, "though tired with the journey, he broke out at once in the carriage and declared that Parnell was impossible, that the country and party, and in particular the Nonconformists, would never endure any maintenance of relations with him." Morley once asked him to name the leading Nonconformists who had written so strongly to him, and Gladstone named Colman "as the very best and most typical of such men." Finally Gladstone sent a decisive letter to Parnell by Morley. Mr. Hugh Kingsmill writes: "belated though it was, it excited intense enthusiasm among the Liberals, who once more saw their veteran chieftain standing forth as the champion of all the principles which they held most dear."[2]

Parnell's own view of his case may be here recorded, if only to show how widely the Irish statesman differed from his religious critics in his attitude to morals and religion: "There will be a howl, but it will be the howling of hypocrites; not altogether, for some of these Irish fools are genuine in their belief that forms and creeds can govern life and men; perhaps they are right so far as they can experience life. But I am not as they, for they are among the world's children. I am a man." Mrs. O'Shea, who is the

authority for this utterance, proceeds, " I burst out passionately ' Why does it matter more now, they have known all for years ? ' and his rare, low laugh came out with genuine amusement as he replied ' My sweetheart, they are afraid of shocking Mr. Gladstone.' "[1]

There were Liberals, amongst them Jacob Bright and Illingworth, who did not approve this abandonment of Parnell. Mr. Reginald Brett (afterwards the second Lord Esher) wrote an article to a Monthly Review entitled " The Tyranny of the Nonconformist Conscience," in which he pointed out that " a man of Napoleonic daring, of immense resource, a tried and tested leader not only of a Party but of a Nation, is ruined and his power destroyed by an offence against morals." He asked a pertinent question : " Is it the view of the Masses, or do the Masses yield to the Nonconformist Conscience ? " And he suggested that this particular Conscience was " perhaps not perfectly sane." But whether it were quite sane or not, or whether or not the " Masses " (to whom indeed Gladstone ascribed every virtue) were in favour of the deposition of Parnell, it was quite plain that the Nonconformists were at present masters of the situation. Harcourt knew this. He said to Gladstone : " You know that the Nonconformists are the backbone of our Party, and their judgment of this matter is unhesitating and decisive." *Roma locuta est, res finita est.*

For twenty years the Liberal Nonconformists suffered politically with their Party. They accepted Home Rule, though not without doubt and misgiving, and not without much embarrassment when their Ulster brethren implored them not to make the Roman Catholic Priest supreme in Ireland. For conscience's sake they deposed Parnell, and the Irish dissensions that followed were a set-back not only to Home Rule but to all the causes to which Nonconformists were attached. During the weak Liberal Government of 1892-5 two of their favourite measures, Welsh Disestablishment and Local Veto were brought forward indeed, but not carried through ; moreover this failure aroused no popular indignation. From 1892 for ten years they must have been disheartened and disgusted by the squabbles of their leaders, not one of whom in his heart of hearts cared much for Nonconformists. Real bonds of affection united their followers to Disraeli, to Salisbury and to Balfour, and

the affection was reciprocated. But what did Rosebery, the Peer-Premier, the racing Premier, care about Nonconformists? What was Dr. Clifford to him, or he to Dr. Clifford? Clifford must have looked on him as "a man of wrath"—as Mr. Stiggins looked on Tony Weller. Did Harcourt, the Whig-Radical, the admirer of the Eighteenth Century, the hospitable and jovial "Squire of Malwood," care for Nonconformists? Did Whigs like Ripon or Kimberley or Spencer care for Nonconformists except as the traditional supporters of the Whig and Liberal Party? Did Asquith, who was beginning to savour the sweets of London Society, really care for Nonconformists? Or Morley, the man of letters, the agnostic philosophic Radical? Morley, as the friend and afterwards the biographer of Gladstone, still enjoyed their regard; so did Campbell-Bannerman, who had kept himself out of the intrigues that ensued on Gladstone's resignation, but Campbell-Bannerman too had tastes that might have been reprobated—his fondness for French novels and Continental life.

During the Boer War Campbell-Bannerman took the anti-National side. He thereby became *persona grata* to the Nonconformists, two of whose leaders, Dr. Clifford and Mr. Lloyd George (in Dr. Clifford's opinion "one of the greatest Liberals, and one of the greatest Free Churchmen of his day"), were prominent in the Stop-the-War campaign and braved great unpopularity. Then came the Education Act of 1902. Campbell-Bannerman wrote to a friend: "Evidently the Non-Cons are worked up to a heat they have never been in before." Campbell-Bannerman was impressed by their vehemence, but the Passive Resistance campaign, as it was bound to, petered out, and the Passive Resisters excited much ridicule.

These years must have brought great discouragement to Nonconformists, and yet they were on the eve of a triumph. The Conservatives, in 1903, became divided on Tariff Reform, and those who advocated Food Taxes could even be denounced by Nonconformists as *immoral*. There was then a Broad Church Bishop, Percival of Hereford, a great friend of Nonconformists, who expressed this view of the *immorality* of Tariffs quite as well, probably, and as forcibly, as any of his Nonconformist friends could have done. In January 1904 he published a letter in support of a Free

Trade candidate during an election, which contained the following reflections :

" What weighs on my mind as I follow the controversy is the thought of the serious moral issues involved in it. . . .

" Every Bishop has solemnly promised to be merciful for Christ's sake to poor and needy people ; but this Birmingham Gospel is all in the interest of the rich, and is without mercy for the poor and needy. . . .

" Consequently every Minister of Christ is bound to do his part in banishing and driving it away. . . .

" It represents and will foster all those elements in our materialistic civilization which are pre-eminently unchristian, or, it might even be said, anti-Christian. . . .

" For my own part I look upon this retrograde agitation . . . as the newest form of that oppression of the poorer and weaker classes which every Minister of the Gospel is bound to oppose."[1]

Percival's biographer comments on this letter : " It causes no astonishment to find that such a deliverance created a genuine *furore* in Herefordshire."

Then there was the outcry against the importation of Chinese coolies to meet a shortage of labour in South Africa. The Chinese were to live in compounds under strict supervision. The term " slavery " was used, and a Liberal poster depicted the coolies in chains. But here even " slavery " was not more to the fore than another moral issue. For the Chinese were to come without women, and it was alleged that inevitably they would practise unnatural vice.

And the Nonconformists were still burning with wrath against the Education Act, so that in the Election of 1906 they were provided with three very congenial " cries " all directed to matters of religion and morals. The Education Act was an invasion of religious rights, enacting forced contribution to the maintenance of dogmatic religion. Tariff Reform involved an " anti-Christian " oppression of the poor. Chinese labour was " slavery," and its introduction would set up a City of the Plain in South Africa. They took full advantage of these opportunities, as did the Liberal Publication Department under the auspices of Mr. Augustine Birrell.

Campbell-Bannerman came into power with a majority that must have surprised himself. As afterwards in the

Election of 1931, many of the Parliamentary candidates had never dreamt of success and found themselves committed to a career for which they had made no provision. He was inundated with congratulations from Ministers of religion. His biographer, Mr. J. A. Spender, says that he had 127 Nonconformist supporters in the House of Commons. F. E. Smith, in his celebrated maiden speech, put the numbers higher. He referred to the three sources of Government strength : " he had heard the majority of the other side of the House described as the pure fruit of the Cobdenite tree. He should say they were begotten by Chinese slavery out of Passive Resistance. . . . He read a short time ago that the Free Church Council claimed among its members as many as 200 of Honourable Gentlemen opposite." (Mr. Crooks : " He is doing no harm.") " The Free Church Council gave thanks publicly for the fact that Providence had inspired the electors with the desire and the discrimination to vote on the right side."[1] Campbell-Bannerman himself considered that he was in office in order to fulfil Nonconformist desires. Cardinal Bourne once called on him with the object of protecting Catholic Schools and the cause of religious teaching. Campbell-Bannerman, " a most charming person, received him with every kindness and consideration, and spoke to him with such frankness that until that day he had hesitated to make public his very illuminating remarks." The Cardinal pointed out to him that the Government would inflict grievous injury on the most sacred interests of the Catholic Church. Campbell-Bannerman replied very simply : " We have been put into power by the Nonconformists, and we must produce legislation that will satisfy the Nonconformists. If you, by your efforts, can bring about a change in public opinion, then we shall be quite prepared to alter our present attitude."[2]

From such a Prime Minister the Nonconformists were justified in expecting the fulfilment of all their hopes. And yet disappointment followed. " The General Election of 1905 was a great Passive Resistance victory. . . . Yet it was all in vain."[3] The Government could not pass its Education Bills. There was another failure—the Licensing Bill of 1908. A repeal of the Licensing Act of 1904 was almost as much desired as a repeal of the Education Act of 1902. For the brewers were as obnoxious to good Non-

conformists as were the Tariff Reformers, and as the men who were responsible for introducing Chinese labour. They were in fact coupled with Churchmen for vituperative purposes. Dr. Clifford spoke of "the friends of the Drink Trade and advocates of State Control of Churches." The Licensing Bill passed the House of Commons with a majority of 237. But the Lords rejected it, and (says Mr. J. A. Spender) "even strong Temperance men were obliged to admit that the Public House was unfavourable ground for a decisive struggle."

Campbell-Bannerman died in 1908; the Cabinet became more Imperialistic, but Lloyd George, the man of the Left and Little Englander, was its most popular member in the Country. There were only 53 Labour Members in the House, of whom 24 sat with the Liberals,[1] but the force behind them began to make itself felt—not an idealist, but a realist force. Lloyd George was still a Nonconformist hero. At the Queen's Hall he rallied his Nonconformists against an old foe, the Lords, in the following terms:

"The Lords are a biased Court, sitting in permanent judgment upon the rights of millions of Free Churchmen, who have not a shadow of a chance of getting equal justice from them. . . .

"Our very Constitution, everything that is best in our law, in our jurisprudence, in our Constitution, is attributable to the effort and to the sacrifice of Nonconformists. . . .

"The little Chapel is the only place in the village that will stand up to that Castle. All the men in the village that would decline to cringe, they are there. Those little buildings—unsightly sometimes—they are the sanctuaries and citadels of village independence. . . .

"Why, I believe in their hearts they (the Peers) put Primitive Methodists and poachers in the same category, as people whom they would rather see living on the neighbouring estate."[2]

The Parliament Act was passed; the powers of the "biased Court," were limited, and yet the Nonconformists were not happy. "We Free Churchmen" (sighed Dr. Clifford in 1913) "are to have nothing but words. Against that we enter our emphatic protest."[3] Dr. Clifford had a project "to create a Party, if we can, composed of the most level-headed of the Socialists, and the most Radical

of the Radicals,"[1] and no doubt it was in his mind that such a Party might promote measures favoured by Free Churchmen. Such a coalition has often been attempted, but never successfully. Two Labour Governments, it is true, have been kept in power by Liberal votes ; but Labour has long ceased to pay attention (if indeed it ever paid much attention), to the peculiar views of Free Churchmen. In July 1931 the London Free Church Federation protested to Mr. Lansbury, the Labour Minister of Public Works, against " the provision of facilities for obtaining intoxicants in the Royal Parks." It is difficult to conceive of Campbell-Bannerman's Government giving " facilities for obtaining intoxicants " ; but, supposing this possible, Campbell-Bannerman would have carefully entertained such a protest, would have complimented the protesters on their moral elevation and promised to consider the advisability of making Rules Regulations and Restrictions to content them. The Labour Minister replied in a very different tone : " I am, I hope, myself an advocate of Temperance Reform, and have been a life-long abstainer, but I do not think it is in the least inconsistent for me to endeavour to provide decent surroundings for those who have other tastes than I myself possess. I should like all men and women to be temperate, but I should regard it as an impertinence on my part to attempt to impose total abstinence on other persons on the ground that I myself am an abstainer. . . . I, therefore, feel sure that those who direct their energies towards the improvement of the facilities for drinking will do far more in the interests of temperance than those who require all liquor to be consumed in the type of establishment which the term ' Public House ' commonly implies."[2]

" Improvement of the facilities for drinking ! " and that this would do " far more in the interests of temperance ! " How horrified Dr. Clifford would have been by such expressions !

Liberalism has declined partly because most of its objects have been achieved ; the same is true of political Nonconformity. The Nonconformist wing of the Liberal Party has had most of its grievances removed. Church Rates are abolished. The Burials Act of 1880 went far to remove another grievance.[3] The Welsh Church has been duly

conformists as were the Tariff Reformers, and as the men who were responsible for introducing Chinese labour. They were in fact coupled with Churchmen for vituperative purposes. Dr. Clifford spoke of " the friends of the Drink Trade and advocates of State Control of Churches." The Licensing Bill passed the House of Commons with a majority of 237. But the Lords rejected it, and (says Mr. J. A. Spender) " even strong Temperance men were obliged to admit that the Public House was unfavourable ground for a decisive struggle."

Campbell-Bannerman died in 1908 ; the Cabinet became more Imperialistic, but Lloyd George, the man of the Left and Little Englander, was its most popular member in the Country. There were only 53 Labour Members in the House, of whom 24 sat with the Liberals,[1] but the force behind them began to make itself felt—not an idealist, but a realist force. Lloyd George was still a Nonconformist hero. At the Queen's Hall he rallied his Nonconformists against an old foe, the Lords, in the following terms :

" The Lords are a biased Court, sitting in permanent judgment upon the rights of millions of Free Churchmen, who have not a shadow of a chance of getting equal justice from them. . . .

" Our very Constitution, everything that is best in our law, in our jurisprudence, in our Constitution, is attributable to the effort and to the sacrifice of Nonconformists. . . .

" The little Chapel is the only place in the village that will stand up to that Castle. All the men in the village that would decline to cringe, they are there. Those little buildings—unsightly sometimes—they are the sanctuaries and citadels of village independence. . . .

" Why, I believe in their hearts they (the Peers) put Primitive Methodists and poachers in the same category, as people whom they would rather see living on the neighbouring estate."[2]

The Parliament Act was passed ; the powers of the " biased Court," were limited, and yet the Nonconformists were not happy. " We Free Churchmen " (sighed Dr. Clifford in 1913) " are to have nothing but words. Against that we enter our emphatic protest."[3] Dr. Clifford had a project " to create a Party, if we can, composed of the most level-headed of the Socialists, and the most Radical

of the Radicals,"[1] and no doubt it was in his mind that such a Party might promote measures favoured by Free Churchmen. Such a coalition has often been attempted, but never successfully. Two Labour Governments, it is true, have been kept in power by Liberal votes ; but Labour has long ceased to pay attention (if indeed it ever paid much attention), to the peculiar views of Free Churchmen. In July 1931 the London Free Church Federation protested to Mr. Lansbury, the Labour Minister of Public Works, against " the provision of facilities for obtaining intoxicants in the Royal Parks." It is difficult to conceive of Campbell-Bannerman's Government giving " facilities for obtaining intoxicants " ; but, supposing this possible, Campbell-Bannerman would have carefully entertained such a protest, would have complimented the protesters on their moral elevation and promised to consider the advisability of making Rules Regulations and Restrictions to content them. The Labour Minister replied in a very different tone : " I am, I hope, myself an advocate of Temperance Reform, and have been a life-long abstainer, but I do not think it is in the least inconsistent for me to endeavour to provide decent surroundings for those who have other tastes than I myself possess. I should like all men and women to be temperate, but I should regard it as an impertinence on my part to attempt to impose total abstinence on other persons on the ground that I myself am an abstainer. . . . I, therefore, feel sure that those who direct their energies towards the improvement of the facilities for drinking will do far more in the interests of temperance than those who require all liquor to be consumed in the type of establishment which the term ' Public House ' commonly implies."[2]

" Improvement of the facilities for drinking ! " and that this would do " far more in the interests of temperance ! " How horrified Dr. Clifford would have been by such expressions !

Liberalism has declined partly because most of its objects have been achieved ; the same is true of political Nonconformity. The Nonconformist wing of the Liberal Party has had most of its grievances removed. Church Rates are abolished. The Burials Act of 1880 went far to remove another grievance.[3] The Welsh Church has been duly

conformists as were the Tariff Reformers, and as the men who were responsible for introducing Chinese labour. They were in fact coupled with Churchmen for vituperative purposes. Dr. Clifford spoke of "the friends of the Drink Trade and advocates of State Control of Churches." The Licensing Bill passed the House of Commons with a majority of 237. But the Lords rejected it, and (says Mr. J. A. Spender) "even strong Temperance men were obliged to admit that the Public House was unfavourable ground for a decisive struggle."

Campbell-Bannerman died in 1908; the Cabinet became more Imperialistic, but Lloyd George, the man of the Left and Little Englander, was its most popular member in the Country. There were only 53 Labour Members in the House, of whom 24 sat with the Liberals,[1] but the force behind them began to make itself felt—not an idealist, but a realist force. Lloyd George was still a Nonconformist hero. At the Queen's Hall he rallied his Nonconformists against an old foe, the Lords, in the following terms:

"The Lords are a biased Court, sitting in permanent judgment upon the rights of millions of Free Churchmen, who have not a shadow of a chance of getting equal justice from them. . . .

"Our very Constitution, everything that is best in our law, in our jurisprudence, in our Constitution, is attributable to the effort and to the sacrifice of Nonconformists. . . .

"The little Chapel is the only place in the village that will stand up to that Castle. All the men in the village that would decline to cringe, they are there. Those little buildings—unsightly sometimes—they are the sanctuaries and citadels of village independence. . . .

"Why, I believe in their hearts they (the Peers) put Primitive Methodists and poachers in the same category, as people whom they would rather see living on the neighbouring estate."[2]

The Parliament Act was passed; the powers of the "biased Court," were limited, and yet the Nonconformists were not happy. "We Free Churchmen" (sighed Dr. Clifford in 1913) "are to have nothing but words. Against that we enter our emphatic protest."[3] Dr. Clifford had a project "to create a Party, if we can, composed of the most level-headed of the Socialists, and the most Radical

of the Radicals,"[1] and no doubt it was in his mind that such a Party might promote measures favoured by Free Churchmen. Such a coalition has often been attempted, but never successfully. Two Labour Governments, it is true, have been kept in power by Liberal votes ; but Labour has long ceased to pay attention (if indeed it ever paid much attention), to the peculiar views of Free Churchmen. In July 1931 the London Free Church Federation protested to Mr. Lansbury, the Labour Minister of Public Works, against " the provision of facilities for obtaining intoxicants in the Royal Parks." It is difficult to conceive of Campbell-Bannerman's Government giving " facilities for obtaining intoxicants " ; but, supposing this possible, Campbell-Bannerman would have carefully entertained such a protest, would have complimented the protesters on their moral elevation and promised to consider the advisability of making Rules Regulations and Restrictions to content them. The Labour Minister replied in a very different tone : " I am, I hope, myself an advocate of Temperance Reform, and have been a life-long abstainer, but I do not think it is in the least inconsistent for me to endeavour to provide decent surroundings for those who have other tastes than I myself possess. I should like all men and women to be temperate, but I should regard it as an impertinence on my part to attempt to impose total abstinence on other persons on the ground that I myself am an abstainer. . . . I, therefore, feel sure that those who direct their energies towards the improvement of the facilities for drinking will do far more in the interests of temperance than those who require all liquor to be consumed in the type of establishment which the term ' Public House ' commonly implies."[2]

" Improvement of the facilities for drinking ! " and that this would do " far more in the interests of temperance ! " How horrified Dr. Clifford would have been by such expressions !

Liberalism has declined partly because most of its objects have been achieved ; the same is true of political Nonconformity. The Nonconformist wing of the Liberal Party has had most of its grievances removed. Church Rates are abolished. The Burials Act of 1880 went far to remove another grievance.[3] The Welsh Church has been duly

disestablished and disendowed. The Education Act of 1902 still stands in the Statute Book ; but the bitterness it evoked has died down, and owing to lack of funds many Church Schools are being annually closed. In fact there has been a great assuagement of Nonconformist bitterness. The relaxation from strict Puritanism has affected Nonconformists as it has affected other members of the Middle Classes. As long ago as 1881 Matthew Arnold wrote to M. Fontanés of "the growing desire, throughout the community, for amusement and pleasure ; the wonderful relaxation, in the Middle Class, of the old restrictions as to theatres, dancing, and such things, are features which alarm many people ; but they have their good side."[1] Nonconformists now attend "the Devil's Chapel," shuffle "the Devil's Prayer-Book," and peruse "the Devil's Bible." The old Puritanism is no more likely to regain its strength than the old Victorian prudery.

Nonconformists, the "backbone" of Liberalism, took a great part in extending the Franchise, believing this to be a necessary means of gaining their own objects. Thereby they helped to open the door to millions of voters who had quite other ends in view than the exclusion of dogmatc religion from Schools, or the wholesale closing of Public Houses. The Public Houses, in fact, were the clubs of these enfranchised voters. The Nonconformists are thrifty, saving, acquisitive ; their leading men are capitalists. They are church-goers and respectable. A. C. Benson described the congregation at the City Temple, the members of which their Pastor, the Revd. R. J. Campbell, "hardly knew"—"clerks, tradesman, doctors, teachers, their wives and daughters—none of them residing there, all coming in by train."[2] But of Democracy only a small fraction goes to Church or Chapel. Of our democrats nine out of ten are weekly wage-earners, to a large extent Trades Unionists bent on maintaining and strengthening Trade Union rights, on limiting hours of work and—in bad times—claiming "Work or Maintenance." Very many of them may be Nonconformists, but as Nonconformists they no longer act politically. In the last Parliament (1929-31) there were 284 Labour Members, and only 59 Liberals. How many of the latter were Nonconformists? In the present Parliament the Labour Members are reduced to 52, and the Liberals to 65, of whom 34 are called Nationalist

Liberals and are, broadly speaking, supporters of the full Government policy. Mr. Lloyd George, "one of the greatest Liberals, and one of the greatest Free Churchmen of his day," now belongs to a very exiguous and divided Party.

NOTES

Page 103.
[1] *Life of Hugh Price Hughes*, p. 51.
[2] See *The Transition from Aristocracy* (1832-67), pp. 72-3.
Page 104.
[4] *Ib.*, p. 74.
[2] *Life*, p. 473.
[3] *English Sects, a Historical Handbook* (Arthur Reynolds).
Page 105.
[1] Lord Morley's *Recollections*, Vol. I, p. 150.
[2] *Life of Hugh Price Hughes*, p. 489.
Page 106.
[1] *Ib.*, p. 207.
[2] *Ib.*, p. 137.
Page 107.
[1] *Life*, Vol. V, p. 484.
[2] *Ib.*, p. 253.
[3] *Ib.*
[4] *Nonconformists and the Education Act* (January, 1903).
[5] *Life of Dr. John Clifford, C.H.*, p. 120.
Page 109.
[1] *Life of Hugh Price Hughes*, p. 354.
[2] *Life*, p. 356.
[3] *Ib.*, p. 559.
[4] In gaol his imagination "conjured up the enthusiastic audiences I had addressed in the North." (*Life*, Frederick Whyte, Vol. I, p. 192).
Page 110.
[1] *Life* (Frederic Whyte), Vol. I, p. 302.
Page 111.
[1] *The Later Years of Thomas Hardy*, p. 45.
[2] Messrs. W. H. Smith & Son excluded *The Pall Mall Gazette* from their bookstalls.
[3] *Life* (Frederic Whyte), Vol. II, p. 234.
[4] *Life* (Frederic Whyte), Vol. I, p. 149.
[5] *My Father* (Estelle W. Stead), p. 106.
Page 112.
[1] *Life* (Frederic Whyte), Vol. II, p. 106. The Prince wondered at the severity of Russell's summing-up—"Why he was so hard on them and strained things so." All who heard this summing-up must have felt that Russell was bent on getting a verdict of Guilty. *The Times* said that it "recalled the judicial habits of an earlier age, and really constituted a more forcible statement of the case against the prisoners than the case of the Attorney-General for the Crown." (See *Life of Lord Carson*, p. 255).
Page 113.
[1] Lord Salisbury's *Life*, Vol. I, p. 319.
Page 114.
[1] *Life of Lord Randolph Churchill*, Vol. I, p. 298. (Birmingham, April 16th, 1884).
[2] *Radicals and Whigs.* (*The Fortnightly Review*, February, 1884).
[3] *Life of Lord Salisbury*, Vol. III, p. 268.
[4] *Letters of Lord Acton to Mary Gladstone*, p. 168.

Page 115.
[1] See Lord Bryce's *Studies in Contemporary Biography*, p. 196.
[2] Newcastle, April 4th, 1903.
Page 116.
[1] At Nottingham Mechanics' Hall, April 3rd, 1895.
[2] *Speeches*, Vol. I, pp. 15, 21. Chamberlain's maiden speech in the House of Commons was made on the Report stage of the Elementary Education Bill, August 4th, 1876.
Page 117.
[1] Kennington, July 13th, 1912 (*Speeches*, Vol. IV, p. 725).
[2] *Richard Burdon Haldane, an Autobiography*, p. 218.
Page 118.
[1] *Speeches*, Vol. IX, p. 373.
Page 119.
[1] Stead was in favour of making adultery punishable by imprisonment. Marriage (he said) was a contract and its violation justified a penalty. But breach of contract is not punishable by imprisonment. In 1650 an Act was passed making adultery a capital offence, but it gradually became impossible to obtain a conviction. (Inderwick, *The Interregnum*, pp. 33-8). Dr. Johnson was in favour of making sexual immorality a crime (*Life*, Birkbeck Hill, Vol. III, p. 17).
[2] *After Puritanism*, 1850-1900, p. 212.
Page 120.
[1] *Charles Stewart Parnell* (Katharine O'Shea), p. 160.
Page 122.
[1] *Life of Bishop Percival* (Archbishop William Temple), pp. 236-40.
Page 123.
[1] Hansard, March 3rd, 1906. (Bagehot said that in 1867 there were 200 " Members for the Railways " in the House of Commons).
[2] *The Times*, June 17th, 1931.
[3] *Life of Dr. John Clifford* (Sir James Marchant), p. 143.
Page 124.
[1] Fourteen of these were Miners and ten were " Lib-Labs."
[2] *Speeches*, pp. 718-22. (*Free Churchmen and the House of Lords*, December 16th, 1909).
[3] *Life*, p. 134.
Page 125.
[1] *Ib.*, p. 147.
[2] *The Times*, July 10th, 1931.
[3] The Burials Act (1880) permitted Nonconformists to bury in churchyards with religious forms chosen by themselves, or without any religious forms.
Page 126.
[1] Matthew Arnold's *Letters*, Vol. II, p. 184.
[2] *The Diary of Arthur Christopher Benson*, p. 163.

REFORM IN 1884

Rural Suffrage a consequence of Urban—Electoral Reform Conference 1872—Trevelyan's Motions—Opposition of Lord Claud Hamilton—The Leeds Meeting 1883—Condition of the Agricultural Labourer—Joseph Arch—The Agricultural Labourers' Union—The Wellesbourne Meeting—The Caxton Hall Meeting—Arch returned to Parliament—Lowe in the Lords—Gladstone introduces the Reform Bill—Gibson and Churchill oppose—Goschen—Redistribution—Survival of Small Boroughs—Balfour Elcho and Hicks-Beach—The Bill is passed—The Labourers vote Liberal in 1885.

ANY statesman, or any politician of average intelligence, might have confidently foretold that the Reform Act which enfranchised the urban Householder would soon be followed by an agitation for the enfranchisement of the rural.

Household Suffrage without limitation to towns, even Manhood Suffrage (which Gladstone seemed to have supported as early as 1864), had figured in many Programmes of Liberal and Radical legislation. Was the countryman less worthy of the vote than the townsman? Should the enjoyment of this privilege depend, in Gladstone's words, "upon an accident of residence, upon the accident of employment in a town or employment beyond the limits of a town?"[1] Some Tories were brave enough to affirm that the countryman was stupider than the townsman; but in 1874 Disraeli himself, when Trevelyan was advocating that the vote should be extended to the counties, said: "I have no doubt that the rated Householder in the county is just as competent to exercise the franchise as the rated Householder in the town."[2] Disraeli was too wise to oppose Trevelyan on principle; he used the time-worn arguments—that the time was not opportune, that the measure would involve a great redistribution of seats, that rural inhabitants first needed Social Reform. He deprecated "this fever for organic change."

During the Reform agitation of 1832 Sydney Smith sarcastically observed that "all young ladies will imagine, as soon as the Bill passed, that they will be instantly married. Schoolboys believe that gerunds and supines will be abolished, and that currant tarts must come down in price;

the Corporal and the Sergeant are sure of double pay; bad poets will expect a demand for their epics." Though this was picturesquely put, it was yet true that the labouring classes did expect that beer beef and bread would come down in price; in fact by some orators this blessing was actually promised. In the 'Seventies and 'Eighties the expectation was no longer entertained that material benefits would, immediately at any rate, result from the Suffrage. It was sought as a means to an end. The Liberal politician thought the vote of the agricultural labourer would keep his Party in power. Gladstone indeed told the Queen that his Franchise Bill "had been framed in all particulars for the promotion of national objects, and not of the narrower objects of the Liberal Party." He argued that "the Bill could not rank amongst measures properly considered Radical, inasmuch as its main object is to extend a principle, established by a Conservative Government in the town and working beneficially there, to the counties, where the corresponding class of Householders are certainly more Conservative than in the towns." The Queen was probably sceptical of this altruism, and more inclined to believe Lord Salisbury who told her the measure was "framed so as to secure power to Liberals." Labouchere was more candid. His view was that the agricultural labourers ought to have the vote, and "we are under the comforting belief that, when they do have it, they will swell the Radical host."[1]

In November 1872, at an Electoral Reform Conference held at St. James's Hall, at which Chamberlain presided, the question of Reform was discussed, but it was decided that the time was not yet ripe. In May 1874, the Tories having just come into power, Trevelyan brought the question before the House of Commons, but of course unsuccessfully. On March 4th, 1879, he again moved that: "It is desirable to establish throughout the whole of the United Kingdom a Household Suffrage similar to that now established in the English Boroughs, and that it would be desirable so to re-distribute political power as to obtain a more complete representation of the opinion of the electoral body." Trevelyan maintained that the next Election would be decided on Reform (wherein he was mistaken), that Reform had more supporters in the House he was addressing than in the previous Parliament, that it would be a remedy for "faggot-voting" inasmuch as the "faggot-voters"

would be outnumbered. ("Faggot-voters," who were to excite Gladstone's wrath in his Midlothian campaign, were persons who were by arrangement granted the ownership or occupation of tenements by some great landlord with a view to voting in his interests.) Trevelyan read a letter, dated from the Scottish Conservative Club at Edinburgh, asking for persons to qualify as faggot-voters "in view of Mr. Gladstone's proposed attack." He said that within a fortnight ninety-four such votes had been manufactured in the County of Midlothian, that Lords Frederick and Claud Hamilton had taken a cottage together, Lord Ernest Hamilton and Mr. Baillie-Hamilton a shop, that London barristers, Naval officers and Grenadier guardsmen were qualifying in the same way—all under the auspices of the Duke of Buccleuch (the father of the Lord Dalkeith who was Gladstone's opponent in 1880). He also urged that the agricultural labourers had no representative elected by themselves to champion them in such matters as Education and Common Rights, and that they had no voice as regards the wars in which they were enlisted to fight.

Lord Claud Hamilton expressed the old Tory view—it might be called a very anti-democratic view, and so it is instructive. Lord Claud asked whether every Householder had a *right* to a vote. Common-sense distinctly said "No!" If every adult man, why not every woman? where were they to stop? neither in 1832 nor in 1867 were votes given as a right. As to Women's Suffrage, the ladies "had already unfurled their banners and extended their demands." He sneered at Trevelyan's "strong-minded friends in petticoats." As for the rural labourers, though they had no votes their interests were safe in the hands of the country gentlemen.[1] (Burke maintained that the voteless were well represented by the Peers.) As for faggot-voting, he instanced a Liberal agent who held such a qualification both for Midlothian and Roxburghshire. If the Bill were passed, "there they would be, with universal suffrage, and equal electoral districts—pure, unrestricted, sublime Democracy." (Lord Claud, though he didn't go quite so far, again seems to have had Burke in his mind who said "a perfect Democracy is the most shameless thing in the world.") Moreover Household Suffrage would hand Ireland over to the Papists. The consequences of the Reform Act of 1876 had been that the House of Commons

had suffered in character and independence, and that in the Boroughs votes had been given to persons intellectually and morally unfitted (as had been proved by the Bulgarian Atrocities agitation) ; but the agricultural Householder was even inferior to the urban Householder in education, and in political and municipal capabilities. (How did Lord Beaconsfield relish these remarks, it may be wondered ?) Mr. Punch remarked that Lord Claud " fired off a rattling broadside from guns of the old High Tory platform." He contrasted the fierceness of his peroration—" it was a proposal designed to subvert the whole fabric of our Constitution, and to trample under foot the glorious traditions of the House of Commons "—with the mildness of his Amendment—" that this House is of opinion that it is *inexpedient* to re-open the question of Parliamentary Reform *at the present time.*"[1]

In the year succeeding Trevelyan's effort Gladstone was again returned to power ; and, whatever may have been the dominant questions at the General Election, it soon became apparent that Household Franchise for the counties excited most interest both inside and outside the House of Commons. " By and by in our own Party " (writes Lord Morley) " there was a preliminary question on which the division threatened to be sharp : should County Franchise precede or follow the Reform of London Government ? "[2] Morley himself presided over 2000 delegates from Liberal Associations who met at Leeds in October 1883 and decided that the County Franchise must come first.

By this time the Reform movement had found a new and genuine impulse. Politicians, like Labouchere, not unnaturally furthered it as a means to their own end—the obtaining of several more millions of Liberal votes. But now the agricultural labourer himself made his voice heard ; for him the vote was to be a boon from which he hoped much—nothing less than the possibility of raising his wages and improving the conditions of his life. With great courage he had established his Union ; now his Union was to get him a vote, and his vote was to bear fruit in Acts of Parliament to be passed for his benefit.

Though the wage of the agricultural labourer did not represent the whole of his emolument, for his rent was not an economic rent and he received a bonus at harvest-time, yet its lowness had long been denounced by Radical

reformers. Lowe told the House of Commons that in Calne, the Wiltshire borough for which he sat, there were labourers who received only 8*s*. a week ; he used this as an argument *against* Reform, alleging that the politics of such ill-paid men must take one form—Socialism.[1] Chamberlain said that " the agricultural labourers in this country are the worst paid, the worst fed, the worst clothed, the worst housed peasantry in the civilized world."[2] In Dorsetshire, about the same time, " the state of the labourers was as bad as it could very well be."[3] In 1885 wages in Wiltshire had not risen beyond 10*s*. or 12*s*., in some cases were 9*s*.[4] Eighteen years later Mr. Lloyd George was attacking the landowners of Wiltshire.[5] Wiltshire and Dorsetshire were generally singled out as Counties where wages were especially low, and conditions bad. When Lord Shaftesbury was attacking the mill-owners, the state of his Dorsetshire property was retorted upon him ; but he built a model village on his own estate at Wimborne St. Giles, each cottage having a quarter of an acre of land and paying a rent of only 1*s*. a week.

As to the general condition of the farm-labourer in the 'Sixties, Bishop Fraser, then a country vicar, gave evidence before a Royal Commission to the effect that bread was dear ; wages were down to starvation point ; the labourers were uneducated, underfed, underpaid ; their cottages were often unfit for human habitation ; the sleeping and sanitary arrangements were appalling.[6] A bitter verse is quoted in Joseph Arch's *Life* :[7]

> " He used to tramp off to his work while townfolk were abed,
> With nothing in his belly but a slice or two of bread,
> He dined upon potatoes and he never dreamed of meat,
> Except a lump of bacon fat sometimes by way of treat."

Richard Pankhurst, when candidate for Manchester in 1883, asked, " Who is the most forlorn object in the world ? The dependent, degraded agricultural labourer of England." In the early Victorian period an economic doctrine was accepted that wages were naturally fixed at " subsistence level."[8] Mr. A. G. Bradley, writing of the 'Seventies, indicates that this idea then still survived :

" I remember the sort of feeling so well that farm wages had nothing to do with rents or profits, that the labouring class were entitled to a bare living, such as was then

considered sufficient, and that more would be bad for them."[1]

Joseph Arch, who fought so manfully for his fellow-labourers, was born at Barford in Warwickshire in 1826, and his grandparents were servants to the Warwick family. At the age of four he was earning 4*d.* a day at crow-scaring, his day being a twelve hours day. As a lad he read the speeches of Gladstone and Bright. As to his character, Mr. Bradley says he was " a simple-minded, honest man. He had no subversive or revolutionary theories, nor did he ever counsel forcible methods. He only considered that, with the abounding prosperity of his country, his class was entitled to a small share of it."[2] Lady Warwick writes with warmer admiration : " He was one of the bravest men I ever knew. It is always inspiring to come in touch with such character, vision, intelligence, pertinacity and unselfish public spirit as were shown by Arch in his pioneer work." But " to the ' County ' Arch was a wicked old man, a reprobate, an agitator, and, worst of all, a Radical."[3] Queen Victoria agreed with the ' County ' ; in 1892 she objected to his being on the Old Age Pension Commission, on the ground that he was an " agitator." On the other hand the Prince of Wales, who happened to be one of his constituents, once called and took tea with him.

It certainly needed courage, in the year 1872, to found an Agricultural Labourers' Union. Many who took part may have remembered the Dorsetshire Labourers' Union of the 'Thirties, which ended in Hammett and five others being transported for five years for administering illegal oaths. Old men could remember the Labourers' Revolt of 1830 and the executions and transportations and imprisonments by which it was crushed. But Arch's movement was not marred by the burning of ricks or the smashing of machinery. There was no disorder beyond alleged obstruction of the highway, or alleged threats by women, though it is stated in Arch's *Life*,[4] that if the tenant-farmers had done nothing to satisfy the labourers' demands " they would in time have been met by the fire of the incendiary, and the knife, and the barricade."

There was something primitive and patriarchal about the beginnings of the movement. On February 7th, 1872, three men " from Wellesbourne way " came to call on Joseph Arch, and the same evening a meeting was held under " the

old chestnut-tree at Wellesbourne, at which nearly 2,000 persons were present. "The men" (said Arch) "got bean poles and hung lanterns on them. I mounted an old pig-stool."[1] It was a dangerous proceeding; some of those present who lived at Radford and Wellesbourne were punished by eviction. On February 21st there was a second meeting, the demand being for an increase of 4*s.* a week in wages—from 12*s.* to 16*s.* The movement spread to Oxfordshire, Herefordshire, Leicestershire, Somerset, Norfolk, Northampton, Essex and Worcestershire. The London Trades Council gave support. There was a great demonstration at Leamington on Good Friday, at which Sir Baldwyn Leighton, the Hon. Auberon Herbert and Jesse Collings spoke. By the end of May there were between forty and fifty thousand members of the Union who sent sixty delegates to attend a Congress. In December there was a meeting in Exeter Hall, at which Samuel Morley, who gave £500 to the funds of the Union, took the chair, and there were present Dilke, Trevelyan, Sir John Bennett, Mundella, Cardinal Manning, Tom Hughes and Charles Bradlaugh. So that in less than a year the visit of "the three men from Wellesbourne way," and the gathering under the Wellesbourne Oak, had developed into a political movement of great significance. It was a movement which went on with varying fortunes through the 'Seventies, being handicapped at the end of the decade by several successive bad harvests, which made any appreciable increase in the agricultural wage impossible, and which Arch believed to be "a visitation of the Almighty upon the farmers for their treatment of the labourers, and upon a luxurious and dissipated aristocracy."[2] Arch himself was returned to Parliament in 1885, and was introduced by Joseph Chamberlain and Jesse Collings.

It could not therefore be truly alleged, as Lord Randolph Churchill and Gibson alleged in the House, that there was a general indifference to Reform in 1884. Leading Liberal statesmen (including Gladstone himself) were committed to it; Liberals and Radicals were almost solid in support; tens of thousands of agricultural labourers looked to it as the one chance of improving their hard lot—and these were the real driving power behind the Bill. In August there was a procession of Franchise demonstrators which took three hours to pass the Speaker's windows;[3] processions can

be organized, but this one must have been about 30,000 strong. Gladstone, at the close of the Second Reading, said that if the debates had been languid (as had been commonly observed), it was because no direct issue had been raised—"gentlemen opposite know that it is a *res judicata*, a settled question, not to-day and not to-morrow, perhaps by this Government, perhaps by the next Government before it is six months old—but the question is not less a settled question." "It is an indirect, instead of a direct opposition."[1]

Lord Bryce writes to the same effect—that Lowe was the last *advocatus Diaboli* against Democracy,[2] that the issue of principle had not been raised since 1867—"not in 1884 even by Tories." The vehement and once famous Lowe was now in the House of Lords; he used to say that speaking to the Lords was like "addressing dead men by torchlight." Sir Henry Lucy describes his "transformation" as "a terrible example of the influence of the Upper Chamber. The bitter tongue that impartially rasped friend and foe is quiet. The keen intellect that flashed like a scimitar through all kinds of sophisms seems dulled. Night after night Lord Sherbrooke sits on the bench behind Ministers, peering about as if his eyes had not yet grown accustomed to the splendour of the scene."[3] Probably the old statesman's anti-democratic views were unchanged, but it is not quite correct to say that in 1884 "the issue of principle" was not raised in the Commons. The sentiments expressed by Lord Claud Hamilton in 1879 still found some echo in 1884 from Goschen and Lord Randolph Churchill: but, on the whole, Gladstone was justified in saying that the opposition was "indirect"—as was the Whig opposition of 1866.

Gladstone, in introducing the Bill which was to mark the third stage in our democratic progress, stated that he proposed to redeem a pledge, to satisfy a desire, and to add strength to the State. "The strength of the modern State lies in the Representative system." He would enfranchise firstly "the minor tradesmen of the country, and the skilled labourers and artisans in all the common arts of life, and especially in connection with out great mining industry;" secondly "the peasantry of the country." His intentions with regard to Faggot-Voters were expressed in characteristic Gladstonese: "We propose to disqualify, with due

exceptions, those incorporeal hereditaments which are, or readily may be, employed for the creation of fictitious votes." The Bill " is, in point of fact, if it is to be described by a single phrase, a Household Franchise Bill for the United Kingdom." As to Redistribution : " I admit that legislation on Redistribution ought to follow legislation on the Franchise at an early date—aye at the earliest date—and the earliest date will be next Session." He declined to reduce " the proportional share of representation accorded by the present law to Ireland." Gladstone ended by re-affirming his belief in Democracy :

" We are firm in the faith that enfranchisement is a good, that the people may be trusted—that the voters under the Constitution are the strength of the Constitution. . . .

" You will have made this strong nation stronger still . . . stronger within by union between class and class, and by arranging all classes and all portions of the community in one solid compacted mass round the ancient Throne which it has loved so well, and round a Constitution now to be more than ever powerful, and more than ever free."[1]

Gibson (afterwards Lord Ashbourne), Member for Dublin University, opposed the Bill indirectly. He asserted that there was a general indifference to the measure, and that the public was more interested in the safety of our troops near Suakim. He insisted that Redistribution must go with an extension of the Franchise, and that it would be dangerous for the Tories to pass the latter without being sure of the former. He also challenged Gladstone's estimate of the new Irish voters ; Gladstone's figure was 400,000, Gibson reckoned there would be 600,000. (Considering the state of Ireland at this time, neither Party could contemplate without concern a large addition to the Nationalist vote.)

Lord Randolph Churchill's opposition was of a livelier character, and could not be accused of " indirectness." He spoke as frankly as did Robert Lowe in 1866 and 1867. " The agricultural labourer, as a general rule, was absolutely unfitted for the exercise of the Franchise. The ordinary agricultural labourer outside the boroughs had no knowledge whatever of the elementary facts relating to political questions." This at least was courageous. He pertinently observed that the Government ought to repeal the Coercion

Acts before they began to talk of political equality between England and Ireland. He added an "indirect" argument, that he did not believe in Reform being dealt with "by a discredited and exhausted Ministry."

Another speaker, much more eminent then than Lord Randolph Churchill, opposed the Bill directly. Goschen made his protest on the Second Reading in terms which Lowe would have admired. "It is said, 'Swim with the stream; let the boat glide; statecraft is no more than the clever use of the pole to keep it from the bank.' That is not my view."[1] Goschen, though a Liberal, voted against the Bill.

Redistribution was not in itself repugnant to the Liberals. In 1875 Dilke complained that more than 400 Members of Parliament sat for constituencies not numerically entitled to representations. Even after 1867 there were Boroughs, which, if not "rotten," were at any rate proprietary. In Trollope's *Phineas Finn*[2] (1869) we read: "it was manifestly a great satisfaction to Lord Brentford that he should still have a Borough in his pocket, and the more so because there were so few noblemen left who had such property belonging to them." And in *The Prime Minister*[3] (1876) the Duchess of Omnium says: "There is Braxon where the Marquis of Crumber returns the Member regularly, in spite of all their Reform Bills; and Bamford, and Coblesborough; and look at Lord Lumley with a whole county in his pocket, not to speak of two boroughs!" Lord Salisbury, as Lord Robert Cecil, had sat for his kinsman's (Lord Exeter's) Borough of Stamford. Similarly Mr. Balfour, by the influence of his uncle Lord Salisbury, was returned for the Borough of Hertford in 1874 and 1880;[4] in a later year, when Hertford had been disfranchised and become part of the East Herts Division, Lord Salisbury put forward as a county candidate his relative Evelyn (now Sir Evelyn) Cecil, who defeated the Hon. C. R. Spencer. Chamberlain and the Radicals came to think that Redistribution would complicate Reform. At Bristol (November 26th, 1883) he said the Tories "never have any objection to anything in the abstract," but they were "anxious to know what is our scheme of Redistribution." The same demand had been made by the Liberal "Cave" in 1866. His advice was not "to jumble the two questions up together."[5] But in the end, at the instance of the Queen and by agreement between the

Parties, the two questions were treated as parts of one settlement, and a serious crisis was averted.

Some of the Tories did not even attain to an opposition of the "indirect" kind. Balfour and Lord Elcho declined to join Lord Randolph Churchill in an anti-Reform crusade; they favoured the assimilation of the County to the Borough Franchise. Lord Balfour has written, in his *Chapters of Autobiography*: "Britain had, in my view, long been a Democracy, and was certainly a Democracy in 1883."[1] Sir Michael Hicks-Beach said in 1880 that "he saw no valid reason why country artisans or agricultural labourers should be less fitted to record their votes than the working classes in towns."[2] The completion of Democracy was really a *chose jugée*. In the debates of 1884 we may find ignorance alleged against the citizens whom it was proposed to enfranchise, but certainly not venality, corruption or drunkenness. "Participation without predominance," "bare degradation of the Franchise," "Household Suffrage properly counterpoised"—all such phrases implied an attitude of mind which could no longer find expression. Sir Henry Maine pointed out that a measure like Gladstone's County Franchise Bill would, in the United States, amount to a Constitutional Amendment, and lamented that his own country was without American safeguards.[3] Maine, however, recognized that in England Democracy was now "thought to be full of the promise of blessings to mankind." Gladstone could confidently ask, at the close of the Second Reading of the Bill, "Does anyone contest the principle upon which I founded myself in my introductory statement—that it is good for the State that the largest possible number of capable citizens should be invested with the Parliamentary Franchise? . . . The vote is an educating power."[4]

Whatever their private opinions, however they might "furiously rage together" in their clubs and country-houses, there were now very few Tories who could publicly contest the principle of an enlarged representation. It was too late to do so; logic and Party policy told against such a course.

After the Franchise had been won the Agricultural Labourers' Union died a natural death, for its purpose had been achieved. As it had been achieved, the Labourers' hopes were high. A Wiltshire man (presumably a Tory) told Chamberlain that "since they got the Franchise, they

have thought of nothing else. They talk of it by day, they dream of it by night. It is positively sickening."[1] In his famous "Ransom" speech Chmaberlain delighted in the thought that "next year two million men would enter for the first time into the full enjoyment of their political rights. . . . It is a Revolution which has been peacefully and silently accomplished. The centre of power has been shifted, and the old order is giving place to the new." He had "a profound belief in the probability of future benefits to follow."[2] And he gloried in the prospect of Democracy's supremacy: "All classes of politicians, Whigs, Tories and Radicals, will have to recognize their masters, and will have to obey their mandate."[3] He knew also that he controlled the Machine by which that mandate could be shaped. He had only one fear—that undue pressure might be put on the rural labourers to vote for Tories. "My hope is," he wrote to Labouchere, "that the labourers will lie courageously—promise to the Tories and vote for us."[4]

Whatever their promises, they voted for the Party that had enfranchised them. "In the English counties the agricultural labourers tramped doggedly to vote down the farmers' and landlords' candidates. Mr. Farrer Ecroyd's Fair Trade movement, which had proved so popular in Lancashire towns, exerted an opposite effect in villages, where Corn Law memories were still wakeful. Mr. Chamberlain's speeches had fallen upon a fertile soil. . . . Henceforth the Conservative leaders, if they were to rule the land, must build in town and country upon the foundation of Democracy."[5]

But little did Chamberlain anticipate in 1885, when he found the cry of "dear Bread" so potent for his Party, that twenty years later it would be revived to drive him from power for the rest of his days.[6]

NOTES TO
REFORM IN 1884

Page 130.

[1] Gorebridge, March 22nd, 1880. Gladstone, in introducing the Reform Bill of 1884, instanced the hardship of shipwrights on the Clyde, disfranchised because their works had been moved out of Glasgow.

[2] *Life*, Vol. V, p. 310.

Page 131.

[1] *Radicals and Whigs* (*Fortnightly Review*, February, 1884).

Page 132.

[1] The labourers themselves thought otherwise. In their agitation for the vote they used to sing a song called "the Franchise":

"There's a man who represents our Shire
"In Parliament House, they say,
"Returned by the votes of farmer and squire
"And others who bear the sway;
"And farmer and squire, when laws are made,
"Are pretty well cared for thus;
"But the County Member, I'm much afraid,
"Has but little care for us.
"So we ought to vote, deny it who can,
"'Tis the right of an honest Englishman."

(Joseph Arch's *Life*, p. 273).

Page 133.

[1] *Punch*, March 15th, 1879.

[2] *Recollections*, Vol. I, p. 198.

Page 134.

[1] *Hansard*, May 20th, 1867.

[2] Sheffield, September 23rd, 1873 (*Speeches*, Vol. I, p. 23).

[3] *Joseph Arch, The Story of His Life*, p. 99.

[4] Joseph Chamberlain at Hull, August 5th, 1885. (*Speeches*, Vol. I, p. 172).

[5] *Speeches*, Vol. IV, p. 621.

[6] The cottages might be *picturesque*, but "these garnished hovels, for such they were with the outside trimmings of ivy and climbing roses, were garnished without, but they were undrained and unclean within, so that the seven devils of disease and vice had possession, and flourished like weeds on a dunghill or toadstools in a cellar." (Joseph Arch's *Life*, p. 44).

[7] p. 98.

[8] See *The Transition from Aristocracy*, p. 39.

Page 135.

[1] *When Squires and Farmers Thrived*, p. 120.

[2] *When Squires and Farmers Thrived*, p. 183.

[3] *Life's Ebb and Flow*, p. 125.

[4] p. 270.

Page 136.

[1] *Life*, p. 73.

[2] *Ib.*, p. 313.

[3] Dilke's *Life*, Vol. II, p. 65.

Page 137.
[1] *Hansard*, April 7th, 1884.
[2] *Studies in Contemporary Biography* (Lowe), p. 309.
[3] *A Diary of Two Parliaments* (The Great Parliament 1880-85), p. 356.

Page 138.
[1] *Hansard*, February 28th, 1884.

Page 139.
[1] *Hansard*, April 7th, 1884.
[2] Chapter 32.
[3] Vol. II, p 123.
[4] In 1874 Mr. Balfour was unopposed. In 1880 the Liberal candidate was Bowen, the Harrow Master, whom he defeated by 164 votes. Hertford always had a strong Whig Party.
[5] *Speeches*, Vol. I, p. 108.

Page 140.
[1] p. 157.
[2] Lord St. Aldwyn's *Life*, Vol. I, p. 215.
[3] *Popular Government*, p. 241.
[4] *Hansard*, April 7th, 1884.

Page 141.
[1] *Speeches*, Vol. I, p. 231 (Birmingham, October 20th, 1885).
[2] *Speeches*, Vol. I, pp. 131-2 (Birmingham, January 5th, 1885).
[3] *Speeches*, Vol. I, p. 161 (Eighty Club, April 28th, 1885).
[4] *Life of Labouchere*, p. 243.
[5] *Life of Lord Randolph Churchill*, Vol. I, p. 472.
[6] Amongst those who were frightened at the passing of this Reform Bill were the three Emperors of Austria, Germany and Russia. Ampthill wrote to Granville (August 16th, 1884): "The progress of Democracy in England is a cause of very serious alarm to the Sovereigns and Governments; and they purpose to meet it by consolidating the Monarchical League." (Granville's *Life*, Vol. II, p. 363).

THE DECLINE OF THE SQUIRE

The power of the Landowner—Survives the Reform Act of 1832—Effect of the Act of 1867—Prosperity of Agriculture—Large Estates—Disraeli and landed Magnates—Multifarious duties of the Squire—Large families—Trade despised—Profuse hospitality—Henry Chaplin—Game-preserving and Poaching—Alleged tyranny and patronage—The farmers—Squires in Parliament—Bad harvests—The wet summer of 1879—Cheap imported Corn—Gladstone's remedies—Ruin of Agriculture—Effect of Reform Act of 1884—Ritchie and the Local Government Act of 1888—Criticisms of County Members—Quarter Sessions powers transferred to County Councils—Death Duties 1894—"The Edwardians"—War Taxation—Closing of Country Houses—Can Agriculture revive?

THE Reform Act of 1884, by enfranchising the Agricultural Labourer, dealt a heavy blow at the political influence of the Landed Gentry. The two previous Reform Acts had done something to undermine the landowner's power, and the agricultural depression of the later 'Seventies had sadly diminished his rent-roll. But, politically, the Act of 1884 was felt as a more direct stroke. Between 1884 and the War two others were to follow. In 1888 as an administrator he was to be largely superseded by the elective County Councillor, and in 1894 Harcourt's Death Duties were to impose an additional heavy burden on his estates, a burden destined to be intolerably aggravated in War and post-War years. Beneath this accumulation of woes is the Landed Interest now almost prostrate.

In the days after the Conquest the Lord of the Manor was Vice-gerent of the King. Except that he owed the King his feudal service and feudal dues, his power was absolute. He held his Manorial Court and could set up his Manorial gallows. In course of time serious offences were remitted to the Judge of Assize, and the Justice of the Peace absorbed some of the functions of the Lords of the Manor—but the Justice of the Peace, until quite lately, had himself to qualify by land-ownership. From the Revolution of 1688 to the Reform Act of 1832 the Government of England, both locally (except in the Boroughs) and centrally, was Government by landowners and their families.

Until 1832, and for some long time afterwards, the Shires

sent only landowners to Parliament, and a very large proportion of the Borough Members also were nominees of great Whig and Tory landed magnates. In 1793 out of 513 Members for England and Wales more than 300 were returned by individual "proprietors"; 88 were absolutely nominated by Peers and 72 secured their election by the influence of Peers. In 1827 Croker told Canning that 203 House of Commons seats were in the hands of the Tory Aristocracy, while the Whigs had only 73. Here may be found the real power of the Lords. The Duke of Wellington said of Grey in 1817 that he was "lost" by being in the House of Lords: "nobody cares a d—n for the House of Lords; the House of Commons is everything in England, and the House of Lords nothing." But then the House of Commons was full of nominees of the Lords. Lord Lonsdale sent nine, Lord Hertford and Lord Fitzwilliam each eight, the Duke of Devonshire and Lord Darlington each seven; several others were responsible for five or six.[1] Locally, too, the great landowners were supreme. "In the country districts," says Mr. J. R. M. Butler, "the administration was identified with the landowning class. The Lord Lieutenant was alike the chief magistrate, the military commander, and the leading territorial magnate and receiver of rents."[2]

The Reform Act of 1832 was a democratic triumph; in fact some of its promoters were admirers of the French Revolution, and imbued with revolutionary principles. They were against the then system of Government; that is to say, they were against Government by landowners. But the *pocket* of the landowner was not affected by the Act, except that he lost his pocket-boroughs—not an altogether negligible loss, for, if available for the whole term of a Parliament, they were worth £6000 apiece.[3] Nor was the social prestige of the landowner seriously affected, though the Poor Law Act of 1835 somewhat diminished his local sway.[4] And Land continued to dominate the House of Commons. Writing in 1867, Bagehot remarked that, besides the County Members, "the landed interest takes plenty of seats from other classes. Half the Boroughs of England are represented by considerable landowners. . . . In number the Landed Gentry in the House far surpass any other class." John Bright made it a grievance that they were so numerous and powerful in the House.[5]

So, after Reform, Land came to be the last hope of the

Tories. The "Die-Hard" Croker regarded the Landed Gentry as a bulwark between Democracy and Despotism. After the Repeal of the Corn Laws he believed that the constitutional struggle lay between the landowner and the manufacturer. If the former won "the Throne is safe; if the latter, in my deliberate judgment, it is gone." This is the reason why the Tories were so bitter against Peel. Peel, by abolishing the Corn Duty, was imperilling the land; therefore he was betraying the national interest.

Disraeli's Reform Act of 1867 only enfranchised the town-dweller. In the debates of 1866 and 1867 there appears no indication of a feeling that it was necessary to justify the omission of the rural Householder, nor did Liberal or Radical orators denounce that omission. In the debates of 1884 Lord Randolph Churchill had the courage to avow that the agricultural labourer was too unintelligent to have a vote; perhaps in 1867 this was taken for granted. The Compound Householder clause would have enfranchised Sheffield but left Birmingham as before. This was obviously ridiculous; yet no one argued that Sheffield should not be treated better than Shropshire.

But every intelligent politician must have realized that there could be no "finality" about 1867. In 1868 Lord Salisbury admitted that "pure Squire Conservatism" is played out. The Ten-Pounders, according to Bagshot, had liked to have "an honourable, or a Baronet, or, still better, an Irish Earl" to represent them in Parliament. The new Household voters were probably less obsequious, and inclined to prefer one of their own energetic fellow-townsmen. "To be an independent representative of a really popular commercial constituency," says Mr. Turnbull in *Phineas Finn*, "is, in my estimate, the highest object of an Englishman's ambition." And when asked "but why commercial?" he replies, "because the commercial constituencies do elect members in accordance with their own judgments, whereas the counties and the small towns are coerced either by indivdiuals or by a combination of aristocratical influences." And if the aristocrat was accepted as a Member, he was now expected to attend to his constituents. In *Lothair*, Bertram, the heir to a Dukedom, says he must return from abroad: "The country is dissatisfied with my absence. And mine is a queer constituency; very numerous, and several large towns; the

popularity of my family gained me the seat, not their absolute influence."

But it was not long before the extension of the Suffrage to the Rural Householder began to be advocated. As we have seen, it appeared in Election addresses; it was discussed at an Electoral Reform Conference in 1872, and brought before the House of Commons by Trevelyan in 1874. No doubt, however, the Tories were sanguine that the measure might be postponed for many years, knowing well that the Whigs cared little about it. There had been an interval of five and thirty years between the first Reform Act and the second; they hoped for at least as long an interval between the second and the third, forgetting that Reform ever accelerates—*vires acquirit eundo*. Meanwhile their land continued to be profitable.

Peel had prophesied that corn would never fall below 48*s*. a quarter, and in fact till the 'Seventies it kept well up to that figure, generally varying between 50*s*. and 60*s*. John Bright told the House of Commons (April 1st, 1868) that "the land, which you said would go out of cultivation and become of no value, sells for a higher price in the market than it ever brought before." Between 1847 and 1877 the annual value of land in Great Britain increased by £12,000,000.[1] According to Caird, in 1875 the farmers were paying £7,000,000 more rent than in 1857.[2] Mr. A. G. Bradley, in his book *When Squires and Farmers Thrived*, describes the splendid prosperity and efficiency of East Lothian farming before agricultural depression set it. Heavy land at the foot of the Lincolnshire wolds was then worth from 30*s*. to £2 an acre. There were "fat wheat lands" in Essex worth £2 an acre. In Wiltshire "The great sheep-farmers of the downs, with their large unfenced tillage-fields swelling in the wide troughs between the ranges, were in their glory then, with plenty of money and well-stocked cellars: the Tanners, the Gales, the Strattons, the Lynes and other notable stock."

No wonder if the land attracted the monied man. "See how every successful trader buys an estate!" wrote Cobden to Bright. And if a proprietor became encumbered by mortgages he found no difficulty in disposing of his property. "Cotton-spinners, cotton-brokers, brewers, iron-masters, and engineers, overflowing with ready cash, and boasting gigantic balances at their bankers" (so *The Morning Post*

catalogued them in 1865) were always ready to come forward as purchasers.

The motive of these newcomers was partly, no doubt, a desire to improve their social position. But land also appealed to them as an investment, which, if not lucrative, was safe. Hope, the great East Lothian farmer, was fond of saying that it was the only investment "that would never let you down." "Land can never run away" was another favourite saying. There must be landowners in our own time who almost wish it could. There were, of course, bad seasons, but these were balanced by good. Rents of good land were high and were regularly paid; when a lease fell in, the rent could be increased. The landowner's position was envied; the years from 1846 to 1871 have been described as "this Indian summer of the Squirearchy."[1]

The great proprietors owned vast estates. Joseph Chamberlain complained (in 1885) that something less than a thousand persons held one third of the land of the United Kingdom. In the same speech he denounced these persons as "those who neither toil nor spin," but, if he really believed this, he must have been sadly misinformed. There was a Duke who owned about 800,000 Scotch acres, which represents (roughly) a domain 40 miles long by 40 wide. Two great Whig Dukes were reputed each to have an income of £200,000 a year; another Duke's income was believed to be £400,000. But these fortunes were by no means wholly derived from agricultural land; ground-rents, coal-mines, harbours, town-developments swelled the total. The proper supervision of such enormous properties might have taxed the business abilities of Chamberlain himself.

Disraeli delighted in describing the magnificence of these landed magnates. He consoled himself for his defeat of 1868 by writing *Lothair*, which appeared in 1870. Lothair came into "a vast inheritance which was in many counties and more than one kingdom." On his coming of age, when he arrived to take possession of Muriel Towers, "he was met at the station by 500 horsemen all well mounted, and some of them gentlemen of high degree, who insisted upon accompanying him to his gates." At the Towers he finds his household assembled on the steps of the chief entrance—"the house-steward, the chief butler, the head-gardeners, the chief of the kitchen, the head-keeper, the head-forester, and grooms of the stud and the chambers, formed one group

behind the housekeeper, a grave and distinguished-looking female, who curtesyed like the old court; half a dozen powdered gentlemen, glowing in crimson liveries, indicated the presence of my Lord's footmen." The inferior members of the domestic staff were marshalled in groups at a respectful distance. Lothair was delighted with the number of courts and quadrangles in his castle; he proceeded through "ball-rooms, and baronial halls, and long libraries with curiously stained windows, and suites of dazzling saloons." Vaux and Brentham, the palatial homes of Lothair's friends, scarcely yield in stateliness and splendour to Muriel Towers.

At parting with a nobleman who had entertained him, Disraeli paid his host the compliment that he had enjoyed "the finest spectacle these Islands can afford—a great nobleman living at home among his own people." He extolled as the ideal type of legislator "an English gentleman, born to business, managing his own estate, mixing with all classes of his fellow-men, now in the hunting-field, now in the railway-direction, unaffected, unostentatious, proud of his ancestors."[1] He goes to North Buckinghamshire and visits constituents—"the Pauncefort Duncombes of Brickhill Manor," "Colonel Hanmer of Stockgrove Park," "the Chesters of Chicheley," "the Lovetts of Liscombe," "the Dayrells of Lillingstone Dayrell," and a great many more, all of whom, by their ancestors, came in with the Conqueror." (None of these names now appears in Burke's *Landed Gentry*.) He writes of these families to Lady Londonderry that they are "people you have never heard of before, yet living with a refinement and splendour quite remarkable. Nothing more striking than some of your English gentry with chateaux, parks, and broad domains; greater men by a good deal than many German princes, and yet utterly unknown in London society."[2] "What is curious about Dizzy" (wrote Matthew Arnold in 1872) "is his great knowledge about county families and their history; I really think not from anything servile, but because it interests him in bearing on English life, politics and society."[3] In 1848, through an arrangement made by Lords George and Henry Bentinck, Disraeli himself became a country gentleman as owner of Hughenden.

The good conscientious landowner was no drone. For instance, Sir Walter Vivian Bart:

" A great broad-shouldered genial Englishman,
A lord of fat prize-oxen and of sheep,
A raiser of huge melons and of pine,
A patron of some thirty charities,
A pamphleteer on guano and on grain,
A Quarter-Sessions chairman, abler none "—

and, probably, also a Colonel of Yeomanry, a M.F.H., possibly an M.P., besides having half a dozen livings in his gift.[1]

Sir Walter Vivian evidently had no inclination to be slothful. The Squire of ample fortune and energetic temperament, who answered every call of duty and was in turn landlord, farmer, sportsman, prominent Churchman, Justice of the Peace and officer in a county regiment, whose benevolence and public spirit were constantly applauded by his family, his neighbours, his tenants and his servants, that sort of Squire was liable to another more subtle form of temptation—self-complacency. He lived in his own little province, and every day heard his praises sung at Sessions, market-dinner, agricultural show or covert-side :

" Que son mérite est extrême !
Que de grâces ! que de grandeur !
Ah combien Monseigneur
Doit être content de lui-même ! "

Perhaps he sometimes tired of the chorus ; yet probably he would have missed it, had it been discontinued.

Those were good times for the heads of County Families, whose principle anxiety—if they had no resources besides their land—was the harvest. In Mr. Punch's picture-gallery[2] the Peer of the later 'Sixties is a rather stiff and formal figure ; in Tenniel's cartoons he wears his coronet and a frock-coat, has whiskers and a tuft, a stock with a pin and a Gladstone collar, and his stomach, over which hangs a heavy gold chain, is slightly protuberant ; but the Squire is seen as a happy, prosperous well-fed man in country dress ; and so is the farmer. The farm-labourer, however, is presented as ill-nourished, rheumatic if elderly, in a smock and thin-legged, and often with the gaping face of an idiot ; but he too appears happy, when seated at the ale-house bench with a mug of beer before him. The owner of four or five thousand acres could keep a good table and a pack of hounds, at any rate go fox-hunting with his whole family,

and enjoy a London season ; though perhaps the season was more enjoyed by his women-folk than himself. For them it must have been a welcome change from rural routine. The winter months in the country could be very dull for those who were not interested in sport or farming. The visitor from London, unless he had these tastes, felt " out of it." A witty contributor to *Punch* narrates a dinner-party conversation, of which the topics were apples and potatoes.[1] As to potato-growing there was much argument about the use of " Dumpton's Dressing "—" Sandilands don't believe in Dumpton's Dressing. No more does Aysford Synge. The ladies are entirely against Dumpton's Dressing. I should like to butt in with some pleasantry about their being still more against Dumpton's *Un*-Dressing, but I feel that anything of this sort would be out of place among the old County Families." One is reminded of the conversation to which Mr. Snob in a previous generation had to listen at Major Ponto's in Mangelwurzelshire—" the subsoil ploughing, the pheasants and poaching."

In the novels of fifty or sixty years ago the hero was almost invariably a young Squire, and so it was in melodrama ; in musical comedy he appeared again with a chorus of village maidens. In novels, if he applied for the hand of a young lady, her father always made anxious enquiries as to his rent-roll. The modern father, if his consent were ever asked, would be more inquisitive about the last balance-sheets of the Companies of which the young man might be a Director.

Of course all Squires were not perfectly comfortable in their circumstances. Like members of other classes of the community, they were very apt to have large families. The provision for the younger sons was a problem ; for the eldest would inherit the estate, and it was indispensable that he should be properly endowed to maintain the family dignity. Owing to the custom of periodically renewing the entail, the Squire was usually no more than a life-tenant. On his death the estate might pass, failing a son, to a nephew or an even more distant relative, so he might have to save for his daughters and this saving might be difficult. In Trollope's *The Prime Minister* the income of Sir Alured Wharton, a Baronet of ancient lineage, was " a modest three or four thousand a year " and " the family settlement for his wife and daughters would leave them but poorly

off; and, though he did struggle to save something, the duty of living as Sir Alured Wharton of Wharton Hall should live made those struggles very ineffective."

The problem of finding careers for the youngest sons was more immediate. Sixty years ago Trade was still despised; men of Trade were supposed to suffer from a vulgarity of mind and manners. The very names of some of Mr. Punch's characters in the 'Seventies and 'Eighties bear out this view—"Old Shoddyworth," "Alderman Gobbins," "Mrs. Snobbington Hardcash," and, later, "Mrs. Bullyon-Boundermere." Sir Gorgius Midas, who begins his appearances in *Punch* on February 9th, 1878, is a dreadfully "bloated capitalist," and his son is an odious cad. A Duchess, in a moment of irritation, refers to Sir Gorgius as "a successful sausage-maker" and is angry at being invited to dine with his wife. His appearance may be contrasted with that of the spare, athletic, cultured, Georgian, Captain of Industry. In externals Sir Gorgius is a type of trader now extinct. Later on, Punch himself is conscious of a development. He presents us (November 17th, 1888) with a "Study in Evolution"—Alderman Brownjones and his son. The Alderman might be own brother to Sir Gorgius; the son is a tall well-dressed gentleman with a refined face, very like one of du Maurier's Colonels.

This contempt for Trade is said to have begun early in the Eighteenth Century; before then it had been quite customary for a country gentleman to apprentice one of his sons to a City Tradesman. Pope wrote a well-known couplet:

> "Boastful and rough your first son is a Squire,
> The next a Tradesman meek, and much a liar,"

which indicates that Trade was already looked at askance. Dean Inge says that disdain of Trade came in with the Georges,[1] and was a German idea. In Johnson's *Ramblers* (1750-1752) we still read stories of younger sons who "go into the City." One, Misocapelus, succeeds to his elder brother's estate; even so the ladies of "the County" do not let him forget he has been a haberdasher—"wherever I came, there was always some unlucky conversation upon ribands, fillets, pins or thread, which drove all my stock of compliments out of my head, and overwhelmed me with shame and dejection."[2] But the early Victorian and mid-

Victorian Squires carried on the later Eighteenth Century tradition that Trade was no fit occupation for a gentleman, and this tradition, which lasted till agricultural depression made the position even of the head of the family a difficult one, sadly limited the opportunities of younger sons, who could not all be accommodated in the permitted professions—the Church, the Bar and the Services, even if they had the necessary spiritual, mental or physical qualifications. In the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries, especially after a War and when demobilization had deprived Army officers of employment, another profession had been sometimes adopted—" the Road " ;[1] but the railway, which had ruined many innkeepers, had made the calling of highwayman as obsolete as the stage-coachman's or the postboy's. Tennyson's Sir Walter Vivian welcomed his tenantry and neighbours

" Among six boys, head under head."

A pleasant sight—but what became of the five younger ? It may be that one or two of them sought their fortunes in " the Colonies," as the King's Dominions were then termed ; and *sometimes* fortunes were found there, but more often the adventurer returned unsuccessful and disappointed. It cannot be denied that, too often, the poverty and dependence of his younger brothers were a condition of the opulence and dignity of the Squire. They vegetated in the country like Mr. Will Wimble, or in London like Mr. Twemlow, and may well have asked themselves the question

" Stemmata quid faciunt ? "

The Squire with a large mansion, following old fashions of hospitality and conscious of the necessity of " living as Sir Alured Wharton of Wharton Hall should live," was sometimes given to extravagance and fell into a way of living beyond his means. Joseph Arch, who knew the life of the countryside, wrote : " The Squire must have his London house ; he must entertain ' the County ' in a sumptuous and ostentatious manner ; he must find money for his sons to spend three or four years of idleness and extravagance at Oxford or Cambridge, or a longer period in a Cavalry regiment ; he must give marriage portions to his daughters. To do all this the money must be wrung from the land ; to give it the land is starved for want of cultivation, and

the labourer, who is least able to protect himself, is kept in penury."[1] This was written some time after bad harvests and foreign competition had made it difficult for the thriftiest landlord to do justice to his property; of course those whose habits of expenditure were profuse were hit the hardest, and were the first to succumb.

Let us consider the case of Henry Chaplin (1841-1923), a super-Squire, a Squire of Squires, and (like the first King of Prussia) *ein sehr expensiver Herr*, whose biographer says quite truly that she tells of men and women and modes of life that will not come again.[2] Gladstone preferred Newdegate "as a survival of the Tory class destroyed by Dizzy;"[3] but in the hunting-field, on the Turf, and in Parliament Chaplin was a far more prominent figure than Newdegate, and his handsome face and fine presence were recognized everywhere. This fortunate man, on coming of age in 1862, inherited an estate of 25,000 acres in Lincolnshire, that is to say a territory of about ten miles by five, besides properties in Nottinghamshire and Yorkshire; as land let then, we may suppose that his rent-roll was about £40,000 a year. "Both at Blankney" (his country-seat), "and at his old house at Lincoln he entertained in princely fashion," for Chaplin was one of the last, perhaps the last, of the county magnates to keep up a "town-house," Burghersh Chantry, in the capital of his county. This once pleasant feature of provincial life was obliterated by the railways.[4] At Oxford he had hunted six days a week; on becoming the Squire of Blankney he subscribed £1200 a year to the Burton Hunt, as his uncle Charles had done before him. He was afterwards, while a Member of Parliament, Master of the Blankney Hunt, and continued to follow hounds and ride hard till nearly the end of his long life. His children "in their infancy were taught to think, speak, and dream of hunting and riding almost like a religion."[5] In 1867 he won the Derby with "Hermit" and a very large sum of money; but afterwards his luck in racing varied, though in 1877 he won nearly £3000, and in 1879 £500 on a "tip" given by Lord Rosebery. He had a deer-forest and a house in Park Lane, and different carriage-horses for Town and Country. After 1876 he began to feel the effects of agricultural depression, and in 1879 (the black year for landowners) undertook, in his own words, "a general overhauling of accounts and expenses of

estate and establishment with a view of arriving at a sound financial basis." There is a Micawber-like hopefulness in this resolve, but Chaplin's "overhauling" was not very successful. Two years later he was proposing to build a house for his deer-forest, and "as long as Blankney was his, he continued to entertain there on the lavish scale which was his habit." No doubt this lavish entertainment was extended to his constituents, for he was continuously in Parliament bearing all the varied expenses of a generous County Member. But in 1892 his finances became seriously embarrassed. "The problem of cutting his expenses to match his diminishing revenues had proved beyond him." Blankney was sold to Lord Londesborough.

"The library of his daily use" consisted of the Bible, the Racing Calendar and the Parliamentary Guide; and his plan of life was "always to have what I like, when I like it, and as much of it as I like." His appetite was heroic, and almost worthy to be compared with Palmerston's.[1] Chaplin was brave, honourable, open-handed and public-spirited—no mean virtues. As a politician, honest but retrograde; quite out of touch with democratic Conservatism which was now the only Conservatism that was practicable, and thereby coming into serious conflict with Lord Randolph Churchill; as an orator, eloquent in a florid, out-of-date style. He belonged to an era when it was considered to be the crown of a statesman's career to win "the blue Riband of the Turf." (This also was one of the three objects of Lord Rosebery's ambition, and in attaining all three he was successful.) When Chaplin said that his aim was to have what he liked, and when he liked, and as much of it as he liked, he was perhaps no more than glorifying his remarkable powers of digestion; but his lordly way of living must have prevented him from doing all that he otherwise might have done for his tenants and labourers—and for his family—in the years when disaster befell the Land. Still it is not easy for a middle-aged man to change his habits; it was even less easy then for a public man, and a man living in the Marlborough House circle, to curtail his hospitalities. And how many foresaw that the agricultural depression of the later 'Seventies would be lasting? Chaplin, though he strayed far into the Twentieth Century, really belonged both as sportsman and orator to the Eighteenth and would have adorned it. It was his misfortune, and the misfortune of

many of his friends, to be smothered in cheap corn. They were ruined, and Joseph Arch rejoiced in the removal of the "fungus growths of feudalism and class privilege." But "feudalism" had come to mean little more on the part of the landlord than a desire to keep his land and his sporting rights while performing his local duties, and on the part of the tenant a sentiment of affection for old families not unmixed with a lively sense of benefits that might accrue from their survival.

"Class privilege" is another matter; the phrase suggests the resentment of the "under-dog." What was the cause of this resentment? We shall not go far wrong in thinking that much of it was connected with the Game Laws, and with their administration. "On the eve of 1832" (writes Lord Morley) "a whimsical genius had uncharitably described the 'game-bagging, poacher-shooting, foot-path stopping, common-enclosing, rack-renting, and the other pursuits that make a country gentleman an ornament to the world, and a blessing to the poor.'" The Duke of Bedford (1849) said that game-preserving was "a feudal luxury unsuited to the times," and some persons prophesied its discontinuance, but it survived the Reform Bill as fox-hunting survived the Railroad. Poachers were still severely punished, and the Poaching Prevention Act of 1862, which gave a right of searching suspected persons, was felt as a great indignity. In reference to this Act Joseph Arch wrote: "We labourers do not believe hares and rabbits belong to any individual, not any more than thrushes and blackbirds do."[1] Joseph Chamberlain in his "Ransom" speech (January 5th, 1885) supported this view as to property in animals *ferae naturae*: "Are the game laws a right of property? Is it just to expect that the amusements of the rich, carried even to barbarous excess, should be protected by an anomalous and Draconian code of law, and that the community should be called upon to maintain in gaol men who are made criminal by this legislation, although they have committed no moral offence?" Such rhetoric was likely to be peculiarly attractive to the newly-enfranchised agricultural labourer; but it was horrifying to the Squire, whose sporting rights had suffered a severe blow in 1880, from the Government of which Chamberlain was a member, in Harcourt's Hares and Rabbits Act. This Act had given great offence to the landowner—"luncheon-table talkers

became apoplectic over this theme," writes Lady Warwick.[1]

The County Benches, very largely manned by game-preservers, were naturally suspected of a bias against poachers. "The Great Unpaid" were pilloried by *Truth*, which published weekly a list of seemingly severe sentences. *Truth* never troubled about such considerations as previous convictions, or that the poacher—quite apart from his poaching—was often a parochial pest. No doubt some Magistrates were opinionated and prejudiced, and some were impatient of argument. A youthful advocate, who had ventured to question a ruling of Charles Chaplin (uncle of Henry Chaplin), was met with the rejoinder, "Young man, you are evidently a stranger in these parts, or you would know that my word *is* law." There was a feeling that at the Petty Sessional Court the poor defendant did not get a fair chance, and this found expression in a "Franchise" song :

"Whenever a tyrant country beak
Has got us beneath his thumb,
For Justice then he ought to speak
But the County Member is dumb. . . .
The Parliament men false weights have made,
So that Justice often fails ;
And, to make it worse, the Great Unpaid
Must always fiddle the scales."

Rightly or wrongly, if a man were summonsed for poaching, he would look on his rural judges as might a licensed victualler arraigned before a Bench of militant teetotallers ; but in a Court of Law it is not only necessary that justice shall be done, it is also indispensable that *the accused person* shall feel sure that he will get justice. In these days the defendant generally sees on the Bench one or more Magistrates who are not separated from himself by a class-division, and this is a democratic development highly to be commended.[2] In any case the democratic Magistrate (if one may so call him), is no less conscientious than the old Squire-Magistrate—and no less incorruptible. It is unfortunately the case that in any Court, however constituted, the poor litigant who is unable to brief counsel is at a disadvantage with the rich. Many poor men are convicted for want of legal assistance ; it does not follow that these are all innocent.

Joseph Arch had other grievances against those rural

potentates, the Parson and the Squire. He complained that their attitude to the poor man varied from tyranny to patronage ; for both advice and charity can be offered in a manner that offends. The poor hate above all things being lectured, and being severely reported upon as Hannah More and her sister reported upon the sinful glass-workers.[1] Arch's mother probably gave offence by refusing to go to the Rectory for soup. He says that the Labourers' Sick Benefit Club was discouraged, because the Parson and his wife liked to be the dispensers, also that those who worshipped with Dissenters were persecuted—" if we did, then good-bye to all our charities ; no more soup and no more coals should we have." In the Election of 1868 neither farmer nor labourer dared to serve on Liberal Committees. He denounces " Parsons' Schools." In the parish Church " the poor were appointed their lowly places," and poor women have to go and curtsey to the Parson's wife in the chancel before taking the seats set apart for them. And here is another curious grievance : " The Parson's wife issued a decree that the labourers should sit on one side of the Church, and their wives on the other." Lady Warwick recalls the same custom at Easton in the 'Seventies, but, strange to say, as applying only to the gentry. " In Church our seats were divided ; the men on one side of the aisle, the women on the other. Only the ' Quality ' did this. The rank and file of the congregation were under no such foolish restrictions. At the close of the Blessing ' We ' filed out first before the gaze of our humble neighbours. The Estate Steward and his family followed, then the farmers, and, last of all, the cottagers. One old lady even made a habit of getting up and curtseying as we passed down the aisle, probably because we were more tangible to her than God ! "[2] Lady Warwick, a friend of Joseph Arch, in her later book, admits the benevolence of " the kind *châtelaine* who played the part of Lady Bountiful," but " the system for which she stood was founded on something akin to serfdom ; the rising tide of Democracy has carried it away—unwept, unhonoured and unsung, except by those in whose blood there is something of the flunkey strain."[3] Most people will agree that the disappearance of the " system " is not to be regretted.

Arch also attacked the farmers. Their wives were sometimes kind but " the picture of them which was bitten

deep into my memory when I was a growing lad is a bitter, black one."[1] But then he adds that farmers too, as a class had been "fearfully oppressed." "Farmer and labourer had improved the land together, but the landlord took the increase thereof." Mr. A. G. Bradley gives an instance of high-handedness on the part of a Scottish landlord, Mr. Nisbet Hamilton, who turned out of his farm the well-known agriculturalist, Mr. Hope of Fentonbarns, because he stood for Parliament as a Liberal.[2]

The village in which Joseph Arch was reared must have been governed with an unusual strictness. "At the sight of the Squire," he writes, "the people trembled." Of the generality of Squires this would have been ludicrously untrue; they more often went to the other extreme—were so good-natured as to be easily imposed upon. But, whether benevolent or harsh, the average Squire was more in his element in his home surroundings than in the House of Commons. He was usually a Tory, belonging to what was then called "the Stupid Party." This reputation had attached to the Tories since the days of the first Georges, when Honest Shippen led, in opposition to the triumphant Whigs, a forlorn hope of Members whose sympathies were with the Jacobites. Till the reign of George III these old-fashioned Tories were excluded from office and from the training which office gives, and their attendance at Court was perfunctory; by cultured Whigs they were despised as rough and barbarous. The Tories then had a very long spell of power, but in 1846 Peel broke his Party. The Peelites, able if few in number, stood aloof from their old Party, and during the next eight and twenty years the Tories were only in office for four; the dauntless Disraeli, never despairing, restored them to office—and to power—in 1874. The idiosyncrasies of some of them were the delight of the political satirist and caricaturist. Sir Charles Wetherell, prominent as an anti-Reformer, was always depicted with a *lacuna* between his waistcoat and trousers. Colonel Sibthorp, ultra-Tory, ultra-Protestant, ultra-Protectionist, and anti-railroad champion, was a frequent butt for Mr. Punch's wit. Bernal Osborne, in the House, described the Tory Party as "that great omnibus-full of stupid heavy country gentlemen." Newdegate, who won nine elections for North Warwickshire, a fine horseman and a kind and considerate landlord, also noted for his attacks on the

Church of Rome and on Charles Bradlaugh, once remarked in the House of Commons, "I belong to the stupid Party I am not intelligent." Dramatists and novelists always presented the Squire as unintelligent. In *The Picture of Dorian Grey* Wilde introduces one as "a red-cheeked white-whiskered creature who, like so many of his class, was under the impression that inordinate jocularity can atone for an entire lack of ideas."

Sir Henry Lucy, the "Toby" of *Punch*, made constant fun of Squire M.P's. He ridiculed Henry Chaplin (criticized also by Gladstone for his "grandiloquent manner and inferior matter"). "He had taken in by the pores, as it were, so many perorations, that they were constantly bubbling up in unexpected places. . . . Evidently a peroration more or less is of no consequence to this gifted man."[1] "He likes the solemn bustle of a discussion on a point of order." "He has no good things to say, and he has an awkward way of producing his poor things." But Disraeli had a high opinion of Chaplin, who gave him great help in passing a complicated Bill. He wrote to Lady Bradford (July 30th, 1875): "He has never left my side, and his aid has been invaluable. He is a natural orator, and a debater too. He is the best speaker in the House of Commons, or will be. Mark my words."[2] There were other county M.P.'s who diverted the House without attaining Chaplin's Cabinet eminence. When John Bright stated that the Upper Classes were negligent in attendance at Church, a Mr. Forester replied: "I wish the Right Honourable Gentleman had been where I was last Sunday, and seen ladies of title carrying baskets of flowers" (an irreverent roar of laughter). General Burnaby made his mark by quoting denunciations of Bradlaugh by such diverse ecclesiastics as the Bishop of Raphoe, the Bishop of Argyll and the Isles, the Chief Rabbi, the Superior of the Greek Orthodox Church and Mr. Spurgeon. Sir Baldwyn Leighton—"his speech is, perhaps, a little incoherent, owing to the immense pressure of thought, which projects miscellaneous information without that orderly arrangement that is a necessity to the more commonplace mind." Mr. George Bentinck ("Big Ben") and Mr. Cavendish Bentinck (known, like a more successful politician, as "C-B") were great characters; so was Mr. Warton who was always taking snuff. Mr. Christopher Sykes, a very retiring

Member and famous for his dinners, once surprised the House by introducing a Bill to amend Acts relating to oysters, crabs, lobsters, cockles and periwinkles. Mr. Dawson (was he a county Member? at any rate he is worthy of record) :—" There are strings in the human heart that had better not be vibrated.[1] . . . I speak as a husband. . . . If anyone dare to lay a hand on my wife, it should only be by stepping over my dead body." The beginning of a peroration by Mr. Rowland Hunt, M.P. for Shropshire, may conclude this anthology : " Seated under one of England's mighty oaks was an ancient Druid. There came by Boadicea, Briton, Warrior, Queen, her back seared with the Roman lash." (Roars of laughter.)

" Toby," a witty writer of Whig-Liberal proclivities, found such legislators very entertaining ; but eccentricity need not be confused with stupidity—there is the eccentricity of genius. Eccentricity was going out of fashion, with the independent Member of the old " Country " Party. For each side of the House the " Machine " was producing a standard type. The old-fashioned Tory Member could no longer express his *real* views without offending democratic or idealistic supporters. When Mr. Winston Churchill joined his regiment, his Commanding Officer was Colonel Brabazon, whose " three main and fundamental tenets were Protection, Conscription, and the revival of the C.D. Acts. He judged Government and politicians according as they conformed, or seemed likely to conform, to his Programme." These were also the privately-held tenets of many a Tory Member, but Colonel Brabazon's Programme was not practical politics. The times were out of joint for it. Seeing in front of him rows of serious, reforming, doctrinaire Liberals and Radicals, the retrograde Tory politician was sometimes tempted to buffoonery ; sometimes, after the dinner-hour, he was tempted to indiscretion. Lord Salisbury himself, in his public speeches, occasionally indulged in " blazing indiscretions," and spoke as if he were thinking aloud ; but Lord Salisbury in the Upper House needed to have no respect for constituents.

Such then, till the later 'Seventies, were the circumstances of the English Squire. He loved his seat and his estate, where he could live on his rents, regarded sport " almost like a religion," was hospitable to profusion, but looked

down on Trade about which he was very ignorant. On his benevolence the happiness and comfort of his farm tenants and cottagers greatly depended, and in benevolence he rarely failed. As Justice of the Peace at Petty Sessions he was active, and fair except for a natural bias against poachers; at Quarter Sessions he had the Police under his control, administered the Lunatic Asylum and looked after the county roads and bridges. If he were rich enough he fulfilled the landowner's duty on which Gladstone laid emphasis —"to assume freely the burden and responsibility of serving in Parliament." He had done much for his fellow-man; between 1857 and 1885, according to a Report of the Enclosure Commissioners, landlords had spent sixteen million pounds on cottages, schools, farm-buildings and roads.[1] His family supplied officers to the Army and Navy, and priests to the Church. The System, of which he was the keystone (said Disraeli), "allows the great body of Englishmen to be ruled by traditionary influence and habit." It was therefore the very opposite of the democratic system. "Only those of us who were mixed up with such things," (writes Mr. A. G. Bradley), "and are old enough to remember those days, can fully realize the profound security and solidity then associated with the Landed Interest."[2]

Then came the time when the Squire who lived by his land found his fortunes crumbling. The bad harvests began in 1875. Disraeli writes to Lytton (August 14th, 1879): "After four bad harvests in this country we are apparently about to meet a fifth dearth." In the House of Commons (March 28th, 1879) he had lamented "a succession of bad harvests, and that these bad harvests are accompanied for the first time by extremely low prices. In old days, when we had a bad harvest, we had also the somewhat dismal compensation of higher prices." Next year (September 22nd, 1880) he writes to the Queen, "there must be something unlucky in a Minister who had to encounter six bad harvests." It was after 1876 that Chaplin found that, owing to bad seasons and foreign competition, his large rent-roll was "deceptive." In the spring of 1878 there were in England 897,000 less crop-growing acres than in 1870—and 2,606,000 fewer sheep than in 1874. In the autumn of that year Norfolk farms were thirty per cent. worse productively than in 1872. In

the spring of 1879 there were more than one hundred farms to let in one county.[1] In May *Punch* had a cartoon called "A Fellow Feeling" depicting the common adversity of the Squire and Farmer Giles.

The summer of 1879 was terribly wet. *Punch* had some verses (July 19th) under one of Linley Sambourne's drawings:

> "Wet! Wet! Still Wet! O weary, watery weather!
> Nature seems now, like Niobe, all tears,
> The Earth her bottle. Hide of porpoise leather,
> Or cuticle of macintosh appears
> Her only hope."

"I dread going round the farms," wrote Chaplin, "but I am sure it is better to do it. . . . It rained hard all last night and the greater part of to-day, and, if it goes on like this for three or four days, everything must mildew, and it will mean almost ruin for them all."[2] "Farm after farm, field after field, that ought to be a crop of wheat or of barley, literally destroyed by the wet."[3] Nothing can now save the harvest," wrote Beaconsfield to Lady Bradford in August. Yet he himself was gallantly buying land—"the old tenants think me quite mad." He writes to the Queen in September that landowners are "at one of the darkest hours of their fortunes," and to Lady Bradford in October: "They say now, however, as the consequence of the landed break-up, that there are to be no more Turf, and no more London seasons. All our friends have shut up their houses, or are to do so. It will be an excuse for some, who ought to have done so under any circumstances." The Duke of Richmond had reported that "his news, from Sussex, was the very worst, and that his men, with leases, were throwing up."

But there was something more disastrous in the year 1879 than want of sunshine. *Soles occidere et redire possunt*, but there was to be no return for the old British agricultural prosperity. Mr. A. G. Bradley writes:

"As a date 1879 means nothing now, save to a few, though 1815 and 1832 are engraved on history. But 1879 nevertheless marks the end of all that land had hitherto stood for, or, if you like, the beginning of the end. . . . If the Squires had lost political power, the prestige of land suffered nothing. 1879 was merely the most disastrous

farming year within living memory. That in itself would be comparatively nothing and mark no epoch. But it knocked farmers flat for the moment, and before they could get up again the first wave of the deluge from overseas met them in the face." Vain were rebates of rent—" of what earthly use, when wheat was below 30*s*., with barley and oats to match, and from causes that had obviously *come to stay*, with every prospect of aggravation?"[1] The deluge from overseas! It was the development of "the Virgin West" of America, the prairies which (according to Cobden's assurance) would never threaten the English farmer—" they were only fit to grow Indians and buffaloes." But their produce had already swamped the Eastern States and halved the value of Eastern farms. Now, with cheaper transport and a vast increase in the carrying power of ships, it was our turn. " The grain of the virgin lands from overseas burst upon the country like a flood. Wheat fell rapidly from its old comfortable consistent figures of 50*s* to 60*s*. to 30*s*. odd, with oats and barley to match. This, alas, was no temporary set-back, such as in a less extreme form and from other causes had often happened and could be easily weathered. It had *come to stay*."[2] (Again those fatal words.)

As for the result: "All the tillage-counties in England simply crumpled up. Farmers disappeared by the hundred, farms were unlettable, land unsaleable, even mortgagees at their wits' end. British land that had been immemorially regarded as the most secure investment upon earth, with interest in rent as regular as Consols, save in spots, became the most hopeless of all forms of property. From envied security landowners dropped into a position that, when unsupported by outside wealth, seemed financially untenable—and was so."[3]

How did the Liberal Party, the Party of Free Trade, regard this disaster? One effect of the fall in agricultural values was a diminution in zeal for Land Reform.[4] But had the Party any remedy? Gladstone, in his Midlothian campaign, diverting his mind for the moment from the wrongs of the Bulgarian and Afghan, and trying perhaps to allay the apprehension of Midlothian farmers, sought to administer comfort. He reminded his audience that agricultural depression had been felt even more severely in Eastern America, prophesied that more American wheat would be wanted later for home consumption, and thought

it likely that freights would be increased. Meanwhile he advised them to purchase their tools in the cheapest market.[1] In a later oration he recommended the cultivation of strawberries, deplored the ravages of ground game and condemned high rents. At a Hawarden Flower Show in 1888 he told of an acre of strawberries making £200, and a lady who had made a profit of £5 by her poultry ; he also advised the manufacture of jam. These were mostly pills to cure the earthquake. But, in advising his countrymen to grow tomatoes, the Grand Old Man encouraged what became a considerable industry—till this also was killed by cheap foreign imports.[2]

The depression *had come to stay*. From 1879 it is a common topic for orator and writer. The countryside now felt the sort of blight that fell on the road with the coming of the railway. In a *Nineteenth Century* article,[3] which attracted some notice, Charles Milnes Gaskell disillusioned his readers of the idea that in 1882 the Squire's lot was still enviable :

" The reality is very different. He has given up his deer, has dismissed his servants, has laid down his kitchen-garden in grass ; he is advertising his house for a Grammar School or a Lunatic Asylum ; he is making arrangements with little Premium for the sale of his ancestors, and with the nearest timber-merchant for that of his trees. . . . He has made permanent reductions in three or four of his principal farms, and he has 800 acres on his hands."[4] As *Punch* put it, referring to this article :

" With an encumbered property, diminishing rent-roll, and expenses beyond his income.
" The question which confronts him at every corner is, Whence will the needful ' tin ' come ? "

Gaskell had enumerated, amongst other increased expenses, that servants' wages had risen, that horses and game cost more, that Eton fees were " up " by thirty per cent. and daughters' dresses by fifty per cent.

" In former times," said Lord Randolph Churchill (at Blackpool, January 24th, 1884),[5] " and not so very long ago, the moment that a man had made a fortune in trade he invested that money in a landed estate ; the possession of a landed estate gave him social status, political influence, sporting rights, and possessed many other amenities and attractions. . . . But now all that is gone : the investment

is no longer safe, and the bloom has been altogether rubbed off the peach." The Whig Hartington, about this time, was equally pessimistic—landlords and farmers were facing ruin, labourers were migrating into the towns. In January 1885 Chamberlain told an Ipswich audience: "I suppose that almost universally throughout England and Scotland farming has become a ruinous occupation." Younger sons were beginning to provide for themselves in a then novel fashion. Gladstone noted "the growth of a new class—a class unknown to the past, and one whose existence the future will have cause to deplore. It is the class of hybrid or bastard men of business, men of family, men of rank, men of titles, men gallant by courtesy, and, perhaps, by nature, county gentlemen, members of both Houses of Parliament . . . giving their names to speculation which they neither understand nor examine, as Directors or Trustees"[1]—in short, "guinea-pigs." The average price of wheat which between 1836 and 1846 was 57*s.* per quarter, sunk between 1886 and 1896 to 29*s.* "Agriculture," said Chamberlain at Greenock (October 7th, 1903), "as the greatest of all trades and industries in this country, had been practically destroyed." And so things went on till the War, when food was badly needed, and it was necessary to take a different view of the usefulness of British land. So Mr. Lloyd George addressed the farmers at Caxton Hall:

"You men are also soldiers. You are in the front line trenches, serving your country. You have been badly treated in the past, but henceforth you will never be forgotten. Go back to your land and produce food for the army and the people."

The Kaiser was to be hanged; the returned soldiers were to be provided with "homes fit for heroes"; the pockets of Germany were to be searched for the last penny of reparations; the farmers were not to be forgotten. All these promises, prompted by the necessity of the moment, were easy to make—not so easy to fulfil. In 1921 the Corn Production Act was repealed.

On the top of the agricultural depression, with its ruinous decline in rents, came the Reform Act of 1884. The Squire, having lost a considerable part of his income, was now to be outvoted by his own farm-labourers. At the Election of 1885 (as we have seen) "in the English counties the agricultural labourers tramped doggedly to vote down the

farmers' and the landlords' candidates." And the country party, "with all its immense territorial influence and candidates of county families, was shattered, never to be restored, except as a shadow of its old strength."[1] The Conservatives might well have despaired of politics; and yet, within twelve months, as Unionists they were again firmly in power. But the Tories were no longer a Party of landowners, and led by landowners, representing what Dickens' Member of Parliament prided himself upon representing—"the Gentlemanly Interest." "There are still a few in our Party," said Lord Randolph Churchill in 1884, "who have yet to understand that the Tory Party of to-day is no longer identified with that small and narrow class which is connected with the ownership of land; but that its great strength can be found, and must be developed, in our large towns as well as in our country districts."[2] A very unpalatable lesson for "the old men who crooned over the fires at the Carlton."

The Conservatives were again in office, but the Squirearchy was to suffer a further diminution of power, this time not their political but their local power; they were to lose their control of county government. Municipal Reform had followed the Reform Act of 1832, and County Councils were to follow the Act of 1884. Elective Local Government was, as Churchill said, "the corollary of the Franchise." This had been long expected. Milnes Gaskell, in a Magazine article already mentioned, had foreseen that "a County Government Bill, making extensive changes, will impair, if not destroy" the landowner's official position. During Disraeli's Administration, Sclater-Booth in 1878 had introduced a Local Government Bill which excited the wrath of Lord Randolph Churchill; but this was before the days of Tory Democracy. The object of this Bill was to transfer the functions of Quarter Sessions to Boards elected partly by Boards of Guardians and partly by County Magistrates. The Bill, said Churchill, was contrary to Tory principles; it was "Brummagem trash"; it was a most Radical and democratic measure ("democratic" was still a recognized term of abuse), a "crowning desertion of Tory principles."[3] (He made fun of Schlater-Booth's "double-barrelled" name, but might not the Minister have retorted, "How about Spencer-Churchill?")

The violence of the attack itself proves how jealous the Landed Gentry were of their Quarter Sessions powers. Ten years later Churchill was praising Ritchie's Bill because it was "based upon a purely democratic foundation." He had meanwhile realized the necessity of "a casting-off and a burning of those old, worn-out aristocratic and class garments from which the Derby-Dizzy lot, with their following of county families, could never, or never cared, to extricate themselves."[1]

Lord Salisbury told the Queen (November 26th, 1886) that the Conservatives might make up their minds to accept Ritchie's Local Government Bill, though it would be "distasteful" to them. It would be vain to describe Salisbury as an enthusiast for Local Government. Of a London Local Government Bill he remarked that "the multiplication of Municipalities—say eight or nine—would please the local leaders, who hope to figure in them and become Mayors."[2] Later, of a Parish Councils Bills, he said: "If, among the many duties the modern State undertakes, the duty of amusing the rural populations should be included, I should rather recommend a circus or something of that kind." But the Unionists were committed to County Councils, and on March 19th, 1888, Ritchie introduced his Local Government Bill.

Charles Thompson Ritchie (1838-1906) had no connection with the Squirearchy nor with Eton or Oxford, nor had he served in the Guards nor been called to the Bar. He was the fourth son of a Dundee merchant and jute-spinner and was himself a London merchant and banker of ability and repute. He was known as a "Progressive" Tory, but the older Tories called him a Radical. He had sat for the Tower Hamlets and was now Member for St. George's in the East. He had been Financial Secretary to the Admiralty, and in 1886 became President of the Local Government Board. Chaplin had indignantly refused this office, because it did not carry Cabinet rank; Ritchie accepted it and was promoted to the Cabinet in 1887.

Ritchie, introducing his Bill, admitted that it aroused little enthusiasm. As Gladstone had said, "the propulsive power is unfortunately weak." The public had confidence in the existing County authorities; their duties had not only been "well discharged, but unselfishly, wisely and economically." Their judicial powers would be untouched, but

he proposed to transfer from Quarter Sessions to the County Councils their administrative powers—County Rates, Finance, County Buildings and Bridges, the provision and management of Lunatic Asylums, the establishment and maintenance of Reformatories and Industrial Schools, the Diseases of Animals Acts, Main Roads, Liquor Licenses, Music and Dancing Licenses, Adulteration of Foods and Drugs, Weights and Measures. (Liquor Licenses were afterwards excepted.) The Police would be under a Joint Committee of Justices and County Councillors. He hoped the Justices "who in the past had so ably and efficiently managed the affairs of the County" would serve on the County Councils, and prophesied that the new *régime* would increase the influence of the country gentlemen. Gladstone admitted that the Bill "embodied many principles, the acceptance of which, as coming from the Right Honourable Gentleman and his colleagues, is a very important fact in the history of Parliamentary legislation."

Many County Members voiced great uneasiness about the Joint Police-Committee—Sir Richard Paget (Somerset), Sir Henry Selwyn-Ibbetson (Essex), Sir Walter Barttelot (Sussex), Henry Chaplin (Lincoln), Baron Dimsdale (Herts). Barttelot asked a question, which—considering Ritchie's praise of the Justices—was very pertinent. "Would they get a better or more economical system than the old?" However, he said, it was too late now to object—"things had gone too far." Chaplin accepted the principle of the Bill, because it had been promised in 1885. He was aware "that there had been grave complaints—more comments, he thought, outside the walls of Parliament than in them—against the sweeping and radical changes which were effected by the Bill, and which some Hon. Members of the Party regarded as a complete repudiation and renunciation of all the principles hitherto professed by the Tory Party on this subject." But the Bill had been promised; it was now too late to object. While complimenting Ritchie on his mastery of detail, he felt glad the task had not been his own: "The operation would have been too much in the nature of 'the happy Despatch' to be pleasing to him and he should have felt compunction in putting an extinguisher upon too many of the class with which he had associated himself—the country gentlemen of England."[1]

The only criticisms levelled at the Bill by the Radicals (Stansfeld, Dilke and others), were that the new Local Government areas were too large and poor men would find it difficult to attend meetings in the County town, and that the new Councils would spend too much money. The latter criticism has been justified, and there was some truth in the former, for County Council work is a matter of time and expense. That the Tories refrained from serious opposition to the Bill was a tribute to their discipline, for it deprived Quarter Sessions of nearly all its administrative functions. It was, as Churchill said, " based upon a purely democratic foundation," and the country gentlemen had loyally accepted it " although undoubtedly they have pride, and rightly have pride, in their own limited administration of County affairs."[1] Lord Salisbury had said in private conversation that " if Squires did not submit themselves for election, their influence was not worth preserving."[2] Gladstone, too, urged that the duty should not be shirked : " The sphere is enlarged, the call is louder than it ever was before, the man who does not listen to it would be unworthy of the name of Briton." As a fact the duty was accepted ; very many Squires became County Councillors, and generally they were elected without opposition. But the old Tories did not forgive Ritchie. Churchill told Sir Algernon West how they hated him for his Bill " which was really a fine piece of work and the best thing the Government had done."[3] They especially hated Ritchie for bringing into existence the Radical-Socialist London County Council.

Cardinal Manning considered that " since 1833 there has been nothing so radical as the County Bill. . . . The County Government will be the field in which, I hope, a new English people will work out a new and equal social law and state. If the Leaseholders, Householders and Capitalists will ' engineer a slope ' we may avert disastrous collisions. If they will not, I am afraid you will see a rough time. Millions are living in an inhuman state—without Christianity and without religion."[4] He was thinking of the squalor of London and other large cities. The London County Council set to work ambitiously—and extravagantly ; its Members have always been divided roughly into two Parties, Radical spenders and Conservative savers. The rural Councils have, generally, been non-political. In

Dorset, for instance, in 1931 : " In only 3 of the 63 electoral divisions were there contests. . . . No party issues have been involved, and the attitude of the public towards the Election has been remarkable for its apparent indifference. The Council is mainly composed of county landowners and magistrates, professional men, retired Service men, and farmers ; "[1] but Dorset is a remote and rural county. In the case of most counties the County Councils, and the Urban and Rural Councils which followed, have afforded the man of energy in whatever rank of life an interesting local career. The work undertaken greatly exceeds the work of the old Quarter Sessions, and it is work of which Quarter Sessions would not have been capable ; one need only instance the administration of the Education Act. Committees and Sub-Committees multiply (as Commissions did after the Reform Bill) ; on many men the habit of attending Committees is a habit that grows. The man trained to business finds it easier to transact all this work than the landowner. In any case the aspirant to the County Council must submit to election, often to canvassing,

" To beg of Dick and Hob."

In the transaction of County business the Squires are now in a minority, and that business is much more important and much more extensive than it used to be. But those who prophesied that the County Councils would be expensive prophesied truly ; and this was inevitable. The County Councillor is expected to get benefits for the electors whom he represents, and there is a competition between districts. If one district is endowed with a new school or an improved highway, the neighbouring one clamours for an equal amenity. In Quarter Sessions days there was a rhyme :

" Old Squire Jones, of his great bounty,
Built this bridge at the expense of the County."

Young Councillor Brown feels impelled to become a public benefactor on the same easy conditions.[2]

Having lost much of their political power by the Reform Act of 1884 and much of their local power by the Local Government Act of 1888, the Landed Interest was to sustain another heavy financial stroke from Harcourt's Death Duties in the Budget of 1894. Death Duties of course fall

on all sorts of property ; but they especially affect property in land, which is difficult to realize and often heavily mortgaged. Sometimes land is sold to pay them, sometimes the country mansion is let or temporarily closed, sometimes the whole estate goes to the hammer. Those who had to pay these Duties denounced them as monstrous and ruinous ; loud was the outcry of the landowner. Lord Rosebery called them 'Dum-Dum' Duties, because of their expanding character. The name was apt ; in 1895 they amounted to £11,600,000, in 1909 (the year of Lloyd George's Budget) to £25,000,000. In 1894 *Punch* imagines the Duke of Westminster telling the Duke of Devonshire : "We may consider ourselves lucky if we can keep a tomb over our heads." The Queen, who disliked Harcourt, was of opinion that he was "actuated by spite to, and a wish to injure, the landed proprietors. It will recoil on the poor who, and the charities which, will no longer be able to be helped."[1] The burden was heavy ; but, so far, not absolutely insupportable. In *The Edwardians*,[2] a valuable study of society in King Edward VII's reign, we read of a very wealthy Duke who was killed in the Boer War and whose executor had to find £100,000 for Death Duties. His mother was very angry and made her solicitor write an indignant letter to the Chancellor of the Exchequer ; she received a polite reply. The whole amount was paid without much difficulty during the young Duke's minority. Estates changed hands and wealthy purchasers were still not wanting. Sport was still pursued, and with even greater intensity ; the expense was no deterrent. At the beginning of the Twentieth Century it was estimated that in Great Britain about 200,000 horses, valued at £12,000,000 and maintained at an annual charge of £8,000,000, were kept for fox-hunting.[3] "Things are quite pleasant even to-day," says the Duchess in *The Edwardians*. Quite pleasant for the very wealthy ; but the luxury of the Edwardians was no longer defrayed out of agricultural rents. The country magnates who still kept up great state, and who survived the ruin of farming and the Death Duties, were the owners of ground-rents or mining-royalties, or had married American heiresses. Rich financiers and manufacturers were admitted into Society, and welcomed. Against wealthy Jews King Edward entertained no prejudice. The Society of *Lothair* and the Society of *The Edwardians*

were poles asunder. The pomp and circumstance of the great country-houses, the retinue of servants with their own curious rules of precedence, the profuse entertainment of tenantry and labourers on such occasions as a "coming of age," the armies of beaters and the stables full of hunters—all this was, as Miss Sackville West writes, "a picturesque survival." People "played at living still during the Wars of the Roses." For they were really living under Campbell-Bannerman's Government with its enormous majority—379 Liberals (mostly of the Left) and, allied with them, 53 Labour Members. Was not this Labour Party itself a portentous thing? It might well be said that those who maintained the old semi-feudal sytem of life "were clinging on, with a sort of feverish obstinacy, to something they no longer quite believed in." And they lived under the deepening shadow of the Great War.

The War came, bringing taxation that would have been incredible to the Victorians. Income Tax, which at 8*d.* had been pronounced to be "a hindrance to Trade," and which on the eve of War had brought in £41,000,000, was gradually raised to 6*s.* and in 1919 produced £317,000,000. The first year's yield of the Supertax (now Surtax) was £2,891,000—a "few coppers," said Lloyd George, could easily be spared by the very rich. But this tax, like the Death Duties, had "Dum-Dum" qualities; again and again the rate has been raised, and the limit lowered. In the 1931 Budget Mr. Snowden estimated that it would produce £72,000,000. The Death Duties have risen from £11,600,000 in 1895 to an estimated £90,000,000 for the year 1931-2.[1]

And what has been the result of these unparalleled exactions? M. Paul Cambon, French Ambassador to London, told Mr. Winston Churchill in 1920:

"In the twenty years I have been here I have witnessed an English Revolution more profound and searching than the French Revolution itself. The governing class has been almost entirely deprived of political power, and to a very large extent of their property and estates; and this has been accomplished almost imperceptibly and without the loss of a single life."

But not without dire distress and hardship borne with silent fortitude. In the country the great houses have been closed, sold for schools or other institutions, even given

away or pulled down—Trentham, Ashridge, Stowe, Cassiobury, Lambton Castle, The Grove, Westonbirt, Canford Manor, Clieveden, Hornby Castle; in London, Lansdowne House, Grosvenor House, Devonshire House, Stafford House, Dorchester House. Will any survive another generation? "For good or for evil" (writes Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch) "their masters are being ousted by taxation, and their private treasures dispersed among foreign money-lenders. Even a few years will suffice to obliterate their parks and gardens; and a few more . . . will dilapidate the house." And Sir Arthur quotes Lord Chief Justice Crewe: "There must be a period and end to all temporal things, *finis rerum*, an end of names and dignities and whatsoever is terrene. For where is Bohun? Where is Mowbray? Where is Mortimer?"[1]

As for the farmers, the men "in the front line trenches, serving your country," at the close of the War they were assured that, though they "had been badly treated in the past," in the future they would "never be forgotten." So many bought their farms with money partly borrowed from the Banks. But such protection as they had enjoyed during the War was soon withdrawn. Imports were again unrestricted; prices fell lower and lower; the Bank Manager must act by rule and must be less patient about his interest than was the old Squire-landlord about his rent. The farmer has gone from bad to worse. "The season of 1931 came as a final blow. The capital of occupiers, small as well as large, has gone; their credit is exhausted; their situation is desperate. . . . Squires who live by the land find it harder to live. Crushed by taxation, crippled by the expenditure which kept agriculture alive in the 'Eighties and 'Nineties, they are again facing farms in hand and falling rents. Many country houses have changed hands; some have become institutions; some are closed."[2]

Will agriculture ever recover? Perhaps with some measure of Protection and with large-scale farming, and subject to the control of Government Boards and "quotas." But the Squire of moderate acreage who lived by his land, opulent and hospitable, locally omnipotent, benevolently despotic, with his pack of harriers and his London mansion and his hereditary seat in the House of Commons, sitting

in judgment on his neighbours at Petty Sessions and at Quarter Sessions administering the affairs of his County—where is he now to be found? "For where is Bohun? Where is Mowbray? Where is Mortimer?"

NOTES TO

THE DECLINE OF THE SQUIRE

Page 145.

[1] See *The Transition from Aristocracy* (1832-67), p. 30.

[2] *Ib.*, p. 31.

[3] The price had gone up from £2,000 in the time of George II. *Ib.*, p. 32.

[4] *Ib.*, p. 117.

[5] *Ib.*, p. 118.

Page 147.

[1] See *The Transition from Aristocracy*, p. 119.

[2] *Life of Joseph Arch*, p. 337.

Page 148.

[1] By Mr. Michael Sadleir (in *Trollope, a Commentary*, p. 15).

Page 149.

[1] *Life*, Vol. 5, p. 189.

[2] *Life*, Vol. 4, p. 77.

[3] *Letters*, Vol. II, p. 77.

Page 150.

[1] The late Lord North dedicated his notes on *Hunting* to his grandchildren in these words: "I want you to grow up good country gentlemen, doing your duty to your Sovereign, your country, and your neighbours, rich and poor, fulfilling all the obligations of your station, and versed in all those pursuits and obligations which make a country life so pleasant and happy, when you have leisure to follow them." (*The Times*, April 9th, 1932).

[2] For instance *Punch*, June 27th, 1868.

Page 151.

[1] *Friends at a Distance* (*Punch*, December 14th, 1878).

Page 152.

[1] *Outspoken Essays*, Second Series, p. 207.

[2] *Rambler*, No. 116.

Page 153.

[1] This was the case after the Civil War, after the Peace of Ryswick (1697), and after the Peace of Paris (1763). With the return of traffic to the roads the profession of highwayman is now reviving.

Page 154.

[1] *The New Review*, February, 1893.

[2] *Henry Chaplin, a Memoir* (by his daughter, the Marchioness of Londonderry), p. 2.

[3] *The Personal Papers of Lord Rendel*, p. 69. Sir H. W. Lucy also records this preference (*A Diary of Two Parliaments*), p. 210.

[4] In the sixteenth century Oxfordshire Squires had "town-houses" in Merton Street, Oxford; in the eighteenth the Duke of Norfolk still made his annual "progress" to "Our Palace of Norwich," and in many towns neighbouring landowners would take a house in their county town for the winter "season"; there was such a "season" in Truro for Cornish magnates. Chauncy, the historian of Hertfordshire, had a country-house, Yardleybury, and a town-house in Hertford (now the Conservative Club). See also *The Transition from Aristocracy*, p. 221.

Chaplin detested motor-cars, but while he was President of the Local Government Board he was responsible for the Act that relieved them from being preceded by a man with a red flag (*Life*, p. 88). During the bicycle craze of 1896, when many notable persons—Sir Evelyn Wood, Sir Francis Jeune, Colonel Brabazon, Lady Sykes, Lady Essex, etc., etc.—might be seen riding in Battersea Park, "Mr. Chaplin stood on the side-walk looking on" (R. D. B.'s *Diary*, p. 63).

Page 155.

[1] Palmerston, when 80 years old, ate at a dinner two plates of turtle soup, a large plate of cod and oyster sauce, a *paté*, "two very greasy-looking entrées," a plate of roast mutton, a very large slice of ham and some pheasant. (Disraeli's *Life*, Vol. IV, p. 422).

Page 156.

[1] *Joseph Arch, The Story of His Life*, p. 159.

Page 157.

[1] *Life's Ebb and Flow*, p. 126.

[2] Harcourt wrote to Lord Northbrook, Lord Lieutenant of Hampshire (December 22nd, 1890): "In my opinion it is a very serious misfortune that the labouring classes should be made to feel that the administration of justice is a privilege confined practically to one class, socially, religiously and politically, and it is in human nature that a bias so absolutely one-sided should make itself felt, and I attach more importance to the social than the political exclusion" (Harcourt's *Life*, Vol. II, p. 141).

Page 158.

[1] "The wages high, the eating and drinking luxurious—the body scarcely covered, but fed with dainties of a shameful description. . . . One, if not two, joints of the finest meat were roasting in each of these little hot kitchens, pots of ale standing about, and plenty of early delicate-looking vegetables" (*The Town Labourer*, 1760-1832, J. L. and B. Hammond).

[2] *Life's Ebb and Flow* (Countess of Warwick) p. 26. Addison described a similar scene: "As soon as the sermon is finished nobody presumes to stir till Sir Roger is gone out of the Church. The Knight walks down from his seat in the Chancel, between a double row of his tenants, that stand bowing to him on each side" (*Spectator*, No. 112).

[3] *Afterthoughts*, p. 242.

Page 159.

[1] *Life*, p. 37.

[2] *When Squires and Farmers Thrived*, p. 196.

Page 160.

[1] Lord Curzon said of Chaplin, "Poor fellow! he cannot learn the difference between 'oration' and 'peroration.'" (*Private Diaries of Sir A. West*, p. 334).

[2] *Life*, Vol. V, p. 387.

Page 161.

[1] This was a plagiarism on Mr. Guppy (in *Bleak House*): "Jobling! there are chords in the human mind—"

Page 162.

[1] Lord Randolph Churchill's *Speeches*, Vol. I, p. 296.

[2] *When Squires and Farmers Thrived*, p. 86.

Page 163.

[1] Joseph Arch's *Life*, pp. 300-304.

[2] *Life*, p. 96.

[3] *Ib.*, p. 101.

Page 164.
[1] *When Squires and Farmers Thrived*, p. 87.
[2] *Ib.*, p. 85.
[3] *When Squires and Farmers Thrived*, p. 86.
[4] Bradlaugh's *Life*, Vol. II, p. 182.

Page 165.
[1] Third Midlothian Speech, November 27th, 1879.
[2] At Hawarden, in August, 1894, he was again praising "Small Culture" (see *Punch*, August 24th, 1894). The tariff has now (1933) done something to revive tomato-growing.
[3] *The Country Gentleman*, September, 1882.
[4] Sir Michael Hicks-Beach told the Royal Commission on Agriculture in 1881 that he had reduced rents from 26/- to 14/-. Temporary reductions had become permanent. For the first time in his life he had had to borrow for repairs and estate purposes (*Life*, Vol. I, p. 190). His acceptance of office as Irish Secretary was only made possible through the generosity of W. H. Smith and other friends. After the Tory defeat of 1906 he went into the City.
[5] *Speeches*, Vol. I, p. 108. In the same speech he also gave a dismal account of British industry—iron, silk, wool, cotton, ship-building.

Page 166.
[1] Rectorial Address, Glasgow University, 1879.

Page 167.
[1] *Life of Lord Randolph Churchill*, Vol. I, p. 472.
[2] *Ib.*, p. 295. (Speech at Birmingham, April 16th, 1884).
[3] *Life*, Vol. I, p. 107.

Page 168.
[1] *Ib.*, Vol. II, p. 19. In the Memorandum he sent to Lord Salisbury in 1885 he had recommended the transfer of all Quarter Sessions business to purely popular Boards elected by ratepayers. (*Ib.*, p. 11.)
[2] *Ib.*, p. 16.

Page 169.
[1] *Hansard*, March 19th, 1888. *Punch* imagines this comment on the Bill by Gladstone: "Never dared have brought in such thoroughly Radical measure as Ritchie's. If we had, would have wasted the Session in urging it on," &c. (*Punch*, March 31st, 1888).

Page 170.
[1] *Speeches*, Vol. II, p. 325.
[2] *Life*, Vol. III, p. 264.
[3] *Private Diaries of Sir Algernon West*, p. 39 (July 26th, 1892).
[4] *Memoirs of J. E. C. Bodley*, p. 228.

Page 171.
[1] *The Times*, March 6th, 1931.
[2] In County Administration economy is now (1933) being rigorously practised.

Page 172.
[1] It recoiled with poetic justice on Harcourt himself. Not long before his death he inherited his elder brother's landed estate of Nuneham. The inheritance, writes his biographer, "clouded the few months of life left to him." The Duties swallowed up all the proceeds of the sale of Harcourt House, his family's London mansion.
[2] *The Edwardians* (Miss Sackville West), published 1930.
[3] *The Pre-War Mind in Britain* (C. E. Playne), p. 185.

Page 173.

[1] These figures are taken from an article by Mr. H. W. Wilson, "Four Crushing Tax Burdens," in *The Daily Mail* of August 21st, 1931. The fourth burden is Stamps.

Page 174.

[1] *Studies in Literature* (Third Series), p. 186.

[2] *A View of the Countryside*, Lord Ernle (*The Times*, February 2nd, 1932). Since 1879, Lord Ernle writes, the arable area has fallen by four million acres, and 500,000 labourers have left the land (*Ib.*). It is a sign of the times that the next edition of Burke's *Landed Gentry* will be in two parts. Part I will deal with families who still have a landed qualification; Part II with "Dislanded Gentry," families who have sold their land in recent years.

THE END OF THE WHIGS

Whig principles—The Queen at first supports Whigs—Palmerston and Lord John Russell—Pride and wealth of Whigs—Gladstone never a Whig—Whigs and Reform 1866 and 1867—Irish Disestablishment—1874-1880—1880-1885—Argyll and Cowper resign—A rift at Brooks's—Whig Under-Secretaries—Churchill, Hartington and Chamberlain on Whigs—Labouchere on "backstairs influence"—Whigs and Home Rule—Harcourt—Granville—Spencer—Hartington—Radical and Tory dislike of Whigs—Whig mentality—Gladstone's Irish measures fatal to Whig Party.

THE great Whigs, too, were great landed proprietors. At the time of the Reform Bill it was believed that Whigs owned more land than Tories, so that in respect of their acreage they would be proportionately hard hit by bad harvests and foreign corn. And, ever since 1832, their political power had been slowly but surely sapped by the Radicals, with whom they were ostensibly in alliance. But the Tories could come out and fight the Radicals in the open; the Whigs, nearly all of them as anti-democratic as the Tories, were continually obliged to vote for Radical measures which they detested. Trollope, in *Phineas Finn*, commiserates "as gallant a phalanx of Whigs as ever were got together to fight against the instincts of their own order in compliance with the insistence of those below them." It is true that they knew the use of delays, demurrers and evasions, for they were clever tacticians; but these manœuvres were neither forgiven nor forgotten.

"The cause for which Hampden bled in the field, and Sidney on the scaffold," triumphed in 1688. The Whigs, many of whom had risked their lives and estates, were victorious; almost without bloodshed the dynasty was changed. The principles for which they had struggled were Protestantism, Liberty, Freedom of Conscience and the independence of the Judges. With some brief set-backs they were in power till a few years after George III began his reign. Then they fell into adversity; from 1770 to 1830 they were nearly always out of office. Queen Victoria, on her accession, found the Whigs again in power; under Melbourne's tuition she became herself a strong Whig.

"The Whigs are the only safe and loyal people," she told Prince Albert in 1840, "and the Radicals will also rally round their Queen to protect her from the Tories."[1] Between 1832 and 1874 there was only one strong Tory Administration, that of Peel (1841-6); but Peel ended by wrecking his Party. Peel and his Free Trade policy grew in favour with the Queen and Prince Albert; Disraeli said that "he reeled under the favour of the Court." Russell and Palmerston were now "those two dreadful old men." Russell bored the Queen by his lectures on the constitutional limitations of "a Sovereign of the House of Hanover." Palmerston continued to offend her by his insubordination; in almost the last year of his life she wrote that he was "extremely impertinent in his communications of different kinds to me."

The great Whigs were grandees of the realm and enormously rich. Many of them first derived their wealth from Church lands. "The grants to the House of Russell," wrote Burke, "were so enormous, as not only to outrage economy, but to stagger credibility." Disraeli told the Queen that the 9th Duke of Bedford, "the wealthiest of your Majesty's subjects," enjoyed an income of £300,000 a year. Bedford, Devonshire and Argyll were the hereditary champions of the Whigs; almost as eminent were Spencer, Fitzwilliam, Lansdowne, Westminster, Sutherland.[2] The heads of these families had an almost prescriptive right to office; any member of a great Whig family would have a good political start. The typical Whig noble was noted for his pride, but not always for his brains. Southey said, "the great Whig landowner is a leviathan with the intellect of a dodo."[3] Jowett asked the Duke of Bedford why the Whigs have always been so unpopular. The Duke replied, "because they were so jobby and exclusive."[4] In *Endymion* we read of "a haughty Whig peer, proud of his order, prouder of his Party . . . freezing with arrogant reserve and condescending politeness." Trollope's Duke of Omnium "was a Whig—a huge mountain of a colossal Whig. He was born to be a Lord-Lieutenant and a Knight of the Garter." He was too proud to talk to his dinner-guests, even to say "How d'ye do?" to them. His nephew, who succeeded him, Plantagenet Palliser, was also very reserved, but in his case it was the reserve of shyness. The old Duke "had contrived to envelope himself in something

of the ancient mystery of rank and wealth." He "acted after his kind, and did not care what others said of him." His successor "is the human sensitive, naked to every wind. He is all nerves."[1] This different attitude towards public opinion was a sign of the times. Of Lord John Russell it was written :

> "His fame would fire you, but his manners freeze."

He too suffered from a mixture of pride and shyness.

After the Reform Bill was passed, the great Whigs began by assuming that they would be able to make use of the Radicals, who would be their humble hewers-of-wood and drawers-of-water. But the Radicals soon made the Whigs realize that they must be taken into account ; the Whigs however, being experienced in affairs, kept the "direction" in their own hands, though they were not always able to dictate the policy. There were indeed aristocratic Radicals —Durham, Molesworth, Villiers—who heartily hated the Whigs ; but it was not till 1868 that Bright, a middle-class Radical, was admitted into the Cabinet as President of the Board of Trade. Nine years previously the Queen had refused to make him a Privy Councillor because of "his systematic attacks upon the institutions of the Country."[2]

Gladstone was in succession Tory, Peelite, Liberal, Radical—but never a Whig and never trusted by Whigs. By the Whigs as a Party he was feared and hated, though with many leading Whigs he was on terms of close friendship.

At first the Whigs imagined that the Reform Bill of 1832 was a final settlement. Lord John Russell himself was known as "Finality Jack" ; but in 1851 it was Russell who began agitating for an extension of the Franchise. The Whigs as a Party did not want an extension ; and, while Palmerston was alive, Reform was blocked. Nor would the Whigs co-operate with the Tories ; in 1859 they defeated Disraeli's Reform Bill, which might have settled the question for a long time, and without any "bare degradation." In 1866, using traditional Whig tactics, they contrived to kill Gladstone's bill by Amendments. In 1867 they abstained from effective opposition to Disraeli because they preferred even Disraeli to Gladstone.

Disraeli having extended the Franchise, Gladstone came into power with his policy of Irish Church Disestablishment. This attack on a stronghold of Protestantism was also an

attack on Whig traditions. The Dukes of Bedford and Devonshire refused to subscribe to Election funds. When the Irish Church Resolutions were introduced Disraeli wrote to the Queen (March 7th, 1868) that they were "received with 'loud cheering' by all those 'below the gangway,' that is, those whom we describe as Radicals, Romanists, and especially Voluntaries; but the great bulk of the gentlemen behind him, on well-filled benches, were cold and silent. These were the Whigs." The new Cabinet, however, was full of Whigs—de Grey, Kimberley, Clarendon, Granville, Argyll, Hartington; but there was this new departure—that the Prime Minister was not a Whig. Lord Morley writes:

"Until 1868, the Whig nobles and their connections held the reins and shaped the policy. After the accession of a leader from outside the caste in 1868, when Mr. Gladstone for the first time became Prime Minister, they continued to hold more than their share of the offices, but in Cabinet they sank to the position of what is called a moderating force."[1] But from 1868 to 1874 Whigs, Liberals and Radicals generally managed to agree; there was as yet no disintegration. When the Ministers were hard pressed over Sir Robert Collier's appointment, "the old Whigs, without an exception almost, came to their rescue, there having been a meeting at Brooks's anent."[2]

When Disraeli came into power in 1874, to Dilke the whole House of Commons seemed to be Whiggish: "The Whigs, instead of being extinct, had become all-embracing, for one knew nobody that was not a Whig. With a Whig Government in office under Mr. Disraeli, and a disorganized Whig opposition on the other side, there seemed to be in question only persons and not principles." Gladstone went into retirement, and it was a question whether the Party should be led by a Whig or by a Radical. Hartington accepted the lead, and Harcourt, at this time pro-Whig, wrote to him: "It depends entirely upon your pluck and determination whether the Whig or Radical flag is to be hoisted to the fore." The Whig Hartington much disliked Gladstone's Bulgarian atrocities agitation. "I feel certain," he wrote to Granville (December 18th, 1876) of the St. James's Hall meeting, "that the Whigs and the moderate Liberals in the House are a good deal disgusted, and I am much afraid that if he goes on much further, nothing can

prevent a break-up of the Party."[1] The followers of Gladstone and Hartington were about equal in point of numbers. In 1877 Dilke reckoned that out of 296 who received the Liberal whip, about 110 were for Gladstone and about 110 for Hartington. There was a distinct division, for Beaconsfield wrote to Lady Chesterfield (April 29th, 1877) : " Gladstone and the real leaders of the Whigs seem at length to have separated, and he is going to take his own time, and move a vote of censure on the Government, which they will not support."[2] On December 11th, 1878, Sutherland, Somerset, Fitzwilliam and several other Whigs voted with the Government on the Afghanistan question.[3] In 1879 Dilke comments on a " row " between Hartington and Chamberlain : " The Whigs had now no principles. Once upon a time they had principles, but their principles had been adopted by the other side, and long before 1879 their distinctive opinions had been taken from them."[4] In January 1880 Fitzwilliam threatened secession both in the House of Lords and in Yorkshire, because Lord Ramsay, a Liberal candidate for Liverpool, had appeared to favour some sort of Irish Home Rule. According to Granville's biographer, it was partly because he relied upon rumours of Whig secession that Beaconsfield dissolved Parliament in 1880.[5]

It was Viscount Gladstone's opinion that the Parliament of 1880-1885 saw the final struggle between Whiggism and the new forces of Radicalism and advanced Liberalism.[6] It was a sign of the times that no candidate stood for this Parliament as a Whig. " That would never have done."[7] Nevertheless the great posts again " went to patrician Whigs, just as if Mr. Gladstone had been a Grey or a Russell "[8]—to Spencer, Argyll, Harcourt, Granville, Kimberley, Hartington. According to Miss Mary Gladstone, " the Cabinet is highly respectable, rather aristocratic, with a democratic dash in the shape of Mr. Chamberlain, but on the whole a good working company."[9] An acute observer remarked that while the Cabinet was three-quarter Whig and one-quarter Radical, the Liberal Party in the country was one-quarter Whig and three-quarter Radical.[10] Gladstone himself was a connecting link between the two sections. Beaconsfield sought to comfort the Queen by assuring her that there were 200 or more Whigs in the House of Commons ; according to Viscount Gladstone

"the moderate or Whig section totalled approximately 65."[1]

Later in this year Beaconsfield told Lady Chesterfield that Gladstone was now "really the head of the Radicals, and will set the Whigs at defiance, who will swallow anything."[2] But they had already refused to swallow the Compensation for Disturbances Bill. Seventy Liberal Members in the Commons refused to vote for it; Lord Lansdowne resigned; the Bill was rejected by the House of Lords and the Government acquiesced in its rejection. Lord Houghton told Dilke that "the Government will have to decide in the Vacation whether they can govern without the Whigs or not. I am glad that I have not to decide the point, but I own I am glad to have lived in a Whig world. It has been a wonderful combination of public order and personal liberty."[3] Lord Houghton evidently felt that the Whig world was beginning to crumble.

Argyll had with difficulty been persuaded to remain when Lansdowne went. In April 1881 he resigned from his office of Privy Seal over the Irish Land Bill—an event which Lord Acton described as "the flight of the Thane." There was now a ferment of unrest in the ranks of the Whigs. Sir Henry Lucy records (June 17th, 1881): "The Whigs—those uncertain compounds of slow-moving impulse, *entrées* in the feast of politics which are neither fish, flesh, fowl, nor good red herring—had stirred, and the atmosphere was tremulous with excitement and doubt."[4] Early in 1882 the Whigs began to "leave the ship." Cowper, who had already threatened resignation, actually resigned with Forster in April, on the ground that the Government was weakening as to coercion in Ireland. About this time it was expected that Argyll would join the Tories. If there were no further resignations of first-rate importance, there was a constant undercurrent of jealousy and strife between Whigs and Radicals in the Cabinet, the House of Commons and the country. The "democratic dash in the shape of Mr. Chamberlain" expressed a poor opinion of his Whig colleague Granville—"one does not expect to sit next an old nurse in Cabinet Council."[5] Meanwhile Lord Salisbury, in opposition, was taking advantage of the situation—"again and again he returned to the task of stimulating Whig uneasiness."[6]

Even in Brooks's Club, that Whig Holy of Holies, there

began to appear in 1881, "a widening rift" on Irish questions.[1] But the Whigs in Parliament were still a well-recognized and separate caste. "Whigs are always serious people," writes Sir Henry Lucy. "Another peculiarity is that there is a decidedly middle-aged flavour about their youth. . . . There is now, as in the last century, a solemn mystery about the Whig Party, which is manifested in its individual members. 'I could never find,' said George III's mother, 'that the Party was anything else but the Duke of Devonshire and his son and old Horace Walpole.' It might be said that one could never find that the Party was anything else but Mr. Heneage, Mr. Brand and Lord Edmond Fitz Maurice."[2] "Mr. Brand has the serious introspective air which marks the Whig when under 40."[3] It was thought also that the younger Whigs, however solemn and introspective, were not unskilled in the art of climbing, and obtained more than their share of the minor offices. "I think we have rather too many Whig appointments" (writes Rendel to Sir M. E. Grant-Duff, September 3rd, 1833, of George Russell's). "He is a clever young man, smart and serviceable. But, after Ashley and Fitz Maurice, I think a Russell was rather surfeiting; and besides, some felt he had played up to it a little too much. Gossips said that he crept up Miss Mary Gladstone's sleeve, corresponding with her during the *séjour* at Cannes, and wrote admirable letters which were to attract her father. Then he published a timely article repudiating Whigcraft."[4]

It may here be not out of place to record a contemporary Tory's view of Whigs (and Radicals), a Whig's view of Whigs, and a Radical's view of Whigs:

Lord Randolph Churchill, who impartially hated both Whigs and Radicals, explained their respective iniquity to the electors of Blackpool (January 24th, 1884):[5]

"The Whigs are a class with the prejudices and the vices of a class; the Radicals are a sect with the tyranny and the fanaticism of a sect. . . . The Whigs tell you that the institutions of this Kingdom, as illustrated by the balance of Queen, Lords and Commons, and the Established Church, are but conveniences and useful commodities, which may be safely altered, modified, or even abolished, so long as the alteration, modification or abolition is left to the Whigs to carry out. The Radicals tell you that these institutions are

hideous, poisonous and degrading, and that the divine Caucus is the only machine which can turn out, as if it was a patent medicine, the happiness of humanity."

Lord Hartington was of opinion that the Whigs "had formed a connecting link between the advanced Party and those classes which, possessing property, power and influence, are naturally averse to change." The Whigs it was, he concluded, who had by their guidance and their action reduced changes in the direction of popular reform to the "calm and peaceful process of constitutional acts."

This utterance aroused the sarcasm of Joseph Chamberlain who composed for Dilke an imaginary Whig speech: "Yes, gentlemen, I entirely agree with Lord Hartington. It is the business and duty of Radicals to lead great popular movements, and if they are fortunate enough to kindle the fire of national enthusiasm and to stir up the hearts of the people, then it will be the high prerogative of *the great Whig noble, who has been waiting round the corner,* to direct and guide and moderate the movement which he has done all in his power to prevent and discourage."[1]

It is clear that, as Gladstone's second Administration drew towards its end, the unfortunate Whigs found themselves to be perpetually between two fires which grew hotter and hotter. Lord Gladstone estimated that in 1880 their number was about 65. In November 1885, according to Labouchere, their number was less but their influence still strong. "As for the Whigs, they were more dangerous than the Tories. There were about 30 of them in the House of Commons. They rarely spoke, but their influence—a backstairs influence—was such that Ministers yielded to them. Happily the Whigs were expiring."[2] Lord Richard Grosvenor however, the Whig Whip, told Labouchere, "You assume that the Radicals constitute the majority of the Liberal Party, but really the Whigs do."[3] It may be that different politicians defined "Whig" differently. Labouchere and Chamberlain always meant by Whig not only the moderate Liberal, but the moderate Liberal of aristocratic connections. These were now dismayed by a Programme of "Ransom" and "Three Acres and a Cow;" nor had they a Programme to compete with it. "Milk may do for babes" (wrote Labouchere to Chamberlain, November 25th, 1885), "but Whig milk will not do for electors. The Whigs have dished themselves, thank God!"[4]

Hartington was now desirous of retiring for good. Eleven Dukes had voted for the Second Reading of the Reform Bill, and twelve against ; but by this time all his Dukes but two had already deserted Gladstone. He impressed it upon the Queen that " the six ducal Houses of great wealth and influence " had separated from the Liberal Party *before* Home Rule.[1] There seem, in fact, to have been eight deserters, for he enumerated to Lord Rendel the Dukes of Norfolk, Sutherland, Bedford, Hamilton, Portland, Newcastle and Somerset, and then Argyll on Irish Land legislation. Only the Dukes of Devonshire and Westminster, he said, left him on Home Rule.[2]

In 1884, when a scheme of Irish self-government had been put before the Cabinet, all the Whig members, except Granville, rejected it. Labouchere and the Radicals had always stigmatized the Whigs as " Coercionists." Cowper had resigned because the Coercion policy was to be relaxed. Home Rule ended the Whig Party. It may be said to have died on January 30th, 1886, when Hartington refused assent to a Memorandum on Irish policy which Gladstone took out of a drawer and placed before him. Since 1886 the " word (Whig) has been used in a purely historical sense, while Tory has still a living meaning. The Whig Party, as a concrete reality, had a history of as nearly as possible 200 years."[3] Brooks's, the historic Whig Club, of which Charles Fox became a member at the age of sixteen, became a scene of internecine struggle, where Home Rulers black-balled Unionists, and Unionists blackballed Home Rulers ; an understanding was at last arrived at, but the political character of the club was lost.[4] A still stranger result of Home Rule was that the chiefs of the Radicals and the Whigs were united. On May 14th, 1886, Hartington and Chamberlain met at Devonshire House and agree to act together. Gladstone had to lament, besides the loss of his last two Dukes, that the Party had scarcely a Marquis, not many Earls, and only one tenth of the House of Lords.

And yet it was a tribute to Gladstone's mesmeric power that of four outstanding Whig colleagues—perhaps the four most outstanding during his two first Administrations—Harcourt, Granville, Spencer, Hartington, three remained faithful. Of these four Whigs Harcourt was the most brilliant ; a younger son, he had had to make his own way in the world, and won success at the Bar before entering on

politics. But of the four he was the least stable. The Queen, whose perceptions of character were instinctive, wrote of him : " He is extremely agreeable in society, full of anecdotes and information, talking a good deal, but quietly, and with a soft voice. . . . However, he somehow does not inspire me with great confidence."[1] A very different critic, W. T. Stead, had a great dislike of Harcourt as a politician, because of his insincerity. Bryce thereon remarked, " I am quite sure that Sir William Harcourt is quite sincere in hating the Colonies."[2] He was a true Whig in Church matters : " When any ecclesiastical pretensions irritated the Erastianism that was the deepest and most undying of his political tenets, his pen made Prelates and their croziers shake."[3] He would speak of the Prayer Book as the Schedule to an Act of Parliament. To Harcourt the Church of England was " the Parliamentary State Church " ; to Gladstone it was " the Mystical body of Christ."[4] He was a true Whig, again, in his hatred of interference with liberty : " I am against putting people to bed who want to sit up ; I am against forbidding a man to have a glass of beer if he wants to have a glass of beer."[5] (But, afterwards, the Newcastle Programme compelled him to introduce a Local Veto Bill.) In Harcourt sometimes the Whig predominated, sometimes the Radical. In 1874 he " hoisted the Whig flag." In 1875 he was inciting Hartington to make the Liberals a Whig Party. " If the Liberal Party is to be reconstructed," he told Baron Bramwell, " it must be on a Whig platform." Labouchere described him as " the head centre of the Whigs " ; Dilke as " a Whig who talked Radicalism." On the other hand he had a clever man's contempt for " the country duffers of the party," he thought they must be got rid of so that the Liberals might " begin afresh." When his elder brother reproached him with having " no landed ideas," Harcourt retorted : " You have the land and may leave the ideas to me." Early in 1880 Chamberlain had some important conversations with him, which indicated " the enormous advance made by the Whigs in Harcourt's person."[6] And Harcourt afterwards helped to put pressure on Gladstone to admit Dilke and Chamberlain to office. " I have never concealed from myself " (said Harcourt to Chamberlain) " that a Liberal Government is impossible unless the Radicals are fully represented, and it is absurd to suppose

that we could carry anything without your assistance." In 1894 his contemptuous dislike of Rosebery, and his bitterness at not being made Prime Minister, drove him into the leadership of the Radicals in the Party, as against the Imperialists. He was the champion of all who hated "a Peer-Premier." An epitaph described him as "a masterful Radical leavened by Whig culture."[1] Lord Morley compares him to Charles James Fox; Fox's coalition with North leaves on the mind the same impression of opportunism as Harcourt's "conversion" to Home Rule, which few of his contemporaries believed to be sincere.

Granville, too, was a mixture of Whig and Radical. He spoke of himself as "a Radical who happens to like good society." Harcourt was eminently a House of Commons man, though he did not enter the House till he was more than forty. Granville began his career in the House of Commons when he came of age, but he succeeded to a peerage at thirty-one, and he led his Party in the House of Lords almost uninterruptedly for more than five and thirty years. "Nature seemed to have destined him" for this function, wrote Mr. H. W. Paul. So he became essentially a House of Lords man. "No political leader," said Lord Derby, "ever lived who was more closely and entirely identified with the assembly in which he sat." He lived to see the Liberal Party in the Lords reduced to impotence; but his biographer makes a fair claim that but for Granville's own patience and skill the break-up would have taken place much sooner than it actually did.[2] If nature destined him to lead the House of Lords, she destined him also to be Foreign Minister. Immersed in foreign affairs, it is not surprising if, like many other great Whigs, he was less interested in questions of social reform. When Mrs. Sidney Webb began a discussion on Labour problems, "Lord Granville listened with a puzzled air, utterly at sea."[3] As Foreign Minister he bore, and still bears, a reputation for weakness. The Queen, who at first had welcomed him as a relief from Palmerston but afterwards resented his opposition to the Royal Titles Bill, took this view of him: "He lamented over things, shrugged his shoulders, but is weak as water."[4] On the other hand Sir Robert Meade claimed for him that "he was the only English or indeed Continental statesman who really stood up successfully to Prince Bismarck at a time when . . . the relations between the two countries

were strained, not to say bitter, e.g. the Cameroons question. . . . He had the misfortune to be in office just during the critical period when it was Bismarck's cue to quarrel with us over the German Colonial aspirations."[1] Whether weak or strong in his diplomacy, Granville had personal courage; there was an occasion when he proved that he could make use of his fists against a burly foe. And in his younger days he had the traditional Whig taste for sport, the taste shared by Walpole and Grafton and Palmerston and Hartington; he was a fox-hunter, a good judge of horse-flesh and a member of the Jockey Club.[2] As for Granville's "conversion to Home Rule," it was ascribed not to opportunism but to devotion to his leader. "I have never," he wrote to Gladstone, "been more proud of being associated with you, or more sure of our being right, than now." And so, says his biographer, "like Peirithous in the Athenian legend, he plunged after his King into the gulf."[3]

Lord Spencer was another Whig sportsman, Master of a famous pack of fox-hounds. As a politician he could lay claim neither to Harcourt's debating power, nor Granville's *finesse*, nor Hartington's stubborn force. "He had a slow mind" (writes Lord Morley) "and was an awkward speaker; in fact he could not speak." But, *omnium consensu*, in the last half of the Nineteenth Century there lived no more high-minded chivalrous Whig—or indeed Englishman—than Spencer. It is enough to record the appreciations of three contemporaries who were well-qualified to judge:

Lord Morley: "No man of high social station or low was ever more disinterested, more unselfish, more free from the defects incident to either patrician pride or plebeian vanity. He was of too lofty a nature to have a trace of the covetousness of place that disfigured the patrician Whig caste even down to such days as these. . . . Of no leading man of that time could it be more truly said that he was the soul of honour; or that the instinct of devotion to public duty was in his inmost fibre."[4]

Lord Rendel: "Of all subjects there could be no nobler pair than Lord and Lady Spencer, and their standing with the King and Queen was probably unique. Perhaps Lord Spencer is the last of his type in our public life. Chivalry, courage, integrity, and amenity of character have been enough, with very great aristocratic connexion and station, to lift Lord Spencer to the lead of the Liberal Party

in the Lords and all but to the Premiership. . . . Yet the disappearance of the type is an irreparable loss to the country."[1]

Sir Algernon West : " Lord and Lady Spencer are really, as far as I know, the only remaining Grand Seigneur and Grande Dame, and they fill the part so well in their beautiful home and surroundings."[2]

It was not from opportunism, nor because he was devoted to Gladstone, that Spencer became a Home Ruler ; but because of his own terrible experience of Coercion during the years when as Lord Lieutenant of Ireland he risked his life daily to enforce it. And, when the decree of the Divorce Court was pronounced against Parnell, the chivalrous Spencer was the only Liberal statesman who stood out against throwing the Irish leader to the Nonconformist wolves. " He was the one man " (wrote Lord Morley) " who doubted whether we were right in putting any screw at all upon Parnell."

Hartington alone of these four eminent Whigs kept the Unionist faith. Unlike Granville and many other Whigs he never succumbed to the almost hypnotic influence of Gladstone. No one, who attentively reads their biographies, can imagine that statesmen or politicians are happy men, however much they may be sustained by hope and ambition or be refreshed by the joy of combat. Out of office they suffer the cark of disappointment and jealousy ; in office they never know a cessation from worry. Of their worries the worst arise from disagreements with their colleagues. But disagreement on policy or particular measures may be accommodated and patched up by the time-honoured British method of " splitting the difference " ; all sensible men appreciate the necessity of this, and that the process must be constantly renewed. Disagreement caused by an opposition of temperament and outlook is another matter, and this is what separated Hartington from Gladstone.

Hartington was a cautious Whig, with a respect for old Whig traditions—" almost worthy to have lived in the Eighteenth Century," said the admiring Harcourt ; Gladstone was a man of his age, hated by Whigs for dragging them after him along the paths of Reform. Hartington's diversions were racing and hunting ; Gladstone spent all his leisure in his library. Gladstone had an enormous respect for clergymen, however humble

their rank in the Church, and enlisted them—High and Low—to fight in his Atrocities Campaign; Hartington refused to address an Atrocity meeting because it was likely to be attended by "innumerable parsons . . . the number of the latter on the list is quite enough for me." This plain man no doubt admired Gladstone's genius, but not his subtlety. "I never can understand Mr. Gladstone in conversation, but I thought him unusually unintelligible yesterday." (August 7th, 1885.)[1] "I have offered to go and see him; but am in hopes that he won't accept this offer, as I can never get on with him in conversation." (September 10th, 1885.)[2] "It is useless to expect him to be intelligible." (January 2nd, 1886.)[3] Hartington himself was always intelligible. Like the Duke of Wellington he came straight to the point. When the Cabinet had decided to drop an Education Bill of which Sir John Gorst, who was keenly interested in education, had charge, Hartington broke the news with characteristic bluntness. "I say, Gorst, that d—d Bill of yours is dead." Hartington was a forthright, downright man, such as Englishmen respect. Was he something more? "Sensible, dullish, gentlemanlike," said Disraeli. "All good sense, and no earnest nonsense," said Lowe. What of his ability?

Wilfrid Blunt reports a certain "Lady C." as having said of him that he was "a thoroughly good fellow, but quite without intellect, who would have done nothing in politics had it not been for the Duchess, who had insisted on it both before their marriage and afterwards."[4] Blunt comments, "she does Hartington injustice." A man's wife can keep him to politics; she cannot supply him with the qualities that give him a great political reputation. It was universally agreed that from 1874, when Gladstone deserted his Party, till 1880, when he returned to power, Hartington successfully played a very difficult part and led his Party with ability. In the next Parliament he gained still more credit. Gladstone's own son considered that after Gladstone himself and Bright and Parnell, "Hartington stands out as the most powerful personality in the history of this Parliament."[5] Sir Henry Lucy wrote that one of the features of the 1880 Session was the success of Lord Hartington—there were "no near limits to his ultimate improvement."[6] And this success was won in spite of what Radical Members must have regarded as drawbacks:

"Lord Hartington represents property in the House of Commons in a sense and to an extent which no other Member—not even the Duke of Argyll—does." His political friends were not his social friends. "Thus he leads a dual life, which adds largely to the complexity of the situation."[1] Lucy, in the character of Mr. Punch's observant "Toby M.P.," remarks:

"The best man for the Parnellites is Lord Hartington, and the worst Mr. Gladstone. He never goes out of his way to aggravate them, though, on occasions, he sends out straight from the shoulder a left-hander which temporarily staggers impudent vulgarity. What they cannot understand is his Lordship's simple and unaffected attitude of absolute indifference."[2]

But, besides phlegm and *insouciance*, he had force. J. E. C. Bodley gives to Hartington the credit of postponing Home Rule for thirty years in 1885, and "smashing Chamberlain and Protection" in 1903.[3] Then, besides being possessed of force and a character of sound and solid sense that deeply impressed his fellow-countrymen, he became a trained and skilful Parliamentarian. Of this he gave proof when he took charge of George Wyndham's Irish Land Bill in the House of Lords. "He seized all the points of the Bill at once," said Wyndham. "Only three or four times, did he have to leave his seat to put a question either to myself or to one of my secretaries."

After Hartington had taken his stand for Unionism, he naturally became more obnoxious to Gladstonian Radicals. The Radicals had always suspected him. "He is constitutionally contemptuous of, and unsympathetic with, the democratic sentiment of the times"—this was Chamberlain's complaint.[4] His "dual life" was also in Dilke's mind, when he entered in his Diary that Hartington's prejudices "were those, not of stupidity, but of ignorance; with his stables and his wealth it was useless to expect him to do serious work." A writer in *The Westminster Review* gave expression to this view of Hartington's aristocratic limitations:

"The History of the family of the Cavendishes is not great in our national life; they have always had a peculiar affinity to the Church, to the land, and to great mansions. A family that owns 193,322 acres in 14 counties, and has the patronage of 42 livings and seven manorial seats, and is the

chief landlord of two great towns, can hardly be expected to take much interest in the people. . . . He is, in fact, a great Trades-Union leader of the landlords."[1]

Radicals were apt to assume that, in the case of Whigs, great wealth and great landed estates were incompatible with "an interest in the people." Gladstone's friend, Lord Rendel, summed up Hartington's character without any such prejudice :

"He had no refinements, no distinction, little literary or artistic culture. He had sporting instincts. But he was, above all, virile. His common sense was prodigious. He could not refine. He looked everything straight in the face. But the Duke of Devonshire, at the lowest estimate, upheld the influence and standard of his class. He had everything that life can give, and had nothing to seek or gain over and above an honourable administration of his fortune. Yet he gave to the country, not only an experience in public affairs which the country's favour rendered remarkable, but a life of steady and public-spirited industry, allied to abilities of a very manly and typical English character."[2]

But, discussing Hartington with Gladstone, Rendel added a rider : "Lord Hartington, with all his virility, had no chivalry." Gladstone "did not dissent." Probably both bore Hartington an undying political grudge, because he declined to support Gladstone's Home Rule policy. Granville, "never more proud of being associated with you than now," like Peirithous plunged after his King into the gulf. But Hartington was never proud of his association with Gladstone. Yet, when Gladstone left his post, he had filled it, and willingly given it back to Gladstone when it suited Gladstone to return : in this there was no lack of chivalry.[3]

To break with old political friends and associates is a severe trial for a politician, but Hartington must have felt it a consolation to be freed from a Party of which the democratic element was growing stronger and stronger. In 1872 Disraeli told Matthew Arnold that "the Liberals had never yet been able to get on without a Whig for their leader."[4] He meant that Gladstone was not the man to lead them ; but Gladstone had then been in office as Prime Minister for four years, and for twenty-two more—except for his years of retirement—was to be the leader of the

Liberal Party. The position of the aristocratic Whig became with each session more difficult. The *rôle* of moderator which he arrogated to himself only infuriated the Radical, who found the great Whig noble ever " waiting round the corner " to control movements which had become too powerful to be suppressed, and which the Whig had done " all in his power to prevent and discourage." Bradlaugh had made the abolition of the Whig Party a " plank " in his platform. His colleague at Northampton, Labouchere, in his letters to Chamberlain and his speeches, was continually inveighing against the Whigs. " They do not act openly ; they conspire secretly." With their back-stairs influence " they were more dangerous than the Tories." " The real enemies of the Radicals are the Whigs, they are essentially your enemies. It is a mistake to undervalue them. They have always managed to jockey the Radicals. They hang together : They have, through Grosvenor, the machine : they dominate in Clubs and in the formation of Cabinets. . . . Nothing would give them greater pleasure than to betray you with a kiss, for you are their permanent bogey." And Chamberlain, though from 1886 onwards he was allied with great Unionist Whigs in opposing Home Rule, found himself once more opposed by them in his Tariff Reform campaign. In his last public speech (July 9th, 1906) he remarked that he still found himself in conflict with representatives of the old Whig Party.

The Tories nourished against the Whigs a more ancient and ancestral hate, which went back to the days of Cavalier and Roundhead. Johnson, enumerating the causes of quarrels between country neighbours in the Eighteenth Century, observed that " the heartburnings of the Civil War are not yet extinguished."[1] If in the Nineteenth Century these heart-burnings had grown less intense, the flames of hate were renewed by Reform, and old enemies fought each other again.[2] Even the polite Balfour (in his *Chapters of Autobiography*) could write of " the lukewarm and slippery Whig." Lord Randolph Churchill allowed himself " a larger tether." Whigs excited him to a fury of abuse. " Any political victory in which Whigs bear a part must be to the last degree unwholesome and scrofulous."[3] This is fairly strong ; but his classic effort of anti-Whig rhetoric was inspired by Hartington's Redistribution proposals in 1884 :[4]

" I can see the viscous, slimy trail of that political reptile which calls itself the Whig Party gleaming and glistening on every line of it. I can see that most malignant monster endeavouring, as it did in 1832, to coil itself around the constituencies of England and to suppress the free action and to smother the natural voice of the English people."

Mr. Pott of the *Eatanswill Gazette* could not have surpassed this.

" Poor old Whig Party ! " was Lord Rosebery's comment on this outburst. " Already moribund, if not dead ; never, at its best or worst, malignant or monstrous, though no doubt a little hungry, a little selfish, a little narrow. It might possibly have been compared by a flatterer to a slow-worm ; but an analogy to a crushing, insidious, over-powering serpent was beyond the bounds of a jest."[1] The Party was indeed moribund and soon to depart this life ; so, as to its failings, here need only be written *De Mortius*. The first Whigs were great patriots, and we owe them our liberties ; if their successors became selfish and narrow, that may partly account for the Party's decay. A stronger reason was the democratic movement, the extension of the Franchise which Whigs themselves did so much to bring about. In the Eighteenth Century the Parties were simply Whig and Tory. In the Nineteenth, when the names had been changed to Liberal and Conservative, the Whigs at first were the dominant part of the Liberal Party and engrossed the " direction." Gradually they became less powerful, but still the Prime Minister was a Whig and nearly all the Cabinet Ministers. With a non-Whig Prime Minister they lost a little more of their vantage, but remained united, a wing of the Party the strength of which was variously estimated. They still collogued at Brooks's and at each other's houses, exercising a " back-stairs " influence out of proportion to their numbers. Then, as the Home Rule controversy began, their last two Dukes left them ; the days when Whigs, acting together as Whigs, had to be reckoned with, were at an end ; on the Liberal side they no longer formed even a group.

Individual Whigs retained their Whig dispositions. In 1886 Lord Lansdowne would not accept office from the Unionists " nor did he like the idea of sitting among the Conservative peers, so strong was still the old Whig family

feeling."[1] And the "Whig mentality" of that time is well described in the *Life* of Lord Salisbury:

"To keep their group a separate entity; to leave a door still open for eventual reconciliation with the main body, from which it had been severed; above all, to preserve their right to the sacred name of Liberal, with all the emotions and traditions which it embodied, was still a dominant anxiety among the Whig leaders."[2] Some moderate Liberals have styled themselves Whigs. Lord Morley described himself as "a cautious Whig by temperament, a Liberal by education and training, and a Radical by observation and experience."[3] Sir Alfred Pease, in his *Elections and Recollections*, calls himself a Whig. Mr. Hamilton Fyfe writes of Asquith: "His Radicalism was sloughed off as soon as he took office. He stood revealed as a Whig, he was all for caution and moderation."[4] But Whig is not a synonym for moderate Liberal; one might almost as well make it one for moderate Socialist. The real Whig was *born* a Whig. That is not to say that he must be himself a Cavendish or a Russell or a Fitz Maurice or a Gower; but he was a follower of a Party of which these families were the hereditary leaders, he accepted the system of the "Cousinhood," or (as it was more irreverently called) the "Great-grandmotherhood." A Whig might, or might not be a Social Reformer; what he must be was a Whig, that is to say one who would act with other Whigs.

The Whigs were killed by Gladstone's Irish policy. Home Rule was the mortal stroke, but previous severe wounds were Irish Disestablishment which antagonized the Protestantism of Whigs, and Irish Land Acts which outraged their ideas of property. With their disappearance the line that divided the Parties became much more horizontal—the Party of the Classes above the line, the Party of the Masses below it. This was a division much to be deplored. The Whigs represented wealth, rank, intellect, moderation, political balance and experience; for this reason their disappearance from the Liberal Party was a serious misfortune to the country.

NOTES TO
THE END OF THE WHIGS

Page 181.
[1] See *The Transition from Aristocracy*, p. 147.
[2] The Marquis of Westminster, head of the Grosvenor family, was created a Duke in 1874. The Marquis of Stafford, head of the Leveson-Gowers, was created Duke of Sutherland in 1833.
[3] Rosebery's *Life*, Vol. I, p. 32.
[4] *Ib.*, Vol. II, p. 479.

Page 182.
[1] *Anthony Trollope* (Hugh Walpole), p. 111.
[2] When in 1868 he went to Osborne to be presented, he won the Queen's heart by talking of children. (See *The Transition from Aristocracy*, p. 153).

Page 183.
[1] *Life of Gladstone*, Vol. III, p. 293.
[2] Disraeli to Montagu Corry, February 16th, 1872. (*Life*, Vol. V, p. 181).

Page 184.
[1] *Life of Lord Granville*, Vol. II, p. 167.
[2] *Life* of Disraeli, Vol. VI, p. 137.
[3] *Ib.*, p. 399.
[4] Dilke's *Life*, Vol. I, p. 294.
[5] *Life of Lord Granville*, Vol. II, p. 193.
[6] *After Thirty Years*, p. 195.
[7] *Ib.*, p. 178.
[8] Morley's *Life of Gladstone*, Vol. II, p. 629.
[9] *Diaries and Letters*, p. 196.
[10] *Life of the Eighth Duke of Devonshire*, Vol. I, p. 280.

Page 185.
[1] *After Thirty Years*, p. 178.
[2] *Life*, Vol. VI, p. 593 (October 28th, 1880).
[3] Dilke's *Life*, Vol. I, p. 344.
[4] *A Diary of Two Parliaments, the Great Parliament*, 1880-5, p. 175.
[5] *My Apprenticeship* (Beatrice Webb), p. 304.
[6] *Life*, Vol. III, p. 69.

Page 186.
[1] *Elections and Recollections* (Sir Alfred Pease), p. 251.
[2] *A Diary of Two Parliaments*, p. 251.
[3] *Ib.*, p. 176.
[4] *The Personal Papers of Lord Rendel*, p. 225. Miss Mary Gladstone did admire Mr. G. W. E. Russell's wonderful memory, of which he gave proof by repeating pages of Farrar by heart! This Whig remained faithful to Gladstone on Home Rule.
[5] *Life*, Vol. I, p. 293.

Page 187.
[1] Dilke's *Life*, Vol. II, p. 3.
[2] Labouchere's *Life*, p. 225.
[3] *Ib.*, p. 287.
[4] *Ib.*, p. 244.

Page 188.
[1] *Letters of Queen Victoria* (1891-1895), p. 172 (October 28th, 1892).
[2] *The Personal Papers of Lord Rendel*, p. 90.
[3] *Life of the Duke of Devonshire*, Vol. II, p. 129.
[4] *Elections and Recollections* (Sir Alfred Pease), p. 221.

Page 189.
[1] *Letters of Queen Victoria* (1879-1885), p. 246.
[2] Whyte's *Life of W. T. Stead*, Vol. II, p. 31.
[3] Lord Morley's *Recollections*, Vol. II, p. 96.
[4] Harcourt's *Life* (A. G. Gardiner), Vol. I, p. 273.
[5] See *The Transition from Aristocracy*, p. 162.
[6] Lord Morley's *Recollections*, Vol. I, p. 165.

Page 190.
[1] Sir Henry Lucy (" Toby M.P.") in *Punch*, October 12th, 1904.
[2] Granville's *Life*, Vol. II, p. 503.
[3] *My Apprenticeship* (Beatrice Webb), p. 395. She complained also of John Morley : " he does not know even the A.B.C. of Labour problems. Oh ! ye politicians ! " (*Ib.*, p. 306).
[4] *Letters of Queen Victoria* (1879-1885), p. 219.

Page 191.
[1] Granville's *Life*, Vol. II, pp. 500-1.
[2] *Ib.*, p. 120.
[3] *Ib.*, p. 489.
[4] *Recollections*, Vol. I, pp. 220-1.

Page 192.
[1] *The Personal Papers of Lord Rendel*, pp. 161-2.
[2] Sir Algernon West's *Private Diaries*, p. 343.

Page 193.
[1] *Life of Granville*, Vol. II, p. 461.
[2] *Life of Granville*, Vol. II, p. 463.
[3] *Ib.*, p. 478.
[4] *My Diaries* (Wilfrid Blunt), Vol. II, p. 196.
[5] *After Thirty Years* (Viscount Gladstone), p. 173.
[6] *A Diary of Two Parliaments, the Great Parliament*, 1880-5, p. 102.

Page 194.
[1] *Ib.*, p. 111.
[2] *Punch*, September 10th, 1881. Hartington was amused by Tim Healey's likening him to " a pike at the bottom of a pool."
[3] *Memoir of J. E. C. Bodley* (Shane Leslie), p. 370.
[4] Dilke's *Life*, Vol. II, p. 137.

Page 195.
[1] *Ib.*, Vol. I, p. 347 (November 23rd, 1880).
[2] *Lord Hartington* (*The Westminster Review*, 1887, Vol. CXXVIII, p. 932).
[3] *The Personal Papers of Lord Rendel*, p. 36.
[4] Matthew Arnold's *Letters*, Vol. II, p. 77.

Page 196.
[1] *Rambler*, No. 46.
[2] Whig hate of Tory was equally strong. (See *The Transition from Aristocracy*, p. 146).
[3] *Elijah's Mantle* (*The Fortnightly Review*, August, 1883).
[4] They were really Dilke's proposals, which were prematurely disclosed and soon withdrawn. (Lord Randolph Churchill's *Speeches*, Vol. I, p. 195).

Page 197.
[1] *Miscellanies*, Vol. I, p. 323.

Page 198.
[1] *Life of the Eighth Duke of Devonshire*, Vol. II, p. 183.
[2] *Life of Lord Salisbury*, Vol. III, p. 299.
[3] Our present King told Lord Morley in 1912 that he regarded him as the only representative of the old Whigs left in the Cabinet. (Sir Almeric FitzRoy's *Memoirs*, Vol. II, p. 494).
[4] *The British Liberal Party*, p. 134.

TORY DEMOCRACY AND IMPERIALISM

IMPERIUM ET LIBERTAS

Lord Morley puzzled by Tory majorities—Disraeli and Social Reform—Measures of 1875 and 1876—Disraeli and Aristocracy—Disraeli no democrat—Alexander Macdonald and Gladstone praise Tory legislation—Northcote—Churchill preaches Tory Democracy—Gorst on Tory Democracy—Churchill attacks Gladstone—Ridiculed by *Punch*—The Primrose League—Churchill's popularity—His Dartford Programme—Salisbury and Balfour and Tory Democracy—Salisbury and "The Classes"—Churchill's resignation and eclipse—Chamberlain a Liberal-Unionist Social Reformer—Churchill reconciled Democracy and Toryism.

Democracy not averse to Imperialism—Imperialism a novelty—Colonies formerly considered burdensome—Disraeli's Imperialism—The Suez Canal—The Queen becomes Empress—National humiliations during Gladstone's second Ministry—Egypt—Gordon—Majuba—A recovery—Tel-el-Kebir—Omdurman—The Boer War—Mr. Kipling—The British soldier—Liberals divided on Imperialism—Gladstone, Harcourt, Campbell-Bannerman, Morley anti-Imperialist—Chamberlain, Dilke, Haldane, Stead Imperialist—Churchill anti-Imperialist—Wilfrid Blunt—Prussianism of Professor Cramb—Small wars—Good and bad Imperialism—Chamberlain and Imperial Federation—He advocates Food Taxes—Labour anti-Imperialist—Democracy rejects Tariff Reform.

AT the Corn Exchange, Edinburgh, on October 8th, 1884, Gladstone reminded his hearers that since the Reform Act of 1832 there had been twelve Parliaments (in all of which he had sat), and that in ten of them the Liberals had had a majority. Of the remaining two, one, though Conservative, had ended by turning out Sir Robert Peel's Conservative Government; as to the twelfth, Lord Beaconsfield owed his majority to the disorganization of the Liberal Party in 1874. And so, he argued, "we will say for forty-five years out of fifty, practically, the nation has manifested its Liberal tendencies by the election of Liberal Parliaments, and once only has chanced to elect a thoroughly Tory Parliament." The obvious deduction was that the nation was a Liberal nation.

Upon this Lord Morley observes: "In time a curious thing, not yet adequately explained, fell out, for the extension of the Franchise in 1867 and now in 1884 resulted in a reversal of the apparent law of things that had ruled our

political Parties through the epoch that Mr. Gladstone has just sketched. The five Parliaments since 1884 have not followed the line of the ten Parliaments preceding, notwithstanding the enlargement of direct popular power."[1]

Two extensions of the Franchise, and yet the second to be followed by nearly twenty years of Tory or Unionist rule! The statesman-philosopher was frankly puzzled by this extraordinary aberration of our British Democracy. For what had Democracy to do with Toryism? It was all very odd. The voters must surely have been suffering, throughout these twenty years, from some mysterious and mischievous delusion.

The Tory might have replied to Morley, as Job replied to his comforters: "No doubt but ye are the people, and wisdom shall die with you. But I have understanding as well as you; I am not inferior to you." Disraeli, who had understanding, perceived that his victory of 1874 proved what he had always maintained, that Toryism was to be found in every *stratum* of the Electorate. Disraeli himself may have been affected by the glamour of Aristocracy, but his ideal for his Party was that it should represent every element of the nation. Toryism was not to depend for its policy upon "hereditary coteries of exclusive nobles."

Tories, who had "understanding"—and they were always numerous—were no enemies of Progress or Social Reform. No one was more conscious than Disraeli of the Social Problem, of the sad divisions between "the two Nations," of the contrast between the luxury of the rich and the privations of the poor. In the 'Forties, with Lord John Manners and Smythe and Baillie Cochrane, he had preached the necessity of regenerating England, of making her a "Merrie England" with her happiness restored under a revived and benevolent despotism. This was a fantastic dream, though the dreamers were men of noble aspirations. Half of England was engaged in manufactures; feudalism could not be fitted on to Manchester or Burslem or Macclesfield or Birmingham.

The three first Ministries in which Disraeli held office, 1852, 1858, and 1866, were short-lived; nevertheless, in 1867, the year of his Reform Bill, the Factory Acts were extended, provision was made for the sick and insane poor of London, and a Trades Union Commission was appointed. In 1867 Disraeli's Party was in a minority of 70. In 1874

he was Minister with a powerful majority ; this was largely due to his having reconstructed his Party organization on the model of democratic Lancashire. In 1875 and onwards this Tory Ministry passed Bills that were concerned with Artisan's Dwellings, the Law of Master and servant, the Law of Conspiracy, Friendly Societies, Merchant Shipping and Public Health. Some of these were carried in the teeth of a stubborn Radical opposition.[1] Disraeli writes to the Queen (July 17th, 1875) : " Mr. Secretary Cross will attend your Majesty to-day. He has done well : a most valuable Minister ; laborious and acute ; straightforward and truthful. He has carried his ' Labour Laws ' triumphantly ; they will greatly content the mass of the people ; and reduce the material for social agitation." He goes on to add : " Sir George Elliott, the greatest employer of labour in your Majesty's dominions, assured Mr. Disraeli yesterday that a very great and beneficial change has come over the feelings of the working-classes ; perceiving as they do, that the object of all the measures of the present Ministry is really to elevate their condition and mitigate their lot."[2] Disraeli was very much in earnest about Social Reform ; he wanted to improve the lot of the working classes, and he wanted the working classes to trust his Government. It was of this reforming policy that Dilke was thinking when he said that Gathorne Hardy would never lead the Conservative Party " because he is not a Liberal." Besides the measures of 1875 already recorded, in that year the Government passed a Housing Act, a Savings Bank Act and an Agricultural Holdings Act. In 1874 the 10 hours day for women and children was reduced to 56 hours a week. In 1876 there were Acts to prevent River Pollution and further Enclosures. In 1879 Alexander Macdonald, one of the first Labour Members of Parliament, stated that " the Conservative Party has done more for the working classes in five years than the Liberals have in fifty."[3] Gladstone, it is true, in his sixth Midlothian speech (Ratho, March 18th, 1880) declared that " we think that the last six years have been singularly inefficient in the work of domestic legislation." But his son, Viscount Gladstone, expresses an exactly opposite opinion : " Six years of Conservative rule had added to the Statute Book measures concerning Friendly Societies, Public Health, Prisons, Factories, Trade Unions, which were sound and valuable."[4]

Disraeli said of himself that he was " in favour of popular privileges, but opposed to democratic rights." His sympathies with the people were strong, but they were to some extent counterbalanced by his feeling for Aristocracy. " The external pomps and trappings of life " (writes Lord Bryce), " titles, stately houses and far-spreading parks, all those gauds and vanities with which sumptuous wealth surrounds itself, had throughout his life a singular fascination for him. He liked to mock at them in his moods, but they fascinated him none the less."[1] His biographer remarks on the aristocratic character of his Government in 1874. In the Cabinet and outside it were Stanleys, Hamiltons, Lennoxes, Herberts, Cecils, Mannerses, Lowthers, Bentincks, Bourkes ; Household appointments were given to Exeter, Somerset, Bradford and Beauchamp.[2] " The runaway nobility rushed into the fold and secured the lion's share of the spoils. The men by whom the victory had been engineered were forgotten."[3] So writes the son of that principal engineer of the victory. Disraeli was quite brave enough to stand up to his grandees. " Talk not to me of Dukes ! Dukes can be made ! "[4] " The insolence of the Duke of —— surpasses belief. I will, some day, greatly chastise him."[5] But the Dukes remained powerful in the Party. Near the end of his life he granted an interview to Hyndman the Socialist, who wanted " comfort " for the poor. " What do you mean by comfort, eh ? " asked Disraeli. " Plenty to eat," replied Hyndman, " enough to drink, good clothes, pleasant homes, a thorough education, and sufficient leisure for all." Disraeli replied that these things could not be got from the Conservative Party— " you will find yourself beset by a phalanx of great families, men and especially women, who will put you to rout every time."[6]

Thus many influential Conservatives, not all, were Social Reformers during Disraeli's Administration. His biographer, after cataloguing the useful Acts he had passed, claims that this was " Tory Democracy in action ; "[7] but Disraeli was not a democrat. In 1880 the Party machinery had degenerated. " Election affairs and organization " (wrote Lord Randolph Churchill) " went to the dogs." The Conservatives sustained a heavy reverse ; in the following year they lost their leader, the man of genius and ideas.

The diminished band of Conservatives were of two camps. Progressives—men like Ritchie, the urban Conservative, who was destined to make his mark, and the others who (wrote the Editor of Churchill's Speeches) " cling firmly, and even affectionately, to a secret fear and distrust of the people, while avowing sympathies of an opposite kind on public occasions."[1] For the County Members Democracy was not yet a practical problem ; as yet the agricultural labourer had no vote, though it was fairly certain that he would soon get it.

On Lord Beaconsfield's death Lord Salisbury was elected to succeed him as leader of the Party in the Lords. Sir Stafford Northcote was leader in the Commons. " A man of well-meaning and temperate, though meagre, quality " (writes one critic), " made up of small doses of virtues and capacities, well-fitted to be a country gentleman, but of too thin stuff and too narrow calibre to be either a very good or very bad statesman."[2] The observant Sir Henry Lucy remarks (June 26th, 1880) : " No one who has watched Sir Stafford Northcote in the House of Commons, whether as leader of the Conservatives in office, or as their titular chief in days of adversity, can doubt that his natural sympathies are with the Liberals."[3] His biographer, Andrew Lang, writes : " In a country ' tired of Squires ' he gave one an example of what a Squire might be. . . . The age for which he was fitted ended ere he died."[4] From these different estimates it may be gathered that Northcote, now over sixty years old, was an old-fashioned Tory of not over-vigorous character, moderate in his Toryism and entertaining an exaggerated respect for Gladstone whose private secretary he had been forty years previously. He had country tastes, and one thing at least in common with Churchill, who was to worry him so sorely—both had been Masters of Harriers.[5] None of the other Conservative leaders in either House (except Salisbury) was of first-rate political capacity ; none was confident of the future. In the constituencies the Party was depressed, and ready to welcome a new leader of enterprise and vision.

Here was Churchill's chance. For he had vision ; he saw that the only hope for Conservatism was to make a wider, bolder appeal ; Conservatism must be really democratic. So he preached Tory Democracy. But what was Tory Democracy ? Democracy is simple enough—

"a Government in which the governing body is a comparatively large fraction of the entire Nation." How is this definition of Democracy affected by the prefix "Tory"? Plenty of people said that Tory Democracy was a contradiction in terms, or an imposture. According to Thomas Burt, an early Labour M.P., "a Conservative working-man is either a fool or a flunkey." Lady Gwendolen Cecil maintains that Tory Democracy was "never precisely defined. . . . With the majority of its supporters the inspiring motive was tactical rather than political." "Restlessly disappointed workers, whose coveting of the catchwords which had served their opponents so victoriously as war-cries expressed itself in clamant aspirations after a 'democratic Programme.'"[1] Thus Hatfield still echoes opinions that must often have been forcibly expressed fifty years ago by Lord Salisbury, in the days when Churchill was a thorn in his flesh. But there is ground for this criticism: Churchill himself proclaimed that victory was the thing to aim at. "Discriminations between wholesome and unwholesome victories are idle and unpractical. Obtain the victory, know how to follow it up, leave the wholesomeness or unwholesomeness to critics."[2] His own definition was not very illuminating: "What is Tory Democracy? Tory Democracy is a Democracy which supports the Tory Party . . . because it has been taught by experience and by knowledge to believe in the excellence and the soundness of true Tory principles."[3] But if we read *Elijah's Mantle* we shall find that Tory Democracy also includes Wash-houses, Dwellings of the Poor, Open Spaces, Temperance Legislation, People's Parks and Public Libraries—Chamberlain's policy, in fact, of "high rates and a healthy city." The Programme had a decidedly urban flavour, for the Tory Party was no longer to be identified "with that small and narrow class which is connected with the ownership of land."[4]

Sir John Gorst defined the principle of Tory Democracy, as clearly as it may be defined, in *The Times* (February 6th, 1907).[5] "The principle of Tory Democracy is that all Government exists solely for the good of the governed, that Church and King, Lords and Commons, and all other public institutions are to be maintained so far, and so far only, as they promote the happiness and welfare of the common people, that all who are entrusted with any public functions

are trustees, not for their own class, but for the nation at large, and that the mass of the people may be trusted so to use electoral power, which should be freely conceded to them, as to support those who are promoting their interests. It is democratic, because the welfare of the people is its supreme need ; it is Tory, because the institutions of the country are the means by which the end is to be attained." Tory Democracy was to promote the welfare of the people *by means of the institutions of the Country.* Democracy was to combine with three institutions not usually associated with Democracy—the Throne, the Church and the House of Lords. It was very natural that Lord Rosebery should sneer at it as " the wolf of Radicalism in the sheep-skin of Toryism " ; for Chamberlain to say that Churchill had " borrowed from the cast-off policy of all the extreme men of all the different sections," taking his Socialism from Burns and Hyndman and his Metropilitan Reform from Professor Stuart, and so forth. One can understand their being wroth against a Tory who dared steal some of their Radical thunder. But, after all, there *was* a difference between Churchill's Radicalism and Chamberlain's. Churchill was for maintaining the Church and the House of Lords ; and, unlike some of Chamberlain's left-wing friends, he was for preserving the Throne. " Trust the people " was Churchill's watchword. It was his achievement to prove that among the new urban voters in the great manufacturing cities there was a strong Conservative feeling, a sensitiveness about the national honour, and a desire for Great Britain's prestige in the world. He knew that it was too late to stay the stream of Democracy, but he succeeded in deflecting much of it into Conservative channels. It must also be admitted that he introduced into Conservatism elements of Socialism, which continued to affect it, and are still a cause of division.

His bold method was to single out the enemy's champion —to strike hard at Gladstone ; but he was no respecter of persons, whether they were his political foes or political friends. Gladstone, himself a demagogue, condemned Tory Democracy as demagogism, " only a demagogism applied in the worst way." Gladstone was quite as capable as Churchill of appealing to popular prejudices, but he generally contrived that his appeal should appear to be directed to the people's noblest instincts. The ideal leader

of Churchill's *Elijah's Mantle* was one "who fears not to meet, and who knows how to sway, immense masses of the working-classes." Sir Harold Gorst says that their imagination was captivated by "his audacity and the unguarded fashion in which he spoke out his ideas just as they occurred to him, regardless of the consequences."[1] He was herein so successful that Rendel, the Liberal, called him "the idol of the urban swaggerers and rowdy adventurers of all categories."[2]

His aggressiveness made him enemies, and his flamboyant methods excited ridicule. *Punch's* Parliamentary Reporter, "Toby M.P.," addresses him (January 15th, 1881): "Men who kick over the traces are common enough on the other side of the House. The new delight you have given us is the spectacle of an undisciplined Tory, who will not march at the word of command, and who snaps his fingers at his Captain. . . . You won't last long, Randolph. You are rather funny than witty—more impudent than important." Then "Toby" ventures on an unfortunate prophecy: "When your side comes back to power, you will probably be gagged with an Under-Secretaryship, "and will become even as those roystering spirits of an earlier age—Cavendish Bentinck and James Lowther." Soon he appears (January 22nd, 1881) in one of Tenniel's cartoons, "The Giants and the Pigmy"; Gladstone and Hartington are the Giants, Churchill the Pigmy offers them his puny aid in coercing the Irish. There was a temporary split in his Fourth Party and *Punch* lampoons him (March 5th 1881):

"Lord Woodcock *had* a Party,—
Where is that Party now?
Where is the hyacinthine crop
That decked young Dizzy's brow?"

or again (September 10th, 1881):

"There is a Midge at Westminster,
A gnatty little thing,
It bites all night,
This mighty Mite,
But no one feels it sting."

Churchill probably welcomed these advertisements of himself. He established the Primrose League with its quaint hierarchy of Knights and Dames. A "silly sentimental

title," said Chamberlain. The Primrose League enrolled men and women of all ranks by the hundred thousand ; at first it was laughed at, but it is still in every part of England an active political organization. " I will back the Primrose League against the Caucus," boasted Churchill.[1] When Gladstone died, an attempt was made to commemorate him by the founding of a Gladstone League, but the Gladstone League was an utter failure. Churchill soon became by far the most popular platform speaker of his Party. At Manchester, on December 1st, 1881, 12,000 persons assembled to hear him. In August 1884 he is said to have addressed 100,000 Tories in that town ; at Leeds 10,000, at Carlisle 4000. His Dartford speech in October 1886 was heard by 20,000 Tories. Even after his fall from power his popularity in the country suffered no diminution. In Yorkshire and Lancashire, in 1887, " he was greeted everywhere by immense crowds. The largest halls were much too small. . . . At Nottingham, long before his arrival, the streets were thronged ; and all the way from the Station to the Albert Hall he passed through continuous lines of cheering people."[2] We are reminded of Gladstone's Midlothian progresses.

Churchill was a great political genius, and the result of his energy and inspiration was evident in the General Election of 1885. The rural labourers, it is true, voted Liberal in gratitude to the Party who had given them the vote ; but the Borough returns were a complete surprise and disappointment to the Liberals. He was now the most powerful Conservative statesman ; his colleagues looked to him as " an oracle whose pronouncements it would be perilous to disregard."[3] Dislike of Home Rule was mainly responsible for the Unionist victory of 1886, but Churchill's vigorous—almost violent—championship of the Union was a chief contributory cause. Churchill then became leader of the House of Commons and Chancellor of the Exchequer ; he was only 37. " All over the Continent he was already regarded as the future master of English politics."[4] Moreover the Queen had praised his " skill and judgment " as leader of the House of Commons.

The Programme put forward in his Dartford speech (October 2nd, 1886) was his democratic challenge to the Liberals—and to the old Tories. The measures he advocated, or promised, included a Reform of House of

Commons procedure, an Allotments Bill (with praise of the work performed by Chamberlain and Jesse Collings), an alteration in Tithe Law, a Railway Rates Bill, a Land Transfer Bill, a Local Government Bill; he also deeply pledged himself to public economy. "All these legislative projects," writes Mr. Winston Churchill, "had received the consent of the Cabinet."[1] But "the Carlton Club was reported to be vexed and sulky."[2] For this Churchill cared little, for he knew he had behind him the new democratic Conservatism which he himself had created. At the Bradford Conference on October 26th he claimed that his Dartford speech was no more than a repetition of Lord Salisbury's Newport speech of November 1885. At this Conference he was enthusiastically applauded by delegates representing a million and a half of electors.[3]

Meanwhile what was Lord Salisbury's attitude to Tory Democracy, and Mr. Balfour's? Lord Salisbury was no democrat;[4] nor was Balfour, though he recognized that Democracy had arrived. Balfour had been a member of Churchill's Fourth Party, but they had had their disagreements. They had differed on Coercion, they had differed on the Franchise. There were differences also between Balfour and Salisbury. Balfour had philosophic tastes; Salisbury was fond of scientific experiment. The uncle was a much greater Tory than the nephew. "My uncle" (said Balfour) "is a Tory, and I am a Liberal."[5] But on one matter they always felt alike and strongly—that the Party must be kept united. Salisbury, discussing Irish policy, told Hart-Dyke that "the possible from a Party point of view was quite separate from the advisable for the future of Ireland."[6] Mr. Winston Churchill writes of Balfour: "he regarded a Party split as the worst of domestic catastrophes, and responsibility for it as the unforgivable sin."[7] Hence his prolonged and thankless attempt from 1903 to 1906 to find a *via media* between Tariff Reform and Free Trade. "I never admired," said Lord Salisbury, "the political transformation scenes of 1829, 1846 and 1867,"[8] Catholic Emancipation, Free Trade, Household Franchise; for these, he considered, ought never to have been carried by Tory Prime Ministers. Peel had split his Party in 1846, and it had remained in a minority till 1874. Salisbury believed in Tory principles, and in his Party as the instrument to preserve and promote them. He con-

demned Disraeli for passing Reform in 1867, and, from his high Tory point of view, rightly. But Disraeli held essentially the same view of Party ; it was " the best guarantee for public and private honour."

Salisbury was ready to go great lengths with Churchill in his democratic legislation. He had himself gone far in the same direction in his Newport speech, as Churchill had pointed out. But, with Salisbury, Party union was the paramount consideration, and this clearly appears in a very interesting letter which he wrote (November 7th, 1886) to his impatient lieutenant, who was now complaining that his Dartford Programme was being obstructed :

" I fully see all the difficulties of our position. The Tory Party is composed of very varying elements, and there is merely trouble and vexation of spirit in trying to make them work together. I think the ' Classes and the dependents of Class ' are the strongest ingredients in our composition,[1] but we have so to conduct our legislation that we shall give some satisfaction to both Classes and Masses. This is specially difficult with the Classes—because all legislation is rather unwelcome to them, as tending to disturb a state of things with which they are satisfied. . . . But I believe that with patience, feeling our way as we go, we may get the one element to concede and the other to forbear. The opposite course is to produce drastic, symmetrical measures, hitting the ' Classes ' hard, and consequently dispensing with their support, but trusting to public meetings and the democratic forces generally to carry you through. I think such a policy will fail. I do not mean that the ' Classes ' will join issue with you on one of the measures which hits them hard, and beat you on that. That is not the way they fight. They will select some other matter on which they can appeal to prejudice, and on which they think the Masses will be indifferent ; and on that they will upset you."[2]

Reading this letter, we recollect Disraeli's warning to Hyndman, that a policy of " comforts " for the working-classes was not likely to be adopted by the Conservative Party. " You will find yourself beset by a phalanx of great families, men and specially women, who will put you to rout every time." We are also enabled to appreciate what an uphill fight was Churchill's against the old Tories ; and we note Salisbury's loyalty to that section of the Party whose

want of vision he deplored and whose idleness he condemned.[1] Twenty years before, Salisbury had recognised that "pure Squire Conservatism was played out." Lady Gwendolen Cecil writes of the views he held in 1884: "He repeatedly urged at the time, both in public and in private, his conviction that the traditional view had become obsolete, and that it was to the large centres of population that the Conservative Party must henceforth look for its main urban support."[2] And yet he would not estrange from his Party "the Classes and the dependents of Class." Whatever their shortcomings, he would not disown those friends "to whom all legislation is rather unwelcome," in order to ingratiate himself with their enemies. If Churchill disdained to compromise with his colleagues, insisted on his full Programme, relied on "public meetings and the democratic forces" to crush the old Tories, he would assuredly be following in Peel's footsteps and with the same ill consequences to Party union. And Salisbury, if he knew all, had good reason to be uneasy, for Churchill was even then making democratic promises to Chamberlain that he was ready "to leave Hartington and Salisbury in the lurch."[3] "His friendship for Chamberlain" (wrote Salisbury to Sir James Fitz James Stephen, December 30th, 1886) "made him insist that we should accept that statesman as our guide in internal politics."[4] Now it was only a year since Chamberlain's doctrine of Ransom had made all men of property tremble.

Churchill resigned because the Cabinet would not accept his Budget proposals in their entirety, and he would not abate them. His resignation was a rash and arrogant act, prompted by an over-estimation of his indispensability; it was universally condemned. Lord Rosebery considered that he was suffering from overstrained nerves. Churchill told Lady Lucy Hicks-Beach afterwards: "I should never have done it if Beach had been in London."[5] The Queen, (like his colleagues), felt relief at his disappearance: "That strange, unaccountable man, Lord Randolph Churchill, who has been a perfect thorn in the side of his colleagues since he has been in office. . . . The fact is *he* expected all to bow to him, as indeed some were inclined to do." His fall, as his son writes, was "ruin utter and irretrievable," and the remainder of his life was a tragedy of ill-health and an unfulfilled career. "And wretched and bitter it is to

see him" (writes Miss Mary Gladstone) "though he worked himself up to something of his old form."[1] And Sir Algernon West on the same day: "Randolph was nervous and physically weak, but made some good points."[2] "Terribly altered" (writes Wilfrid Blunt, May 23rd, 1894) "makes prodigious efforts to express himself clearly, but they are only too visible."[3]

On November 23rd, 1891, he writes to his wife from Mafeking: "So Arthur Balfour is really leader—and Tory Democracy, the genuine article, is at an end!"[4] But this was not so; for Chamberlain, Churchill's old friend and foe, was now exercising a powerful influence on Conservative Ministers—Chamberlain who had long shed his Republicanism, but retained his Radicalism, and was soon to superimpose on it an Imperialism which Churchill never shared. "With the extension of the Franchise" (said Chamberlain, May 28th, 1888) "and the spread of democratic ideas the old Toryism has died out." He took advantage of the new situation. Before he joined the Unionist Administration, in the years 1886-1892, he was largely responsible for Coal Mines Regulations, the Allotments Act, County Councils, Housing and Agricultural Holdings Acts, and Free Education. After 1895, when he was in office, he passed or promoted Workmen's Compensation, and the Small Houses Acquisition Act. In opposition he had strongly advocated Old Age Pensions, and this measure was prominent in the Unionist Programme of 1895; it was delayed by Committees in 1899 and 1900, and only stranded because of Chamberlain's own absorption in the Boer War.[5] It was Chamberlain who finally fastened a democratic policy on the Unionist Party; the old Tories accepted it as unwillingly from him as they had done from Churchill.

Churchill set himself to the tremendous task of enlarging the sphere of Conservatism. He saw that the country was committed to Democracy, and that his Party, upon which—as he believed—the country's welfare depended, could only survive if it organized its strength on a democratic basis and promoted democratic measures. Himself an aristocrat, he had an aristocrat's impatience with the old-fashioned Tories by whom he was criticized or obstructed. He also saw that the Landed Interest was declining, and that "the Classes and the dependents of Class" were being left in a

hopeless minority. With boldness and success he sought the votes of the manual workers of the great cities. To them he promised legislation on Social Reform and Local Government ; but at the same time he enlisted their support for the Throne and the Empire. His political career ended in utter catastrophe ; here he was his own enemy—" his faults " (wrote Lord Oxford) " were largely those of temperament ; but he was fatally lacking in the sovereign gift of judgment."[1] But in his few years of triumph he had done what he set himself to do—he had reconciled Democracy to Conservatism, and Conservatism to Democracy. The Conservative Party, now the only stable element in British politics, continues to reap the harvest that was sown by Lord Randolph Churchill.

An authoress, who attributes the Great War to national rivalries exhibited in an inordinate desire to acquire fresh territories, has written of our own politics : " Imperialism lay directly across the path of democratic progress," and " Democracy's adoption of Imperialism . . . has helped to lower the moral standards in public and in social affairs, in the sphere of art and thought."[2] There is here an assumption that Democracy is normally identified with Progress, but that our British Democracy, in the thirty years that preceded the War, was somehow lured away from the straight road of righteousness into Imperial bye-paths, to the detriment of our public and private morality and the degradation of our culture. But Democracy means no more than a form of government in which every citizen, or nearly every citizen, has a voice. There is no reason why it should be more " progressive " than Aristocracy. True it is that Imperialism may hinder democratic schemes of expenditure, for Imperialism itself is bound to be expensive ; but, if we read history, we shall not find that Democracy is any more moral than other forms of government, or any less inclined to military or colonial adventure. The Athenian Democracy is an instance to the contrary. Our business is rather to observe how, in the latter part of Queen Victoria's reign and later, the British electorate, now based on Household Suffrage, reacted to the new Imperial ideas.

As to terminology, in our case Imperialism is scarcely distinguishable from Nationalism, for our Nationals have

long been scattered over our world-wide Empire. Nor can the word Imperialism be dissociated from matters naval and military. "The very word Empire" (writes Lord Morley) "is in history and essence military; Emperor means soldier; all modern history and tradition associate Empires with war."[1] With Imperialism then Nationalism is to be joined, and (as most would agree) Patriotism. But the authoress just quoted will not have it so: "Nationalism, a very different emotion from Patriotism." She links together "Nationalism, Imperialism and Jingoism, the three evil passions closely related."[2] Jingoism has certainly always been a term of abuse, like Chauvinism, Militarism, Junkerism.

Imperialism, as preached by Chamberlain and sung by Mr. Kipling, was a sentiment unknown in early and mid-Victorian times. The old feeling that the Colonies were an encumbrance, that as they grew stronger they would naturally cut themselves adrift from the Mother-Country, died slowly. John Bright said that if Canada so separated, "I believe that it would be better for us and better for her." "If they (the Canadians) should prefer to unite themselves to the United States, I should not complain even of that." He considered that Gibraltar "was retained contrary to every law of morality and honour."[3] Bright "accepted the Indian Empire—but as a burdensome responsibility, originating in national wrong-doing, and in no sense as a subject for congratulation."[4] As to Canada, the United States had broken away from us, so why not Canada? Similarly, when the Southern States of America broke away from the North, many Englishmen thought that the North would democratically acquiesce. Lord Salisbury thought so at first, but the Civil War convinced him that "Democracy when driven to bay can struggle for the integrity of its possessions as fiercely as any continental autocrat and far more stubbornly and successfully than did the Eighteenth Century Oligarchy of England."[5] The American Civil War revealed to Europe "for the first time the fact of democratic Imperialism."

The fact is that statesmen of both parties had been inclined to regard the Colonies as burdensome.[6] In 1866 Disraeli himself spoke of colonial "deadweights." Typical of this attitude was a letter written by Granville to Russell (August 28th, 1869):

"Theoretically you assume that I wish to get rid of Canada, Australia and India. Our relations with North America are of a very delicate character. The best solution of them would probably be that in the course of time and in the most friendly spirit the Dominion should find itself strong enough to proclaim her independence."[1]

(He added that there was no present question of separation, and that India was on quite a different footing from English-speaking Colonies). But Disraeli now began to entertain, and utter, sentiments quite as Imperialist as those of Chamberlain twenty years later. On June 24th, 1872, he made a notable speech to the National Union of Conservatives at the Crystal Palace: "Self-government, when it was conceded, ought to have been conceded as part of a great policy of Imperial consolidation. It ought to have been accompanied by an Imperial Tariff. . . . It ought further to have been accompanied by the institution of some representative Council in the Metropolis which would have brought the Colonies into constant and continuous relations with the Home Government." He had himself once thought otherwise, but he now recognized that public opinion demanded the preservation of the Empire, which was thenceforth to be one of the three great objects of Toryism—the other two being the maintenance of our institutions and Social Reform: "In my judgment no Minister in this country will do his duty who neglects any opportunity of reconstructing as much as possible our Colonial Empire, and of responding to those distant sympathies which may become the source of incalculable strength and happiness to this land."[2]

So Imperialism was now to be part of the Conservative Programme, the Conservative leader believing this to be desired by Democracy. Here was a new dividing line between Liberals and Conservatives; but not a line of perfect division, for certain Liberals—as events proved—were to be found on the same side of the line as Conservatives. Disraeli the Imperialist, having come into power, bought the Suez Canal shares, and proclaimed the Queen Empress of India. Gladstone disapproved of the purchase of the shares, and so did Granville. But Hartington recognized that the purchase was popular and "was likely to turn out a most successful coup"; he advised against its being denounced in Parliament. Goschen disapproved

of the purchase *commercially*, but approved *politically*. He wrote to Granville, "you do not deal with the risk of the shares being bought by others."[1] As to the Royal Titles Bill, the Queen was as pleased at becoming an Empress as any Elector of the Reich when he was made a King; she never forgave anyone, except perhaps Rosebery, who had opposed the Bill. In Imperialism she was Disraeli's willing pupil, and he opened before her eyes dazzling prospects. "He wished to see Your Majesty the Dictatress of Europe, and it is clearer to him every day that this may be your Majesty's position."[2] The Prince of Wales shared his mother's feelings; "a strong Conservative" (wrote Dilke) "and a still stronger Jingo, really agreeing in the Queen's politics, and wanting to take everything everywhere in the world and to keep everything if possible."[3]

The idea of Imperialism made a great advance amongst all classes during Disraeli's Administration. And yet there were many, and some of these within the ranks of his supporters, who were still doubtful about the advantages of a world-wide Empire. "Are we the weaker or the stronger" (asked *The Times* in 1881), "the richer or the poorer, the happier or the reverse for our vast Colonial possessions?"[4] There were old-fashioned Conservatives who thought of the new movement as novel and not quite in accordance with old Party traditions, as something that partook too much of their leader's eccentric and flamboyant genius; but they did not dissociate themselves from it. They felt about Imperialism, as Lord Agramont in *Lothair* felt about the Early Celebration: "It is not much to my taste; a little new-fangled, I think; but I shall go, as they say it will do good." Like Gladstone, they looked on Imperialism as "an innovation." They doubted whether the Queen of England gained in dignity by being made an Empress. They felt that there was no higher position in the world than the Queen of England's. They did not realize that, whether they liked it or not, the country had entered on a path where there could be no turning back, and that by force of past events we were committed to an Imperial destiny; that, this being so, it was a true policy to make Empire popular, and to instruct Democracy as to the necessity of retaining our Colonies and developing their resources.

But, whatever might be its attitude towards Imperialism,

the country could ill endure the blows to National and Imperial prestige which it had to suffer during Gladstone's second Administration. Viscount Gladstone enumerates some of them in *Fifty Years After*—Bronkhorstspruit, Laing's Nek, Ingogo, Majuba; to which might be added the evacuation of Candahar, El Obeid and the crowning tragedy of General Gordon. Then, nearer home, there was the Kilmainham Treaty and the Phoenix Park murders, and the miserable affair of Bradlaugh and Parliamentary obstruction. As regards most of these a case might be made for Gladstone and his colleagues. Gladstone himself, in his Midlothian campaign, had denounced the annexation of the Transvaal. Lord Acton went so far as to describe the peace made after Majuba as "the noblest work of the Ministry."[1] Lord Morley sets out strong reasons for a reversal of the annexation even with Majuba unavenged,[2] but he notes "the galling argument that Government had conceded to three defeats what they had refused to ten times as many petitions, memorials, remonstrances; and we had given to men with arms in their hands what we refused to their peaceful prayers." Mr. Winston Churchill has written: "The British settlers were everywhere humiliated. The British flag was in South Africa associated only with surrender. The loyalists who had fought and risked their all in faith of British power and justice were left to shift for themselves. The attempt to make a virtue of necessity failed ignominiously."[3] Lord Cairns, in the House of Lords, expressed the national feeling, quoting the lines:

"In all the ills we ever bore
"We grieved, we sighed, we wept; we never blushed before."

In the case of Egypt Gladstone's one aim was to avoid being committed to expensive military operations. There were three possible policies—(1) "scuttle," (2) a more or less prolonged occupation and control, and (3) annexation. Gladstone would have preferred the first, but it was obviously impossible because of our interest in the Suez Canal; the third also was impossible because it would have embroiled us with France, and perhaps with other Powers. The second should have been pursued vigorously and consistently; but its militarism made it detestable to Radicals. The bombardment of Alexandria caused the resignation of John Bright. "Dizzy" (he said) "had never

done anything worse than, or so bad as, this bombardment."[1] Yet "inch by inch and hour by hour the Liberal Government was dragged deeper and deeper into the horrible perplexities of the Egyptian riddle and the Soudan tragedy."[2] When Hicks Pasha and 10,000 men were annihilated at El Obeid, Granville disclaimed responsibility for the expedition. The Government drew a distinction between their relations to Egyptian affairs and to Soudan affairs, but Granville's biographer says that "the truest criticism on their conduct had been that the Government might have carried this negative decision originally a step further, and might have prohibited the march of General Hicks into the Soudan."[3] No doubt they had hoped that the enterprise would be successful. Gordon was an agent difficult to control, and may have exceeded or misunderstood his instructions. Dilke wrote: "We were evidently dealing with a wild man under the influence of that climate of Central Africa which acts even upon the sanest men like strong drink."[4] But his death was, in Viscount Gladstone's words, "a crushing blow to the Liberals."[5] The forces sent to rescue him arrived too late. "To think that all this might have been prevented" (wrote the Queen) "and many precious lives saved by earlier action is too frightful."[6] The nation felt as the Queen felt. Gladstone incurred the wrath of the Queen and general unpopularity for his indecision and dilatoriness; but he also excited deep dissatisfaction in the Left wing of his Party on account of the military measures he had been obliged to take. "If anyone" (said Labouchere in the House of Commons, February 27th, 1885) "had then said (i.e. at the time of the Midlothian Campaign) 'you will acquire power and become the most powerful Minister England has had for many a day; you will bombard Alexandria; you will massacre Egyptians at Tel-el-Kebir and Suakim, and you will go on a sort of wild-cat expedition into the wilds of Ethiopia in order to put down a prophet'—the Right Hon. Gentleman would have replied in the words of Hazael to the King of Syria—'Is thy servant a dog that he should do this thing?'"[7]

The inconsistencies of Gladstone resulted from a policy, or want of policy, which was primarily prompted by a desire to "scuttle," but then qualified by a realization that some action was necessary, and followed by action being taken too late. All this disgusted his fellow-countrymen and

materially contributed to the Unionist victory of 1886, though that victory was won on the major issue of Home Rule. And surely a capacity to understand this national resentment might have solved Lord Morley's problem for him, providing him with a reason for the "curious thing not yet adequately explained"—the strange phenomenon that the five Parliaments elected after 1884 were on the whole far more Conservative than Liberal. Then Gladstone's Home Rule proposals seemed to Conservatives, and to great numbers of Liberals, not only to threaten the disruption of the United Kingdom, but to come as the climax of all his previous surrenders. Lord Salisbury said that he thereby "awakened the slumbering genius of Imperialism."[1] To be a Unionist implied something more than opposition to Irish Home Rule. The party of Union, said Lord Randolph Churchill, was also for "Union with our Colonies, Union with our Indian Empire." It accepted "that gigantic duty of maintaining and diffusing freedom, civilization and Christianity, which an all-wise Providence had devolved upon the English-speaking millions of mankind."[2]

Our arms began to be more successful. The bombardment of Alexandria was followed by the victory of Tel-el-Kebir. But then the Soudan was evacuated, and for many years after Gordon's death our prestige in Egypt suffered. Then, after years of quiet patient preparation, the victories of Atbara and Omdurman were won, and Kitchener marched into Khartoum. There were other small wars. "In the wide dominions of the Queen," said Chamberlain (March 31st, 1897), "the doors of the Temple of Janus are never closed."[3] "History, in fact," wrote Mr. J. A. Spender, the Liberal biographer of Campbell-Bannerman, "could show no better example of skilful and business-like Imperialism than British enterprise during the half-dozen years which ended in 1895."[4] By the Boer War we regained our ascendancy in South Africa—at a cost, it is true, of 30,000 lives and 250 millions of money. Only two London newspapers disapproved of this War—*The Star* and *The Morning Leader*. Public opinion was overwhelmingly in favour of the War. Eminent Liberals—Asquith, Haldane, Grey, Rosebery—encouraged the national effort. It has been said that Sir Robert Reid was the only "Pro-Boer" in public life who enjoyed social popularity.[5] The War also had its effect on English literature, producing "a vast

multiplication of books on the War itself, and the issue of large quantities of warlike and patriotic poetry."[1] In Queen Victoria's last two decades and in the reign of King Edward VII millions of square miles were added to the British Empire.

A poet, familiar with all the races of India and with all the idiosyncrasies of the governing race, arose to sing the triumphs and glory of Imperial Britain. To those to whom Empire meant simply an excuse for unscrupulous aggrandisement Mr. Kipling was anathema. Mr. J. M. Robertson voices this feeling : " The doctrine of Mr. Kipling's school—who may be defined as barbaric sentimentalists—is that Asia in general, and India in particular, are absolute exceptions to all the principles of European politics. The East, they say, is unprogressive, unchangeable, unimprovable. . . . The simple canon of Mr. Kipling is the feeling that any race which thwarts his own must be base."[2] Mr. Kipling exalted the mission of his fellow-countrymen. The old patriotic pride was based on the conviction that the Englishman was the finest creature in the world—worth, for instance, three Frenchmen. The gospel of Mr. Kipling went further ; he preached that the Briton was chosen by God to rule a very large portion of the world, and continually to enlarge the domain of his rule—to the great advantage of the subject races. The Briton was the vicegerent of the Almighty,

" Beneath Whose awful Hand we hold
" Dominion over palm and pine."

His duty was everywhere to keep order,

" By the peace among our Peoples let men know we serve the Lord !"

Mr. Kipling felt a lordly contempt for " the Little Englanders " :

" The poor little street-bred people, that vapour and fume and brag,
" They are lifting their heads in the stillness to yelp at the British flag."

Their disrespect for the national emblem contrasted very unfavourably with its recognition by the animal creation :

" The lean white bear hath seen it in the long long Arctic nights,
" The musk-ox knows the standard that floats the Northern Lights."

Mr. Kipling further looked to a united Empire as our sure hope and strength in a World War :

" In the day of Armageddon, at the last great fight of all,
" That our Houses stand together, and the pillars do not fall."

W. T. Stead called him " the Banjo Bard of Empire," but Stead praised *The White Man's Burden*. The *Recessional*, too, shows Mr. Kipling's spirit at its best. He knows well wherein lies the true strength of an Empire :

" Dis te minorem quod geris imperas."

He does not forget what a conquering race is apt to forget :

" Still stands Thine ancient sacrifice,
" An humble and a contrite heart."

Yet even here there is a touch of racial superiority—a depreciation of " the Gentiles " and " lesser breeds without the Law." The Radical Bishop Percival denounced Mr. Kipling to Americans as " the exponent of strife and violence, we might even say of brutality. His ideas are those of the barrack-room." But is it not a merit of Mr. Kipling that he interpreted the ideas and understood the virtues and the weaknesses of the private soldier? Undoubtedly he raised Tommy Atkins in public estimation. Bradlaugh, who had served in the Army and had seen floggings, once told the House of Commons that " he did not know any other country in the whole world where it was a disgrace to wear the uniform of the country." He had been refused refreshment in a hotel because he was in uniform. Mr. Kipling, in one of his poems, indignantly resented such treatment. He made civilians at any rate realize that the King's coat, worn by men who won the Empire's battles, was an honourable garment.

Speaking generally, Conservatives were Imperialist and Liberals were anti-Imperialist. But Imperialism attracted great numbers of Liberals, many of whom were very eminent, creating almost as deep a schism in the Party as Home Rule had done. Differing views on Imperialism were largely responsible for the disunion in the Cabinet of 1892-5, and in the ranks of the Liberal Opposition during the next ten years ; they were also a fruitful cause of dissension in the Administrations of Campbell-Bannerman and Asquith.

Gladstone, reminding his audience that he had been Under-Secretary for the Colonies as far back as 1835, claimed that till 1830 the Tories had hampered the Colonies in legislation and material prosperity, and that it was the Liberal Party which had granted self-government.[1] He argued that we could not afford Imperial adventures: "From whence are the money and the men to come? What do you mean by the strengthening of the Empire? It is simply loading the Empire. It is not strengthening the Empire." These islands could supply only a "limited store of men and of funds."[2] *Imperium et Libertas* "meant simply this—'Liberty for ourselves, Empire over the rest of mankind.'"[3] Jingoism, he said in 1893, "is no longer war-fever; it is earth-hunger." In 1894 he talked to Sir Algernon West of "the menace to Europe our proposed Naval expansion would be."[4] A few months before he died "Mr. Gladstone over his tea spoke with fire about Imperialism. He called it a form of Jingoism, 'a vulgar road to popularity and power.' He said *it was an innovation.*"[5] This was the statesman who had been reproached by Labouchere for bombarding Alexandria, for the "massacre" of Egyptians, and for "wild-cat expeditions into the heart of Ethiopia." However responsible he may have been for these enterprises, it is clear that he must have entered on them with repugnance.

Harcourt's views on Imperialism were in sympathy with Gladstone's. When Stead accused him of insincerity, Bryce replied that Harcourt was certainly sincere in his hate of the Colonies.[6] "In Imperialism" (writes Mr. A. G. Gardiner) "Harcourt saw the thing he most detested, Jingoism, in a thin disguise, and its appearance as a challenger for the control of the Liberal Party seemed to him to threaten the very ark of the Liberal convenant."[7] Both Gladstone and Harcourt were rigorous economists, to whom the expense of wars and expeditions was hateful.

Lord Morley wrote: "We have had imposed on us by the unlucky prowess of our ancestors the task of ruling a vast number of millions of alien dependents."[8] He did not believe that the Colonies had much affection for the Mother Country. In 1885 he prophesied that if we were ever engaged in a great war, in which they were not immediately concerned, they would not send one man to help us.[9] This was a very unhappy forecast. When the Great War came

the Dominions sent men by hundreds of thousands, but Morley himself retired to his "little doctrinaire study." Yet it fell to Morley the anti-Imperialist, as a member of Campbell-Bannerman's Administration, to be responsible for India. In February 1908 he announced in Parliament a punitive expedition against the Aga Kehls. "He follows the permanent official lead" (said Wilfrid Blunt), "being the weak man he is."[1]

Campbell-Bannerman avowed that he "loathed" Imperialism. At the time of the Boer War he coined the famous phrase "methods of barbarism" to describe the operations of the British Army. Copies of his speeches were found by the British troops in Boer lagers.

On the other hand Chamberlain had shown his Imperialist leanings long before the Home Rule split. In the 'Eighties, said Lord Granville, he was "almost the greatest Jingo in Mr. Gladstone's Cabinet." In his terrible Radical "Ransom" speech (January 5th, 1885), which so fluttered the Tory dovecotes, he took occasion to refer to Bismarck's recent acquisition of North Guinea. When necessary, he said, "the English Democracy will stand shoulder to shoulder throughout the world to maintain the honour and integrity of the Empire." (From this he passed on to denounce the Game Laws.) As an Imperialist, said Lord Morley, he followed "where Dilke, Rosebery and Forster had led the way."

To describe Lord Rosebery's Imperialism Morley invented a new word—"neo-Palmerstonianism." Lord Rendel records that "Morley seems to think Rosebery more Jingo and emotional in foreign affairs than Lord Salisbury, and less cautious."[2] Rosebery first put on record his Imperial faith in 1878.[3]

Dilke, judged by Liberal standards, was a Militarist. The German peril was always in his mind; he objected to "lying down" to Germany, he condemned the cession of Heligoland. He said that if Gladstone had given away that island, the Tories would have "destroyed" him. He was always deploring the weakness and want of organization of our Army. He said that "the serious needs of self-defence are sacrificed to the poor aims of keeping constituencies in good humour;" also that "Liberals should give up thinking of this question of National Defence as a hateful one, and as one against which they ought to close their eyes

and ears."[1] With Lord Brassey he elaborated a scheme of Imperial defence.

Thus these seven principal Liberal statesmen were sharply divided on Imperialism; some were for an efficient and adequate Army and Navy, the others for (what was called) "starving the Services."

Haldane developed an interest in the Colonies through his Privy Council law-cases.[2] Milner, according to Wilfrid Blunt, was "invaluable to the Empire Builders"; both as regards Egypt and the Transvaal he succeeded in converting Liberals to Imperialism.[3] The Liberal publicist W. T. Stead is described by his daughter as "an impassioned Imperialist." His was, in his own words, "an Imperialism *plus* common-sense and the ten Commandments." He insisted on Gordon being sent out, and also on Wolseley's expedition to rescue him. He agitated for a strong Navy—"two keels to one." He was the friend of Rhodes, and with him advocated "an English-speaking reunion." With this in view, Rhodes proposed the absorption, if necessary, of the British Empire into the United States.[4] Because of Stead's eccentricity Rhodes, in the end, removed his name from his celebrated Will.

To counterbalance these Liberal Imperialists, Lord Randolph Churchill was on more than one important question an anti-Imperialist Conservative; his Tory Democratic followers were Imperialists, but not Lord Randolph. In December 1880 he proposed to Wolff that the Fourth Party should support the independence of the Transvaal: "it occurs to me one of us (like a thunderbolt in a clear sky) should on the Address pronounce for the independence of the Boers, and protest against British blood and treasure being wasted in reducing a gallant nationality." It must be admitted that he was prompted to another motive besides sympathy with "a gallant nationality," for "the question of reducing the Boers will divide the Liberal Party by a sharper and more insuperable line than any Irish question. . . . Think this over in your 'anxious mind,' and consider the numerous advantageous features which the position offers."[5] The suggestion that this high Imperial matter should be treated tactically does not redound to Churchill's credit, and was declined by Wolff. If it had been adopted, it would have divided Churchill's own Party more sharply than the Liberals. Churchill afterwards

condemned Gladstone for his surrender after Majuba ; but ten years later, when visiting South Africa, he came to the conclusion that Gladstone had acted wisely, and made concord possible between the Dutch and English in the Colony.[1] Then as regards Egypt, he sympathized with Arabi's revolt and subscribed £50 towards his defence. He regarded our expedition to crush him as " a bondholders' war."[2] Dilke warned Granville (October 1882) that the Fourth Party might carry " the mass of the Tories " with the Liberals on a cry of " the liberties of Egypt."[3] Later, Churchill denounced the retention of the Soudan " as a violation of the principles of freedom."[4] In April 1893 Wilfrid Blunt records that Churchill was still in favour of evacuation.[5]

There were certain Englishmen who scorned tactical considerations and Party policies, and were the indiscriminating champions of all races that opposed British arms or came under British rule. They were obsessed by the conviction that all our subjects in distant lands were the victims of fraud and oppression. Of such Wilfrid Blunt was the extreme example. It would be difficult to affix a political label to Blunt, whose altruistic activities have been described by Lady Gregory as " an unusual and gallant record for a Sussex gentleman of many acres, of inherited wealth and ease."[6] He was a traveller and a poet and a lover of horses ; he had many friends in both Parties, was imprisoned as a Home Ruler for offences against the law, but voted for Lord Winterton in the General Election of January 1910. " My mission in life," he said, " is that of pleading the cause of the backward nations of the world."[7] " The British Empire is the great engine of evil for the weak races now existing in the world. I shall be delighted to see England stripped of her whole foreign possessions."[8] So he was " an active combatant for Egypt's independence."[9] Dilke said that Blunt as an English sympathizer with Arabi Pasha, was " more extreme than the Egyptian revolutionary." He wished the Matabeles " all possible success." He told Harcourt he would like to see the Boers established in Cape Town—against which sentiment even Harcourt protested.[10] (Blunt would probably have also, subsequently, supported the Hottentot against the Boer, as Dr. Clifford championed the Koreans against his former heroes the Japanese.) As for Jameson, after the Raid, " I devoutly

hope he may be hanged."[1] He made excuses for Dingra, the assassin of Sir Curzon Wyllie. He rejoiced when Dillon told him that George Wyndham's Land Bill had not lessened Irish ill-feeling towards England.[2] Dillon admired Blunt's "Coronation Ode," but added "rather too hard on your own country and your own people. If I were an Englishman, I do not think I could so utterly have condemned England."[3]

"My country right or wrong!" As against those who so uphold their country there have always been Englishmen, since the time of the illustrious Charles James Fox, who have judged England to be almost certainly in the wrong in all her wars, and have hoped and prayed for her defeat. Blunt became de-Anglicized; he hated Western civilization more bitterly than did Riaz Pasha;[4] but his very Orientalism, his self-identification with "the lesser breeds" enabled him to put himself in the skin of the conquered and expropriated. For there are two parties to Empire—the ruling race and the ruled. In 1851 Roebuck recommended in Kaffraria "the gradual annihilation of the native population. It is an utter pretence to talk of humanity, and the principles of the Christian religion, and the Decalogue; the black man must vanish in the face of the white."[5] Queen Victoria was more humane; she wrote to Lord Salisbury after Grenfell's victory at Suakim (December 23rd, 1888), "One cannot help regretting that we have to kill so many of these misguided but brave fanatics."[6] By this time the theory of our mission had strengthened, the mission of "the greatest governing races that the world has ever seen"—so Chamberlain described the British race. A certain Bishop, during the Boer War, preached that he "believed England to be the righteous instrument of God."[7] Cecil Rhodes considered the mission to be "to paint as much of the map of Africa red as possible."

It is undeniable that, for the fulfilment of this mission, small wars—small at any rate in comparison with the Great War—were a necessity. It has been said that English Militarism was acquired rather than instinctive, and was a product of Imperialism.[8] A certain Professor Cramb, after the Boer War, exalted this imperialistic Militarism in words that might have been uttered by Bernhardi or Treitschke or Nietzche. "War is thus a manifestation of the world spirit in the form most sublime and awful that can enthrall the

contemplation of man." His war-cry was "God for Britain, Justice, and Freedom in the World!"[1] To our young officers these small wars, besides affording a welcome change from garrison duties, offered opportunities of promotion and distinction, and of gaining professional experience. The element of risk was also very attractive; but the chances were in favour of the soldier's return after a not very long absence. Mr. Winston Churchill (in *My Early Life*) writing of his soldiering days, tells how eager he and his comrades were to take part in these adventures, and how envious they were of the medals that adorned the breast of Colonel Brabazon, their Commanding Officer. Like the young Zulu warriors they were impatient to "wash their spears."

So Imperialism ministered to the love of glory, but excited less admirable emotions in the great majority for whom others performed their military service. The "Mafficking" which took place during the Boer War was a demonstration not quite in accordance with the Briton's traditional character. Jingoism, says J. A. Hobson, is "the passion of the spectator, the inciter, not of the fighter."[2] But the old Common Law duty of the citizen was worthily inculcated by the National Service League which was founded in 1902; in that year three Members of Parliament joined the League, in 1912 it numbered 180.[3] There were two sides to Imperialism. Joseph Chamberlain said: "I am not prepared to say that we have any right to be proud of all the steps that have been taken in the acquisition of the Empire. But it is a great potentiality: the greatest that was ever given to man."[4] There can be no doubt that Democracy was proud of the Empire, nor that the new spirit reacted profoundly on our politics—and not least by causing a new schism in the Liberal Party.

But the later development of Imperialism was to cause a schism also in the ranks of the Tories. For with the spread of Imperial feeling there naturally arose the desire for Imperial Federation, for drawing closer for the purposes of Imperial Defence. And if for Imperial Defence, why not for Imperial Trade?

In 1872 Disraeli had said that Colonial self-government should only have been conceded as part of a policy of Imperial Federation: "it ought to have been accompanied by an Imperial Tariff." The idea of an Imperial Tariff

was indeed "an innovation," of which nothing more was heard for a long time. The man who was to revive it, Joseph Chamberlain, had earned the repute of being "almost the greatest Jingo in Mr. Gladstone's Cabinet;" but, as President of the Board of Trade in 1881, he had "mercilessly exposed the commercial fallacies variously described as 'Reciprocity' and 'Retaliation'," refusing to make any distinction between "Fair Trade" and "Protection."[1] Just possibly, said Chamberlain, "under the sting of great suffering, and deceived by misrepresentations, the working classes might be ready to try strange remedies, and might be foolish enough to submit for a time to a proposal to tax the food of the country." But if the remedy proved a failure, "it would be a signal for a state of things more dangerous and more disastrous than anything which has been seen since the repeal of the Corn Laws."[2] Then came the Home Rule struggle, and it was probably through his intense desire to preserve the Union with Ireland and the Parliament of the United Kingdom, on which he felt so passionately, that Chamberlain's mind was opened to the possibility of a more extended Union. On April 21st, 1886, he said:

"I hope we may be able, sooner or later, to federate, and bring together, all these great independencies of the British Empire into one supreme and Imperial Parliament."[3]

Then, on his return from a mission to Newfoundland:

"There is a word which I am afraid to mention. I have been assured upon the highest authority that Confederation is an empty dream, the fantastic vision of fools and fanatics,

> "'It cannot be. The vision is too fair
> For creatures doomed to breathe terrestrial air,
> Yet not for that shall sober Reason frown
> Upon that promise, and that hope disown.
> We know that only to high aims are due
> Rich guerdons, and to them alone ensue.'"[4]

Then, in his second year of office as Colonial Minister, his note becomes more confident:

"I believe in the practical possibility of a Federation of the British race."[5]

It was soon after this that Chamberlain began to contemplate taking a further step. In the winter of 1898-9, at a dinner party he "shadowed forth his policy of Imperial

Preference."[1] Early in 1903 he said: "Preference may lead ultimately to Free Trade in the Empire—it is at least an advance towards it." This was after his return from S. Africa. But it was at Birmingham, on May 15th, 1903, in a speech that has been called "The First Blast," that he formally opened his campaign for Tariff Reform:

"The second alternative is that we should insist that we will not be bound by any purely technical definition of Free Trade; that, while we seek as our chief object free interchange of trade and commerce between ourselves and all the nations of the world, we will nevertheless recover our freedom, resume the power of negotiation, and, if necessary, retaliation, whenever our own interests or our relations between our Colonies and ourselves are threatened by other people."[2]

Finally, at Glasgow (October 6th, 1903), having argued that we should give the Colonies a preference on their own particular products:

"You must put a tax on food. The murder is out."[3]

The murder was out indeed, and (as Mr. Churchill would say) "the hunt was up." The bankers, merchants and shipowners, the Nonconformists almost to a man, the Trades Unions and the Labour Party—all these joined in an intense opposition. The Conservatives were divided; some of their strongest Ministers resigned office. But the most significant effect of Chamberlain's campaign was that it re-united the warring sections of the Liberal Party; for, whatever their differences on other questions, all Liberals were Free Traders. Posters were displayed contrasting the Big Loaf of Free Imports with the Little Loaf of Protection; "the Hungry Forties" were recalled to memory; it was impressed on the electors that "your food will cost you more;" they shuddered at hearing how the German workman was fed on black bread and horseflesh. Democracy decisively rejected any Imperialism of which dear food was to be a condition, and Chamberlain was voted down. But he continued the fight while his health lasted, and ended his last speech with the words:

"I know that the fruition of our hopes is certain . . .
"'Others I doubt not, if not we,
The issue of our toil shall see.'"[3]

With the defeat of Tariff Reform, Imperial Federation

and Imperialism itself sustained a severe check. The door was "banged, barred and bolted" for a quarter of a century. But the ideal of Empire had permanently affected both Liberals and Conservatives. For a time it had divided the Liberals; and, though in 1906 they all marched in step behind the banner of Free Trade, their divergent views on Empire, and especially on Imperial Defence, were later to make themselves felt once more. But it may be admitted that the adherents of Campbell-Bannerman, "a Liberal without a prefix," constituted the great majority of the Party. "The main stream of Liberalism" (said Lord Hugh Cecil in 1903) "is 'Gladstonian' in foreign, Colonial and Irish questions; it is Nonconformist in ecclesiastical and educational questions; it is Radical in questions affecting Labour and Capital."[1] On foreign Colonial and Irish questions, the men of the Labour Party, which was now gathering strength, were likewise "Gladstonian"; that is to say, they were hostile to Imperial aspirations. Their sympathy has always been with the native and subject races of the Empire, which they regard as the victims of British exploitation.

NOTES TO

TORY DEMOCRACY AND IMPERIALISM

Page 202.
[1] *Life of Gladstone*, Vol. III, p. 129.
Page 203.
[1] *Letters of Queen Victoria* (1870-1878), p. 362.
[2] *Letters of Queen Victoria* (1870-78), p. 414.
[3] See *Life of Disraeli*, Vol. V, p. 369.
[4] *After Thirty Years*, p. 163.
Page 204.
[1] *Studies in Contemporary Biography*, p. 30.
[2] *Life of Disraeli*, Vol. V, p. 295.
[3] *The Story of the Fourth Party*, by Harold E. Gorst. (*The Nineteenth Century*, November, 1902).
[4] *Life*, Vol. V, p. 174.
[5] *Ib.*, p. 472.
[6] *Disraeli* (André Maurois), p. 315.
[7] *Life*, Vol. V, p. 369.
Page 205.
[1] *Lord Randolph Churchill's Speeches*, Vol. I, p. xvii.
[2] *Life of Charles Bradlaugh* (J. M. Robertson), Vol. II, p. 217.
[3] *A Diary of Two Parliaments* (*The Great Parliament*, 1880-1885), p. 44.
[4] Lang's *Sir Stafford Northcote, 1st Earl of Iddesleigh*, Vol. II, p. 317.
[5] Hicks-Beach had been Master of a pack of Beagles.
Page 206.
[1] *Life of Lord Salisbury*, Vol. III, p. 84.
[2] *Elijah's Mantle* (*Fortnightly Review*, May 1883).
[3] *Speeches*, Vol. II, p. 330.
[4] *Speeches*, Vol. I, p. 139.
[5] Quoted in Disraeli's *Life*, Vol. V, p. 369.
Page 208.
[1] *The Story of the Fourth Party, Its Nirvana* (*The Nineteenth Century*, January, 1903).
[2] *The Personal Papers of Lord Rendel*, p. 226.
Page 209.
[1] *Speeches*, Vol. I, p. 209.
[2] *Life*, Vol. II, p. 326.
[3] *Life of Lord Salisbury*, Vol. III, p. 316.
[4] *Life of Lord Randolph Churchill*, Vol. II, p. 170.
Page 210.
[1] *Ib.*, p. 165.
[2] *Ib.*, p. 175.
[3] *Ib.*, pp. 176-7.
[4] Lord St. Aldwyn (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) said of him : " Though certainly no ' Tory Democrat,' he was keen about the housing of the poor and sanitary improvement."
[5] *Autobiography of Margot Asquith*, p. 154.
[6] *After Thirty Years* (Viscount Gladstone), p. 402.
[7] *The World Crisis*, 1911-1914, p. 28.
[8] *Life*, Vol. III, p. 281.

Page 211.
[1] Mr. Lloyd George asserted that " the Idle Rich " with their families and retainers were two millions strong. (Speech on " Social Waste " at the City Temple, October 17th, 1910. *Speeches*, p. 773).
[2] *Life of Lord Randolph Churchill*, Vol. II, p. 224.

Page 212.
[1] He condemned " clubland " (*Life*, Vol. II, p. 6).
[2] *Life*, Vol. III, p. 123.
[3] Dilke's *Life*, Vol. II, p. 265.
[4] *Life of Lord Salisbury*, Vol. III, p. 336.
[5] Lord St. Aldwyn's *Life*, Vol. I, p. 301.

Page 213.
[1] *Diaries and Letters* (February 16th, 1893), p. 421.
[2] *Private Diaries*, p. 142.
[3] *My Diaries* (Wilfrid Blunt), Vol. I, p. 142.
[4] *Life*, Vol. II, p. 452.
[5] See Chamberlain's *Speeches* (Chas. W. Boyd), Vol. I, p. 82.

Page 214.
[1] *Fifty Years of Parliament*, Vol. I, p. 103.
[2] *The Pre-War Mind in Britain* (Caroline E. Playne), pp. 172-3.

Page 215.
[1] *Recollections* (Vol. II, p. 80).
[2] *The Pre-War Mind in Britain*, pp. 23, 35.
[3] See *The Transition from Aristocracy*, p. 84.
[4] *Life of Lord Salisbury*, Vol. I, p. 167.
[5] *Life of Lord Salisbury*, Vol. I, p. 168.
[6] See *The Transition from Aristocracy*, p. 101, note 17.

Page 216.
[1] *Life of Granville*, Vol II, p. 22.
[2] *Life of Disraeli*, Vol. V, p. 195 ; *Life of Gladstone*, Vol. II, p. 391.

Page 217.
[1] *Life of Granville*, Vol. II, pp. 157-8.
[2] Beaconsfield to the Queen, September 16th, 1879 (*Letters of Queen Victoria*, 1879-85, p. 46).
[3] *Life of Dilke*, Vol. I, p. 500.
[4] *The British Liberal Party* (Hamilton Fyfe), p. 83.

Page 218.
[1] *Acton, Gladstone and others* (Mary Drew), p. 3.
[2] Morley's *Gladstone*, Vol. III, pp. 41-4.
[3] *Life of Lord Randolph Churchill*, Vol. I, p. 193.

Page 219.
[1] Rosebery's *Life*, Vol. I, p. 161.
[2] *Life of Lord Randolph Churchill*, Vol. I, p. 225.
[3] *Life of Lord Granville*, Vol. II, p. 402.
[4] Dilke's *Life*, Vol. II, p. 41.
[5] *After Thirty Years*, p. 259.
[6] *Letters of Queen Victoria* (1879-85), p. 597.
[7] Labouchere's *Life*, p. 198.

Page 220.
[1] *Life of Lord Randolph Churchill*, Vol. II, p. 117.
[2] *Speeches*, Vol. II, p. 23 (at Manchester, March 3rd, 1886).
[3] *Speeches*, Vol. II, p. 4.
[4] Campbell-Bannerman's *Life*, Vol. I, p. 189.
[5] *Memoir of J. E. C. Bodley* (Shane Leslie), p. 35.

Page 221.
[1] *Later Years of Thomas Hardy*, p. 92.
[2] *Life of Bradlaugh*, Vol. II, p. 198.

Page 223.
[1] *9th Midlothian Speech*, March 20th, 1880.
[2] *2nd Midlothian Speech*, November 26th, 1879.
[3] *3rd Midlothian Speech*, November 27th, 1879.
[4] *Private Diaries of Sir Algernon West*, p. 250.
[5] *Personal Papers of Lord Rendel*, p. 147.
[6] Harcourt's *Life*, Vol. II, p. 152.
[7] From his book *On Compromise* (quoted in *Life of W. T. Stead*, Vol. I, p. 100).
[8] See *Joseph Chamberlain's Speeches*, Vol. II, p. 300.
[9] Wilfrid Blunt's *Diaries*, Vol. II, p. 195.

Page 224.
[1] *The Personal Papers of Lord Rendel* (January 7th, 1896).
[2] *Life*, Vol. I, p. 108.
[3] See Dilke's *Life*, Vol. II, pp. 261-3, 398, 416, 482.

Page 225.
[1] *Richard Burdon Haldane, An Autobiography*, p. 93.
[2] Wilfrid Blunt's *Diaries*, Vol. I, p. 325.
[3] *My Father* (Estelle W. Stead), pp. 106-10, 231-48.
[4] *Life*, Vol. I, p. 195.
[5] *Ib.*, p. 197.

Page 226.
[1] *Ib.*, p. 226.
[2] Dilke's *Life*, Vol. I, p. 547.
[3] *Ib.*, Vol. II, p. 34.
[4] *My Diaries*, Vol. I, p. 97.
[5] Preface to *My Diaries* (Wilfrid Blunt).
[6] *My Diaries*, Vol. I, p. 1.
[7] *Ib.*, p. 212.
[8] *Ib.*, p. 139.
[9] *Ib.*, p. 334.
[10] *Ib.*, p. 211.

Page 227.
[1] *Ib.*, Vol. II, p. 236.
[2] *Ib.*, p. 352.
[3] *Ib.*, Vol. I, p. 135.
[4] See *Victoriana* (Barber and Sitwell), p. 41.
[5] *Letters of Queen Victoria* (1886-90), p. 457.
[6] *Victoriana*, p. 155.
[7] *The Pre-War Mind* (Caroline E. Playne), p. 126.
[8] *Ib.*, p. 202.

Page 228.
[1] *The Pre-War Mind*, p. 70.
[2] The Navy League had been founded in 1894.
[3] *Recollections* (Viscount Morley), Vol. II, p. 79.
[4] *Life of Lord Granville*, Vol. II, p. 238.

Page 229.
[1] *Life of Lord Granville*, Vol. II, p. 238. (Was this speech ever quoted against Chamberlain in 1903 and after ?).
[2] At Rawtenstall (*Speeches*, Vol. I, p. 279).
[3] Devonshire Club, April 9th, 1888.
[4] Royal Colonial Institution Dinner, March 31st, 1897 (*Speeches*, Vol. II, p. 5).
[5] *St. Loe Strachey, His Life and His Paper*, p. 93.

Page 230.
[1] *Speeches*, Vol. II, p. 139.
[2] *Ib.*, p. 157.
[3] *Ib.*, p. 372.

Page 231.
[1] *The British Liberal Party* (Hamilton Fyfe), p. 157.

THE LIBERAL REVIVAL

" Gladstone's impetuosity about Ireland and the struggle in South Africa checked and held up the Liberal movement, so that in the twenty-five years between 1880 and 1905 the Tories were in office nearly seventeen years, and the Liberals little more than eight. Then the pent-up Liberal movement was released in another flood at the end of 1905, and the results began to follow which the Anti-democrats had predicted in 1866 and 1867.

" But the Liberal Party, great as its triumph seemed to be in 1906, was no longer the sole exponent of the Progressive cause."

The Public Life (J. A. Spender), Vol. I, p. 152.

Campbell-Bannerman takes office—His character, abilities, politics, career—Fond of France—A " canny " Scot—A " Pro-Boer "—No sympathy with Fabians—Compact between Grey, Asquith and Haldane—Weakness of Asquith—They join the Government—Enthusiasm at the Albert Hall Meeting—Conservatives routed in 1906 Election—Estimates of New Parliament by Dilke, Balfour and Birkenhead—Nonconformist supporters—Academic Liberals—Fabians—The Webbs—" The New Machiavelli "—Bureaucracy—A Free Trade Resolution—Snowden's maiden speech—Asquith succeeds Campbell-Bannerman—His career at the Bar—Home Secretary—Second marriage—Moderating influence of Society on Radical and Labour politicians—Asquith accused of becoming Whiggish—Radicals and the Lords—Mr. Lloyd George's 1909 Budget—His Newcastle and Limehouse speeches—Vituperation of Dukes—Increased expenditure—Pressure of Labour Party—Payment of Members—" Votes for Women "—They break up meetings—Victorian women—*Punch's* Women-Suffragists—J. S. Mill and Dilke their champions—Women on the L.C.C.—Chaplin and Labouchere against the Suffrage—Asquith's conversion—Women and the Labour Party—The W.S.P.U.—Breach with Labour—Militants and Moderates—Lawlessness of Militants—Liberals concentrate against the Lords—Asquith attacks the Lords—Asquith and the King—The Lords yield—Fate of Land Value Duties.

MR. BALFOUR resigned office on December 4th, 1905. The next day Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman kissed hands as Prime Minister.

What sort of an exponent of Democracy was this new leader of the Liberal Party?

He was an amiable man. He had very few, if any, personal enemies. Even the Queen spoke well of him, although he was a Liberal politician, and a Liberal of the Left; she called him " a good honest Scotchman."[1] He was also *persona grata* to King Edward VII. He was not generally credited with shining talents; he was amused once at overhearing somebody describe him as " a sufficiently dull man." Wilfrid Blunt's epitaph was that he

" was a worthy soul and did his best to carry on the better tradition." But he had a sense of humour ; he would apologize for his own " horrid long name," and he was ingenious at inventing a species of nick-names for his colleagues. Rosebery was " Barnbougle " (the name of a castle which he restored), Harcourt " the fair Malwoodiana," Morley " Priscilla " or " a petulant spinster."[1] Then he had tact and shrewdness ; when he entered the Cabinet in 1886 as Secretary for War, Gladstone said to him, " you will be canny and you will be couthy." And his biographer rightly claims for him the virtues of courage and perseverance—" that a man should bear adversity bravely and persist in his ideas through the most untoward circumstances will always in this country be one of the tests of his fitness for the highest position."[2] Campbell-Bannerman was equal to this test. He was a very humane man, one who gave up shooting from distaste of the *battue*. It was largely his humanity that made him a pro-Boer ; he was shocked at such cruel features of war as the mortality of nearly 40 *per cent.* in the camp of Bloemfontein. He was one of the honestest of politicians ; he admired and himself illustrated a saying of Sir Wilfrid Lawson—" the man who walks on a straight road never loses his way." He kept clear of the intrigues and quarrels that preceded and followed Gladstone's resignation. Finally, there was a touch of quaintness—almost of mysticism—in his composition ; he would bow to his sapling trees, and apologize to the walking-sticks he was leaving at home when he went out for exercise.

As for his career, he had sat in Parliament for 36 years ; in Gladstone's first Administration he had been Financial Secretary to the War Office, and was regarded as an authority on Army matters ; he had since been Irish Secretary and War Secretary. As War Secretary he had tactfully arranged the retirement of the Duke of Cambridge. After the Liberal defeat of 1895, Rosebery resigned the leadership of the Party, and Harcourt resigned the leadership in the Commons. Then Morley retired from politics. Campbell-Bannerman succeeded Harcourt ; it was a most unenviable position, in which he was frequently flouted by his Liberal-Imperialist colleagues, but never lost his equanimity.

As for his politics, he stood for Stirling Burghs as an " advanced " Liberal in 1868. " Like Mr. Gladstone

before him, he moved steadily and continuously to the Left. He was to the core a Radical and a Democrat."[1] But he was never as "advanced" as Chamberlain was in his pre-Unionist days; he never expressed Republican opinions, nor did he join the Dilke-Chamberlain alliance. On Home Rule he followed Gladstone and "found salvation"—as the phrase then went.[2] He was in close sympathy and co-operation with Lord Spencer; his Irish experience may have convinced him of the impossibility of governing that country from England, but he was alive to the terrible difficulties of Gladstone's policy. With King Edward VII he shared a love of France, which made him faithful to the *Entente;* this did him little harm with the Radicals, for France was a Republic—but autocratic Russia was a very different matter. The King, foreseeing that the Liberals would soon be returned to power, had a long conversation with Campbell-Bannerman in August 1905.[3] The King had strong Liberal sympathies; in 1884 as Prince of Wales he asked Rosebery whether he could constitutionally vote with the Government on the Reform Bill.[4] It was said that all his *entourage* were Liberals; but he could not prevail upon Campbell-Bannerman to take Dilke into his Cabinet.[5]

Campbell-Bannerman, said Asquith, in a valedictory speech, "had no misgivings about the future of Democracy." Democracy had no misgivings about Campbell-Bannerman, largely because he was a Scot; by serious Nonconformist Liberals, at any rate, a Scot was believed to be more moral than an Englishman. Sir Henry Lucy said: "He is Premier by choice rather of the sturdy Provinces, than of the fickle Metropolis."[6] The "sturdy" Provinces, the "hard-headed" Yorkshiremen, the "canny" Scots, at all seasons found faithful supporters of the Liberal Party. To all he seemed to be a good, plain, guileless man; and he was reputed to be wealthy. Dilke said that all his work was done for him by subordinates; "he had only to read novels, prepare jokes, look inscrutable and fatherly."[7] But to such a glutton for work as Dilke even a man of average industry might seem lazy.

As a politician he was, during the Boer War, almost as much detested by Conservatives as was Mr. Ramsay MacDonald during the Great War. In *The National Review* of January 1906 may be found an article, "The Pattern Englishman," the title of which is taken from Carlyle—

" the Pattern Englishman, raised by solemn acclamations upon the bucklers of the English people, and saluted with universal ' God save thee,' has now the honour to announce himself." The writer remarked that Campbell-Bannerman " has associated with himself in office, except for a handful of Liberal Imperialists, the most extraordinary collection of the enemies of their country ever assembled in a Cabinet." He had " steadily exerted all his influence against his own country, to stimulate its enemies and discourage its friends." " His attacks upon the honour and good conduct of the British soldier were reproduced with applause in foreign journals." Balfour took much the same line ; he asserted in the House of Commons (July 5th, 1901) that the only cause of the prolongation of the War was the belief of the Boers that they had in England a body of opinion that will " carry out a policy consonant with their view." On the other hand it has been asserted that peace was ultimately made possible owing to an assurance given by Kitchener to Smuts that " in two years time a Liberal Government will be in power," and would remedy any hardness in the terms agreed upon.[1]

Haldane's criticism of the new Premier was " that he was not identified in the public mind with any fresh ideas, for what was wanted was not the recrudescence of the old Liberal Party, but a body of men with life and energy and a new outlook on the problems of the State. . . . We had only one great asset and that was our Free Trade creed."[2] Haldane's " fresh ideas " were probably to be sought in Fabian quarters. But with such ideas Campbell-Bannerman was not in sympathy. He wrote to Herbert Gladstone (September 12th, 1901) : " We have had the benefit of instruction by Mr. Sidney Webb, and survived it. . . . I fear I am too old to enjoy that Academy."[3] He may have felt instinctively that Webb's ideas, (as will be seen later), were by no means consonant with orthodox Liberalism.

As to his record as Prime Minister, it is to be remembered that he took office with his own health undermined and a sick wife. He nursed her, and " in the first six months of his Premiership he scarcely spent one continuous night in bed."[4] Often he would leave the House of Commons to return to her bedside. A truly noble devotion, but how difficult to combine it with the government of an Empire ! She died in August 1906. Two months later he had

his first heart-attack, and died himself on April 22nd, 1908.

Such was the Prime Minister who was to lead a Party of 379 Liberals; kind, easy, consistent, persevering, a hater of war and of Imperial development. His career was one of steady progress, successful and in the end triumphant. He was an able administrator, and a skilful manager of men—especially in his later days. Whether he was fitted to rule 300 millions of people of divers races, or to face the terrible European problem, is another question. Mr. Winston Churchill reminds us that, while he was receiving congratulations from all the friends of Progress, "the Algeciras Conference was in its throes."[1]

On the whole, *felix opportunitate mortis*.

Campbell-Bannerman had to form his Government before the General Election, with the consequence (says Mr. J. A. Farrer) that "the destinies of the country passed entirely into the hands of the Liberal Imperialists, who were indistinguishable in everything that mattered from the leaders whom the Country had rejected."[2] This must be rather an over-statement. There was a strong opposing influence to Imperialism in the Cabinet—Mr. John Morley; Sir Robert Reid, who now became Lord Loreburn and Lord Chancellor; Mr. Lloyd George, an ardent pro-Boer; Mr. Birrell; and the redoubtable Mr. John Burns, who had become celebrated as leader of the Dock Strike, and had been conspicuous at Trafalgar Square in the "Bloody Sunday" tumult of November 13th, 1887. The vote of censure on Lord Milner, and the early grant of self-government to the Transvaal, indicate that the Imperialists were not all-powerful. But the Prime Minister was anxious to come to terms with the three eminent Liberal Leaguers—Grey, Asquith and Haldane. They had made a compact, which they called the "Relugas" compact (the name of a place where Grey went fishing), the effect of which was that none of the three would join the Government unless Campbell-Bannerman retired to the Lords and Asquith were to lead the House of Commons as Chancellor of the Exchequer. But Asquith is said to have been the weak link in the chain. "It was evident" (writes Haldane) "that Asquith had not been resolute about the solidarity of our position. In the end, and about the middle of the

week, it appeared that he had yielded and was prepared, in response to Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman's appeal, to enter his Ministry in any event."[1] Lord Grey says the same: "Asquith had from the first been prepared to take office."[2] He became Chancellor of the Exchequer; Grey went to the Foreign Office, Haldane to the War Office. Campbell-Bannerman remained in the House of Commons, as his wife had advised him. But, having regard to the results of the General Election, the trio had done well for themselves. Campbell-Bannerman afterwards told Lord Rendel that, if he had formed his Government *after* the Election, he could not have included all those Liberal Leaguers. "The Constituencies and the new House of Commons would not have stood it."[3]

Before the Election on December 21st, 1905, nine thousand Liberals were given an opportunity of expressing their enthusiasm and their aspirations at the Albert Hall. According to the report in *The Times*, "for an hour before the proceedings began the audience passed the time in singing with much fervour the familiar political songs.[4] . . . Apart from the Prime Minister, the greatest ovation was reserved for Mr. John Burns." The Chairman, Mr. W. H. Dickinson, spoke of "a new era of political righteousness and radical reform" that might be ushered in. (As in 1880, "the speedy dawn of a Second Advent" was anticipated).[5] Campbell-Bannerman promised "to stop forthwith—as far as it is practicable to do it forthwith—the recruitment and embarkation of coolies in China." (Loud and prolonged cheers.) He advocated economy in the Services: "We are spending twice as much on the Army and Navy as we spent ten years ago." His Irish policy was cautious: "Those domestic affairs, which concern the Irish people only and not ourselves, should, as and when opportunity offers, be placed in their hands." (Cheers.) There was to be Land Reform: "We wish to make the Land less of a pleasure-ground for the rich" (loud cheers), "and more of a treasure-house for the Nation." (Renewed cheers.) The law of combination, which had been affected by the Taff Vale judgment, was to be amended. Free Trade was to be upheld. Dr. Macnamara completed the tale, denouncing "the affront done to the conscience of a great and estimable section of the community" by the Education Act of 1902. There was some interruption by

women, both at the beginning and end of the Prime Minister's speech—an omen of great trouble in the near future.[1]

The Programme put before the meeting, the proposals and speakers specially applauded, the excitement against Chinese "slavery", the enthusiasm for Land Reform, the desire to limit expenditure on the Army and Navy—all these went to show that Campbell-Bannerman's Liberalism was now the dominant Liberalism of the Party. Imperialism was at a discount; national righteousness was the ideal. "A.G.G." wrote that the ovation accorded to the Premier "seemed to embody in one passionate outburst not only the devotion to a leader, but the sense of escape from National humiliation." Chinese labour was exciting the same indignation as the Bulgarian Atrocities had excited thirty years previously. No longer Nationalism, but Internationalism, pervaded the political atmosphere. "The conception of the solidarity of the human race underlies the words spoken that evening."[2]

Punch (January 24th, 1906) had some verses expressive of the intensity of Radical feeling at this General Election:

"He paints your lurid portraits on the polls:
'Drivers of slaves that oust the white man's brood!'
'Bigots that bind in chains our children's souls!'
Filchers of poor folk's food!'"

The Election proved to be a Conservative *débâcle*. Arthur Balfour was defeated at Manchester, Gerald Balfour at Leeds, Alfred Lyttelton at Leamington, Brodrick at Guildford, Sir William Hart-Dyke at Dartford, Chaplin at Sleaford. Other well-known Conservatives who lost their seats were Lord Stanley, Bonar Law, Bromley-Davenport, Arnold-Forster, Pretyman, Ailwyn Fellowes, Gibson Bowles, and Sir John Gorst. As afterwards in the Election of 1931 many candidates were returned who had never dreamt of success and were consequently much embarrassed by the obligation to undertake Parliamentary duties. The new House of Commons contained 379 Liberals, 157 Unionists, 83 Nationalists and 51 Labour men; of the Labour Members 20 were "to all intents and purposes Liberals."[3] Of the 157 Conservatives, 107 followed Chamberlain, 32 followed Balfour and the rest were definitely Free Traders. The Liberals thus had a majority of 88 over all the other

parties combined. But it was then customary to talk of Liberal and Labour Members as both belonging to the Party of "Progress," and through the exigencies of politics even the Irish were often constrained to support the "Progressive" measures of British Radicals: Irish Roman Catholics and English Nonconformists were harnessed to the same "Progressive" chariot. Such being the circumstances, the Liberals could boast of a "Progressive" majority of no less than 356, a figure that exceeded the Whig majority of 300 in 1832 and was not surpassed till 1931.[1]

As to the quality of this Parliament opinions differed, according, perhaps, to political prepossessions; it was the same with the first Reformed Parliament. Sir Charles Dilke's view was that "there has probably never sat so interesting a House of Commons in the history of this country. . . . I am certain that there has never met at Westminster an assembly so able and at the same time so widely different in intellectual composition from its predecessors as that which is now there gathered."[2] Lord Birkenhead (Mr. F. E. Smith), who entered it as a new member, calls it "the Mad Parliament of 1906,"[3] or, less succinctly, "the most hysterical and ill-informed Parliament which has ever, at a critical moment, determined the fortunes of the nation."[4] To Balfour, who soon returned as Member for the City, the Ministry seemed to lack distinction. He wrote to Hicks Beach (January 26th, 1906): "It is curious that the Government which has the largest majority of modern times contains not a single individual whose personality appeals to the general public."[5] Mr. Lloyd George was already a platform celebrity; with his exception there was now no liberal statesman in whom the country was much interested, no one to touch an audience with the thrill of Gladstone or Disraeli or Churchill.

Campbell-Bannerman was master of his Cabinet. Lord Grey says that "the differences and divisions of opinion that had existed when the Party was in opposition never reappeared."[6] (One cannot help suspecting that under the surface they still smouldered.) He felt himself to be in a position to treat Balfour's questions with contempt, in the heavy manner of a Mr. Podsnap:

"I have no direct answer to give to them. They are utterly futile, nonsensical and misleading. They were invented by the Right Hon. Gentleman for the purpose of

occupying time in this debate. I say 'Enough of this foolery!' It might have answered very well in the last Parliament, but it is altogether out of place in this Parliament. The tone and temper of this Parliament will not permit it. Move your Amendment and let us get to business."[1] Rosebery was isolated; he had been out of touch with his friends the Liberal Imperialists, and unaware that Grey and Asquith had made terms with Campbell-Bannerman.[2]

The Prime Minister's strongest supporters were the Nonconformist Members, who numbered considerably more than a hundred. As he himself put it, by the Education Act of 1902 they had been "worked up to a heat they have never been in before." One of their clerical leaders, the Revd. Dr. J. Guinness Rogers, bears this out: "It is no exaggeration to say that the Free Churches have seldom, if ever, been more united in purpose, and, it may be added, more fiery in temper than in their resistance to this measure."[3] "We have been put in power by the Nonconformists," said Campbell-Bannerman to Cardinal Bourne, "and we must produce legislation that will satisfy the Nonconformists." Unfortunately for the Liberals this legislation was not successful. The Nonconformists were also bent on dealing a blow at the brewers, and on destroying the Welsh Church. The result was that Liberal policy presented a somewhat negative aspect. "It was tremendously clear what they were *against*," says Mr. Wells of a Liberal gathering (in *The New Machiavelli*). "The trouble was to find out what on earth they were *for!*"

Campbell-Bannerman had other supporters, whose politics were more constructive. These were academically-trained; men who started from *a priori* principles, deducing therefrom what ought to be done or attempted. Soon after the middle of the Nineteenth Century Oxford had turned from Mediævalism to Liberalism. At Balliol the celebrated Benjamin Jowett had encouraged his pupils to enter on political careers, in which many of them were very successful. Mr. R. W. Macan says that he treated "the University as a training station for practical life rather than as a laboratory of science."[4] The *Gelehrte* of Lincoln, Mark Pattison and Bywater, "poured scorn on the ideals of Balliol, which aimed at turning out public officials," and "flung gibes at Christ Church where Pusey and Liddon still directed the

powerful Church Party of the University."[1] Balliol men (writes Mrs. Humphry Ward), "regarded themselves as the natural allies of the Liberal Party."[2] Asquith and Milner were typical Balliol-Liberals, but Milner had fallen away to Imperialism and had been actually censured by the House of Commons. Asquith was *par excellence* the Balliol statesman, and he was now the second man of the Government. It is true that he had by this time shed some of his academic simplicity and rigour; but his achievement excited emulation, and many young Oxford admirers sat on the benches behind him. Campbell-Bannerman himself was not attracted by this section of his supporters. He had taken a good degree at Cambridge, but he was never a "high-brow." "This blind belief in a Balliol hero he regarded as a psychological infirmity of the Oxford mind."[3]

Many of these young political theorists had leanings towards Fabianism, though they might not be actually admitted to Fabian membership. Haldane quite early in his career had been intimate with Sidney Webb and Bernard Shaw and other Fabians. He never belonged to the Fabian Society, but he believed that, if its ideas had been more studied in Campbell-Bannerman's time, "Labour and Liberalism might have come to dwell under the same roof."[4] Sidney Webb is described, about this time, as being "a Socialist camouflaged as a Liberal," and Mrs. Webb was a dominating personality in Fabian circles. Many young Liberals frequented her house and sat at her feet.

"They were all tremendously keen upon social and political service, and all greatly under the sway of the ideal of a simple strenuous life." . . . "Seeking the good of the community by beneficial legislation, and the amelioration of social conditions." These sentences are from Mr. Wells' *The New Machiavelli* in which are drawn two characters, Altiora and Oscar Bailey, who are generally understood to represent Mr. and Mrs. Sidney Webb.[5] There is rather a dearth of political novels in the period under review. *Lothair* only just comes within it. As for Trollope's, his politicians have been condemned as unreal, and their politics as "feeble."[6] About this judgment there may be two opinions; at any rate his characters are natural, and some of them (the old Duke of Bungay for instance) very attractive, and Trollope knew his world. Mrs. Humphry Ward could give a lively description of a House of Commons

debate, but her statesmen—especially Lord Maxwell—are appalling prigs.[1] But *The New Machiavelli* is a realistic and penetrating account of how Fabianism began to permeate the young Intellectuals of Campbell-Bannerman's Party, enlisting men like Willersley who "lived for social service and to do vast masses of useful, undistinguished, fertilizing work."

The Baileys described themselves as "publicists." Altiora talks "of a projected Town Planning Bill with Blapp, who was practically in those days the Secretary of the Local Government Board." They entertain to lunch "a woman Factory Inspector and the Educational Minister for New Banksland and his wife." And they put this significant idea before the young Radical M.P. :

"We want to suggest to you that from the mere necessities of convenience elected bodies *must* avail themselves more and more of the services of expert officials. We have that very much in mind. The more complicated and technical affairs become, the less confidence will the elected official have in himself. We want to suggest that these expert officials must necessarily develop into a new class and a very powerful class in the community. We want to organize that. It may be *the* power of the future." They saw Government, says Mr. Wells, "not on terms of a growing collective understanding, but in terms of functionaries, legislative change, and methods of administration." Oscar Bailey, in fact, admits that Democracy is "just a dodge for getting assent to the ordinances of the expert official by means of the polling booth."

The aim of the Baileys was to establish a Bureaucracy, a form of government in which democrats might imagine they were having their way, while in reality they were mere puppets whose strings were pulled by subtle bureaucrats. They had visions of great new Government offices organized for the administration of Social Services ; at the head of each there would be a Minister, nominally the Chief, but actually the creature of the permanent Fabian Civil Servant. (These dreams have to a great extent become realities.) The system was to be a very expensive one, as had already been proved in the case of the London County Council on which Fabian Progressives for many years were in the majority.

In due time Fabianism was to have developments that

were fatal to the Liberal Party. Meanwhile Free Trade was, as Haldane said, its "one great asset." It was thought proper formally to affirm the Party's attachment to Free Trade principles; but even on this subject, in the course of debate a discordant voice made itself heard. Sir James Kitson, on March 12th, 1906, moved the Resolution:

"That this House, recognizing that in the recent General Election the people of the United Kingdom have demonstrated their unqualified fidelity to the principles and practice of Free Trade deems it right to record its determination to resist any proposal, whether by way of taxation on foreign corn or by the creation of a general tariff upon foreign goods, to create in this country a system of Protection."

No doubt it was hoped that both sections of the Labour Party would give an unqualified approval of this affirmation. But Philip Snowden rose, "a slender twisted figure supporting itself on a stick and speaking with a fire that was altogether revolutionary,"[1] and in a remarkable maiden speech began by demurring to the words "their unqualified fidelity to the principles and practice of Free Trade." That, he said, "was a matter of opinion on which they were justified in differing very considerably." Some Members thought that they were returned as a protest against Chinese Labour. He referred to "evils which fifty years of Free Trade had failed to mitigate or palliate," and he quoted Campbell-Bannerman's statement that one third of the population was on the verge of hunger. The Labour Party "while standing as firmly as the most ardent members of the Cobden Club to the maintenance of our Free Trade policy, declined to fall down and worship the god." The rich were getting richer and the poor poorer; during the last two years there had been an increase in the incomes assessed to Income Tax of £101,000,000 a year as compared with the two years before the Boer War; with increasing wealth and trade there was more starvation. Also he recognized that "this country had not that isolated position in the markets of the world which was ours in times gone by." His own election was due to "a moral indignation amongst the people at the waste and mismanagement which had occurred in previous years." The country must realize that grave industrial and social conditions did exist. As one remedy he proposed that mining rights and royalties "in-

stead of going into the pockets of the useless and unnecessary landlords" should go to the State.[1]

So it appeared that this Colossus of a Liberal Government had feet of clay. Nonconformists were pressing for an Education Bill which was doomed to rejection; Fabians were imbuing young Liberal minds with ideas and principles quite alien to the old Liberalism; the Labour Party was bent on legislation of a very confiscatory character; the Irish Members were suspicious and discontented.

Campbell-Bannerman died, and Asquith became the new leader of Democracy. "After Campbell-Bannerman" (writes Mr. Hamilton Fyfe) "Liberalism had no principles."[2] The Liberals of 1908 would have considered this a surprising statement. They were still fighting for the old Liberal causes—Local Veto, Disestablishment of the Welsh Church, and Undenominational Education, and Asquith had long been marked out as their future leader. Asquith was a Yorkshireman and of Nonconformist stock; both his birth and his religion recommended him to serious Liberals. He went from a celebrated London day-school to Balliol, where his academic career was brilliantly successful. At Oxford he was also President of the Union, and an eloquent speaker. J. E. C. Bodley describes him as "the dissidence of dissent in person, the first fruits at Oxford of the Repeal of University Tests."[3] He married early, and was called to the Bar, but his progress was not rapid. One who shared chambers with him told Wilfrid Blunt that in his first eight years of practice he made no more than £500;[4] however, like many young barristers, he managed to combine journalism with the law. The turn of his professional fortune came when he was appointed "Devil" to the Attorney-General's "Devil," R. S. Wright (afterwards Mr. Justice Wright). He obtained a Scotch seat in Parliament; his maiden speech (March 24th, 1887), said Lord Grey of Falloden, "was listened to as the speech of a leader." The speech was also notable for those effective but rather grandiloquent phrases in the coining of which Asquith was already an adept—"a colossal and disastrous mistake"; "the catchwords of the Metternichs and the Castlereaghs" (names which made every well-principled Liberal shudder); "the more than foolish abominations of Castle rule;" "trial by jury with a doctored and

manipulated panel ; " " this gross caricature of the British Constitution."[1] He was now better known at the Bar ; at the Parnell Commission he cross-examined Macdonald of *The Times* with great skill and effect, and he was briefed in the Dilke Divorce suit and other celebrated cases. Asquith could argue a point of law with great clarity and succinctness, but in addressing a jury he was quite unequal to even the second-rate gladiators of the Common-Law Bar. Sir Horace Davey was said to have spoken at public meetings as if his hearers were all Lords Justices. Asquith, with his air of aloofness and austerity, spoke to juries as an Oxford don might speak to his lecture-room. As a platform speaker, lacking the fire of Gladstone, the robust humour of Harcourt, the vituperative talent of Lord Randolph Churchill and the reckless raillery of Mr. Lloyd George, he never had any popular following ; he despised demagogic arts and refused to cultivate the Press. He was eminently a House of Commons man ; Dilke said he was " one of the greatest Parliamentarians he had even known."[2] Lord d'Abernon emphasizes his veneration for the House, as a consequence of which " he was disposed to rate a brilliant speech above a battle won," and to make " an erroneous estimate of the relative value of words and action."[3] Gladstone promoted him to the Cabinet as Home Secretary contrary to his own rule that a politician should first serve in a minor office.[4] Jowett wrote of him, early in 1893 : " He has the certainty of a great man in him—such strength and simplicity and independence and superiority to the world and the clubs."[5] In May 1894 he married his second wife, Miss Margot Tennant, the daughter of a very wealthy man, a brilliantly clever lady and very notable in London Society. She too was a great friend of Jowett. This marriage probably marked a new stage in Asquith's life.

Haldane has a story of Asquith in his earlier career pointing to the statue of John Bright and saying : " there is the only man in public life who has risen to eminence without being corrupted by London Society."[6] London Society, writes Haldane of Asquith, " came to have a great attraction for him, and he grew by degrees diverted from the sterner outlook on life which he and I for long shared."[7] Whether or not this criticism is just, it may here be not out of place in an Essay on Democracy to notice how certain

democratic leaders were affected by the Court and the Aristocracy and the Plutocracy, those elements of British social life which form a permanent background to the changing political scene. And it is to be remembered that in the first decade of the century the Court was a brilliant Court, and that the long epoch of Victorian stiffness had ended.

The English Aristocracy, writes Mr. Hamilton Fyfe, "made a complete capture of Joseph Chamberlain. It absorbed Asquith. It dazzled Morley. Men who had been steady Radicals, like Bryce and Shaw Lefevre, became Peers. For a time it seemed to cast its noose over Lloyd George. Countless smaller men were netted."[1] There is some foundation for this statement. Chamberlain, once the formidable Republican Mayor of Birmingham, lived to claim that he belonged to the Party of "the gentlemen of England," and to be very much at ease in the ducal society of Chatsworth. John Morley, to whom *The Spectator* had once attributed "a certain austerity," as of a man who

> "' fixed his face
> In many a solitary place
> Against the wind and open sky.'"

and in whom Mrs. Humphry Ward marked "something of the sombre intensity of the prophet,"[2] developed a more mundane disposition. Thomas Hardy saw him at an Academy dinner—"Morley tried to look a regular dining-out man-of-the-world, but really looked what he is by nature, a student."[3] Morley himself describes with relish a gathering at Althorp "of what Burke called the capital people" (namely himself, Gladstone, Spencer, Rosebery and Harcourt), as "like a scene from one of Dizzy's novels."[4] He was entranced by the splendours of Marlborough House, "the glittering silver and glowing gold, the superb flowers and fruit, the colour of ribands, stars, and orders, and the general presence of fame, distinction, greatness of place and power about me."[5] Did such experiences influence his politics? During the Administration of 1892-5 "a lady of quality" told him, "You know what people are beginning to complain of? They say three things. You are too haughty. You are not at heart a real democrat. You are not half ambitious enough."[6] Haldane lamented that Asquith had fallen away from the stern and simple life;

but what about Haldane himself? He too was suspect. Lord Rendel records a conversation with Campbell-Bannerman: "I went further, and said that Haldane and Asquith were both handicapped by their social proclivities, and that, for my part, I sympathized with the distrust and disfavour thus created, and Campbell-Bannerman also agreed with me."[1]

So we get an impression of these leading democrats watching one another to detect those unhealthy symptoms of social ambition, which might not have been considered so discreditable in the case of a Conservative. They would have come up from their provinces, men of strict upbringing, resolved to be incorruptible Tribunes of the People, and then, it may be, their political or literary talents would make them known and popular and give them the *entrée* to great houses. Mr. A. might think Mr. B. to be too "terribly at ease" in this new *milieu*. Mr. C., a rank-and-file politician, might not even receive invitations, and would be all the readier to regard as backsliders those that did. Harcourt described Bishop Wilberforce as "an angel who had been too much about town." This is the sort of view which some Liberals took of other Liberals.

Labour politicians go through the same mellowing process. John Burns in the 'Nineties disdained office. "Office!" he cried with a fine scorn. "I am prouder of my present office, Judge Advocate General of the Poor, than I should be of the Premiership itself!" But in 1905 he became President of the Local Government Board, and (whether or not in that capacity) attended in 1906 the manœuvres on Salisbury Plain; from there he was reported "to have developed advanced Jingo views. . . . He knows the history of every regiment and is 'quite a good fellow.'"[2] Who more bitter and fierce against the existing order than Philip Snowden? Who ever lavished more violent abuse on the Liberal Party in the House of Commons? Yet in due time he actually takes his seat in *the Lords*. "The imposing train appeared: Black Rod; the Garter King-of-Arms, in his quartered coat; the Lord Great Chamberlain, carrying his staff; Lord Lee of Fareham and Lord D'Abernon, the sponsors; and Philip Snowden, in his ermine-barred red robe."[3] In the words of Macaulay, "all the fantastic pomp of heraldry was there." Before long he is admiring the expedition with which the Here-

ditary Chamber gets through its business and " the absence of any talking for mere talking's sake."[1] Precisely the same accusation, of caring too much for country-house society and Aristocracy and pomp and Court uniform, as used to be made against Liberal statesmen of a past generation, is now made by Labour men against Mr. Ramsay MacDonald. In Labour's political circles a tendency to social aspirations is said to be so prevalent that it is known as " the measles," or as " the aristocratic embrace." " It is both infectious and contagious ", (writes one who knows the world of Labour), " and it spread at a devastating speed amongst the wives of middle-aged politicians. A Court function, a dinner with the very wealthy, a week-end at one of England's 'stately homes,' a kind word from a Duke, any of these might bring out a sudden rash, and once the disease has caught hold there is little hope for a complete recovery."[2] And why do Labour leaders thus succumb? Because " they had been introduced to new and interesting sides of life which appealed strongly to them, and even more strongly to their wives—music, painting, good furniture, and the conversation of men who had travelled, who ran large businesses, or who were artists."[3]

The susceptibility of the democrat to these social attractions has always been a favourite subject for the satirist. Keir Hardie saw a danger in it : " We are only guys to them all the time. We must not lose touch with our own folk." And the faithful straight-walking " Comrade " is apt to mourn for his more compliant brother as for a Tannhäuser fast-bound in the Venusberg. But a man would be very strangely and dismally constituted if he proved insensible to the charm of such things as are enumerated by the author just quoted. For it is not only rank and wealth and splendour that weave the spell, but art and music and witty conversation and gracious manners.[4] To taste of all these is a completion of their education for men who have led rigorous and restricted lives—

" Emollit mores, nec sinit esse feros."

And so the old grace and amenities of English society which have lasted through the centuries, though our government meanwhile may have changed from an absolute Monarchy to an almost unfettered Democracy, still make their appeal. They are in effect, fortunately for the country, a more

powerful brake on violent change than the temporary Veto of the House of Lords or any other check that constitution-mongers may devise.

By the time that he became Prime Minister it was said that Asquith, owing to his fondness for society, had lost influence with the Radicals. On this point there is a good deal of not very kind gossip in Wilfrid Blunt's *Diaries*, but Blunt was too fond of gossip to be always reliable.[1] At Asquith's official residence in Downing Street, one afternoon, there was an exhibition of Parisian costumes, which caused some comment. We can imagine the Revd. Dr. Clifford pulling a long face, and no doubt the Nonconformists, who had been distressed by Rosebery's successes on the Turf, were pained by this very harmless display. With a different social outlook, in politics the Prime Minister became less inclined to the Left. "His Radicalism" (writes Mr. Hamilton Fyfe) "was sloughed off as soon as he took office. He stood revealed as a Whig, he was all for caution and moderation."[2] Writing of the year 1914 the same author alleges that "Asquith had grown more and more lethargic, less and less inclined for hard thinking or energetic action."[3] Lord D'Abernon says that he liked to reserve a spare hour in the day for "romantic converse with intellectual and gifted women,"[4] and who would grudge an even moderately-jaded statesman such a solace? He often, when pressed for information, had recourse to the phrase "Wait and see," which was credited to him as original, but had been used by Lord Randolph Churchill in 1886.[5] According to Sir Almeric FitzRoy, who as Clerk to the Privy Council may have had some opportunities of judging, laziness infected nearly the whole of the Cabinet. "With the exception of Haldane and Crewe, and perhaps Lord Morley and the Chancellor, there is not a hard worker amongst them. . . . Disinclination to read Cabinet papers has resulted in a departmental independence not far from ministerial anarchy."[6] And, Campbell-Bannerman being no longer in control, the Cabinet was much more Imperialistic in its outlook.

The Radicals, when they saw their Bills—and especially the Education and Licensing Bills—rejected or mutilated by the Lords, grew more and more impatient and angry. "Our hearts are filled with wrath," said one of the

Ministers. The Government began to divert its attention from what may be called Nonconformist legislation to measures of Social Reform, such as Old Age Pensions and National Insurance; these measures necessitated higher taxation. Mr. Lloyd George, now Chancellor of the Exchequer, who was becoming the prominent figure in the House of Commons and the idol of public meetings, was eager to impose it. "The new Radicalism," said Grant Allen, "is essentially a Celtic product." Mr. Lloyd George was a perfervid Celt, but he had a gift more practical than fervour. In the opinion of Campbell-Bannerman he was "a first-rate negotiator, had a very clear head, and persuasive and conciliatory ways."[1] Asquith, on account of his decreasing energy and increasing Whiggishness, was believed to be losing influence with his followers; he was beginning to be regarded as a figure-head, while Mr. Lloyd George was the driving force. Wilfrid Blunt states that Mr. Winston Churchill claimed that himself and Mr. Lloyd George re-established the Prime Minister's credit by the Budget of 1909,[2] which was designed to finance Radical Social Reform—and incidentally to chastise the brewers for defeating the Licensing Bill of 1908. This celebrated Budget could not have been very agreeable to wealthy Liberals, many of whom sat on the Government benches.[3] Lord Rosebery wrote to the Press: "This is not a Budget but a Revolution, a social and political Revolution of the first magnitude."[4] But it revived the spirits of the Liberal rank and file. "I am an old man," said Dr. Spence Watson (President of the National Liberal Federation 1890-1902), after hearing Mr. Lloyd George's speech at Newcastle, "but I want to say this. Thank God that I have lived to see this day!" (This was the speech that contained the phrase "rare and refreshing fruit.")

Lord Birkenhead writes of Mr. Lloyd George that "his speeches at Newcastle and Limehouse struck out a new view in vituperation, and indeed in vulgar indecorum, on the lips of a responsible Minister."[5] *Audi alteram partem.* Lord Rendel, known as "the Member for Wales," writes to a friend of these speeches: "Some call them scurrilous. But he never hits below the belt. He has chivalry as well as courage. . . . It was rather harsh of him to tilt at the Dukes. Of course there are good and bad Dukes. But there is no Liberal Duke, and it is time to shake up England

a little about Dukes—I let alone Duchesses."[1] Whether or not an orator is scurrilous is a matter of taste; but it is curious to note that in the first decade of this century a Duke was still looked on as enormously wealthy, more wealthy than a financier. There was really no reason why a Duke should be richer, or more opposed to Progress, than a Marquis, but he was—perhaps still is—regarded as on a different foot from a Peer of lesser degree. Gladstone wrote to the Queen (January 1st, 1894): "It is felt that a promotion to a Dukedom is not altogether parallel to other steps in the Peerage."[2] And since, as Lord Rendel remarked, there were now no Liberal Dukes, Mr. Lloyd George ran no risk of offending a magnate of his own Party. So he could amuse hus audiences with Dukes:

Newcastle, October 9th, 1909 "Only one stock has gone down badly—there has been a great slump in Dukes. They used to stand rather high in the market, especially in the Tory market, but the Tory Press has discovered that they are of no value."

"One specially expensive Duke made a speech, and all the Tory Press said, 'Well now, really, is that the sort of thing we are spending £250,000 a year upon?' Because a fully equipped Duke costs as much to keep up as two Dreadnoughts, and they are just as great a terror, and they last longer."

Walworth, December 17th, 1909. "What about the House of Lords? How do they ascertain the wishes of the people? Have you seen any Dukes about the Walworth Road? Before the Budget was thrown out, did any Earls leave their visiting-cards upon you?"

Dukes were almost an obsession to the orator. After denouncing one who was a great ground-landlord, he broke out, "Oh! these Dukes! how they harass us!"[3]

Then as regards Peers generally and landlords and other wealthy persons, and their alleged idleness and luxury, and reluctance to contribute to the cost of Social Reform:—

"Your landlord is a gentleman who does not earn his wealth. His sole function, his chief pride is stately consumption of wealth produced by others."[4]

"They never deposited the coal in the earth. It was not they who planted the great granite rocks in Wales."[5]

"We say, 'only a ha'penny, just a copper.' They retort

'you thieves!' And they turn their dogs on to us, and you can hear their bark every morning."[1]

"No country, however rich, can permanently afford to have quartered upon its revenue a class which declines to do the duty it is called upon to perform in the beginning."[2]

The Peers. "Five hundred men, ordinary men chosen accidentally from among the unemployed."[3]

"And yet here you have an order of men blest with every fortune which Providence can bestow upon them, grudging a small pittance out of their super-abundance in order to protect those who have built up their wealth against the haunting terrors of misery and despair."[4]

"Men, who never knew the sting of poverty, have cruelly, callously, flung out that great humane provision for the sake of the wounded soldier of humanity."

"Why exempt a man from rendering an account of his taxable property, because he has a man to fix his collar and adjust his tie in the morning, a couple of men to carry a boiled egg to him at breakfast, a fourth man to open a door for him, a fifth man to show him in and out of his carriage, and a sixth and seventh to drive him?"[5]

These sallies were extraordinarily popular; they may have been scurrilous, but they were certainly amusing and the speaker was almost as much idolized as a film-star. Asquith was quite incapable of such platform liveliness, and indeed it was not at all according to the Balliol manner.

"Only a ha'penny!" On Mr. Lloyd George's own showing the ha'pennies were going to mount up: "Nine millions for Old Age Pensions. Between one and two millions to bring in the paupers. Three millions for unemployment. Three millions *per annum* for the sick, broken soldier of industry. A provision of eighteen millions. Eighteen millions as a total."[6] This was felt to be of more practical benefit than Licensing or Education Bills. And hundreds of new officials were being appointed to administer the Old Age Pensions Act, the Labour Exchanges Act, the National Insurance Act, and the Finance (1909-10) Act.[7] Between 1909 and 1914 the National expenditure was increased from 149 to 209 millions. Gladstone had truly predicted that "Democracy was going to prove a very costly mistress." But then (said Mr. Lloyd George) there was to be value for the money spent. "I do not say that it will ensure an era of abund-

ance, but it will inaugurate it. I do not say that it is the millenium, but it brings it nearer."[1] There was no doubt about the millenium being attained—sooner or later, for both the speaker and his hearers then believed that the taxation of the rich could be indefinitely increased for the benefit of the poor.

Mr. Spender rightly stated, in the passage which is chosen for the motto to this chapter, that "the results began to flow which the anti-democrats had predicted in 1866 and 1867." Lowe, for instance, had asked: "What man will speak acceptably to them except the man who promised somehow or other to re-distribute the good things of the world more equally so that the poor will get more, and the rich and powerful will get less?"[2] And Mr. Spender's next sentence is equally true: "But the Liberal Party, great as its triumph seemed to be, was no longer the sole exponent of the Progressive cause." There was now another Richmond in the field.

Let Lowe be quoted once again: "The working men of England . . . will awake to a full sense of their power. They will say, 'We can do better for ourselves. Don't let us any longer be cajoled at elections. Let us set up shop for ourselves.'"

How the working men of England gradually contrived to "set up shop for themselves" is the subject of the next chapter. The measures which they took the earliest opportunity of promoting in this Parliament were the reversal of the Taff Vale decision, the Right to Work Bill, the feeding of necessitous School-children and Old Age Pensions. The "instalments" (to use Mr. Hamilton Fyfe's phrase)[3] which they accepted in part payment of their full demands were Old Age pensions (1908), Payment of Members (1911), 1*d.* off Tea and 2*d.* off Sugar, the feeding of School-children, Unemployment and Health Insurance and the Miners' Eight Hours Day. The Labour Party, and also the Radicals, set great store by Payment of Members. Labouchere rightly said in 1884 that this "would do more to democratize our legislation than any other measure that can be conceived."[4] It opened up a career which Lord Salisbury, years before, had prophesied in his bitter way that politicians would seek "for the pay and the journey-money." (The journey-money was added later.) It has greatly affected the character of the House

of Commons. One who has had fifty years' experience of Parliament from the Press Gallery says :

." For a few years there was little or no perceptible change, but some of its results are becoming very apparent. The Socialist Party consists almost entirely of professional politicians ; Liberal representation is tending that way, and it is difficult to see how the Conservative side of the House can avoid infection as times goes on."[1] Scarcely any Member now, of any Party, refuses the salary.

It is more germane to this chapter to observe that, before Campbell-Bannerman had been in office for a twelve-month, Mr. Lloyd George, alarmed at the growing pretensions of the Labour Party, was strenuously—almost pathetically—exerting himself to prove that the Liberal Codlin was the friend, and not the Socialist Short,[2] and that Short could never expect to do anything without the help of Codlin :

" The working man is no fool. He knows that a great Party like ours can, with his help, do things for him which he could not hope to accomplish for himself without its aid. It brings to his assistance the potent influences drawn from the great middle classes of this country, which would be frightened into positive hostility by a purely class organization to which they did not belong. No party could ever hope for success in this country which does not win the confidence of a large portion of the middle class. That is an asset brought by Liberalism to the work of Progress which would never be transferred to a Progressive Party constructed on purely Labour lines, and I would strongly urge the importance of this consideration upon those who would wish to drive Liberalism out in order to substitute another organization."

He said that if farmers and traders " are threatened with a class war then they will surely sulk and harden into downright Toryism."

He asked, " Does anyone believe that within a generation, to put at the very lowest, we are likely to see in power a Party pledged to nationalise land, railways, mines, quarries, factories, workshops, shops, and all and every agency for the production and distribution of wealth ? I say again, within a generation. He who entertains such hopes must indeed be a sanguine and simple-minded Socialist."

He pointed out that Wales already had seven Labour Members or " representatives directly associated with

Labour," a larger proportion than in any other part of the country. "We do not seek the aid of Labour merely to win elections for the Party. We want its assistance to give direction to the policy of Liberalism and to give nerve and boldness to the attack."

All this reads strangely in the light of the twenty years that followed. But if we look at past political history, we may find a curious parallel between the attitude of Liberals to Labour in 1906 and that of Whigs to Radicals in the period between the first and second Reform Bills. Mr. Lloyd George in this speech disclaimed any desire to make the Labour Party "hewers of wood and drawers of water" for the Liberals, and doubtless the old Whigs made similar protestations about the Radicals—in public.[1] But both the Radicals of the 1830's and 1840's and the Labour men of 1906 felt that this was their allotted function. And they resented it, for it is the A.B.C. of Democracy that the men who have the votes shall also have office and power. Mr. Lloyd George said nothing about giving office to a Labour Member; it would have been vain for him to instance the promotion of Mr. John Burns, for Mr. Burns, who had been denounced by Mr. Snowden, was now scarcely regarded by Labour men as one of themselves.[2] But it may have been a conviction of the necessity to bid up to the Socialists that prompted Mr. Lloyd George's "Limehouse" campaign three years later.

The "Votes for Women" agitation, which began to become very loud about the time when Campbell-Bannerman came into office, was not in its essence democratic. It was on quite a different plane from the agitation for the Urban or the Rural Householder's vote. It was not an agitation which ranged the Employer against the Operative, or the Landlord against the Agricultural Labourer; it was a domestic and petty-treasonable revolt of the "Feme" against the "Baron." And, as Mr. Wells wrote in *The New Machiavelli*, "it marked far deeper and wider things than an idle fancy for the Franchise." Gladstone had said in 1864 that every *man* "is morally entitled to come within the pale of the constitution"; but he did not add "and every *woman*." Asquith maintained that no question of Natural Right was involved, for the Women's Vote was contrary to Nature. "Democ-

racy . . . aims at the obliteration of arbitrary and artificial distinctions. Democracy has no quarrel whatever with distinctions which Nature has created and which experience has sanctioned."[1] On another occasion he went further, and argued that the movement was not democratic —" not of the Masses but of the Classes." And he had some grounds, for by this time Miss Christabel Pankhurst had enrolled many aristocratic supporters, and cut her connection with the Labour Party.

But it was a question upon which the democratic politician, and the politician of any Party, had to make up his mind ; for the agitation had continued intermittently since the time of John Stuart Mill, and there was always the possibility—even the probability—that it would finally succeed. In that case what would be the fate of its opposers ? They might look to be politically torn in pieces, as Pentheus was physically torn in pieces by the Bacchic women ; for it was already realized that the women voters would outnumber the men. Therefore the politician who opposed Women's Suffrage needed the courage with which Lowe opposed Household Suffrage. And, whatever its merits, the movement grew to be a very serious embarrassment to the Ministries of Campbell-Bannerman and Asquith. By the year 1907 " Cabinet Ministers had long ceased to address open meetings ; their audiences were now only admitted by ticket "—and even this restriction was not effective.[2] On one occasion a Cabinet Minister had to be protected from female attentions by 200 police.[3]

In the early part of Queen Victoria's reign women were not only excluded from political life but also from the professions. Even authorship was considered unwomanly. Southey wrote to Charlotte Bronte : " Literature cannot be the business of a woman's life and ought not to be."[4] " No woman " (wrote a Saturday Reviewer) " ought to be encouraged in the belief that she should have separate interests or separate duties. God and Nature have merged her existence in that of her husband."[5] The same Journal pronounced in 1878 that " throughout the civilized world the English Parliament would lose in consideration if even one woman sat on it. . . . The world is so ordered that, when things are at their best, men govern with wisdom and women obey with wisdom."[6] Women gradually engaged more and more in literature, and without losing their

characters. "The literary women of the early and middle Nineteenth Century," says Miss Sackville-West, "were quite ordinary women in one way; they were morally respectable. . . . Literature, in fact, was not to be thought unwomanly."[1] Miss Sackville-West then gives the student of social developments a very useful "tip"; "In order to find out what was happening (i.e. to women in the 'Seventies), we will not go to any learned work; no, we will simply open an old volume of *Punch*," and she quotes *Punch's* lines,

"You'll make a woman half a man, the souls of parents vexing
To find that all the gentler sex this process is unsexing."

If we take this advice we shall find that Tenniel (May 28th, 1870) represents Female Suffragists with spectacles and hideous red noses. Du Maurier's Mrs. Witherington Mildew (June 17th, 1871) is stately but formidable, with a wretched little husband; his Miss Gander Bellwether (March 14th, 1874) is a sinister figure, surrounded by weakly "intellectuals." And why should he draw "the gifted authoress of *Heart Throbs*" (April 11th, 1874) as appallingly hideous? Charles Keene is not much more complimentary to the sex in his picture (May 31st, 1873) of Mrs. Dr. Mandragora Nightshade. As to intellect in women the Colonel tells Little Tompkyns: "The less of it in a woman the better, my boy." (November 15th, 1873). Little Tompkyns replies "I've always looked upon Woman as *a mere toy*." The ladies who wanted the Franchise were often alluded to as "The Shrieking Sisterhood."

Towards the end of Queen Victoria's reign women became more and more insistent upon securing both social and political rights. In *The Case of Rebellious Susan* (by Henry Arthur Jones, 1899), we find Elaine Pybus organizing "The Clapham Boadicean Society for the Inculcation of the New Morality amongst the Women of Clapham." "We want freedom," she says, "to develope our real selves." The elder characters in the play condemn her activities. Admiral Sir Joseph Derby: "A woman has no right to shake the foundations of Society in this way." Sir Richard Kato: "Nature's darling woman is a stay-at-home woman, a woman who wants to be a good wife and a good mother."

It is therefore clear that women, in their struggle to attain political and social equality with men, had to contend against tremendous forces of Victorian prejudice, convention

and tradition. They had to reckon with Queen Victoria herself, who denounced "this mad, wicked folly of 'Women's Rights' . . . Lady —— ought to get a *good whipping* . . . God created men and women different—then let them remain each in their own position."[1] It never occurred to the Parliamentary Reformers of 1832 that women should be enfranchised. The Six Points demanded by the Chartists ignored Women's Rights. But women found a champion in John Stuart Mill, who was returned for Westminster in 1865 with Women's Suffrage in his Election Address. In May 1867, when Disraeli's Reform Bill was under discussion, Mill moved a neat Amendment to include women as voters—to substitute the word "Person" for the word "Man." It is very noteworthy that Disraeli left this Amendment an open question, and forbade the Government Whips to tell against it.[2] An excellent summary of Mill's argument may be found in Mr. Punch's *Essence of Parliament* (June 1st, 1867), but Mr. Punch ends playfully, in a tone agreeable to his readers:

"Mr. Mill was pleased, as well he ought to be, at the fearful debility of his opponents, and took the division, which was,

"For the ladies 73
"Against ,, 196

"Majority 123 for keeping you out, dears."

In 1869 Mill published *The Subjection of Women*. A review of this book in *The Athenæum* contained the following: "In their eyes a lover is a hero, a husband is a god. Female Rights! Such rights as they wish for, they have got; for all desires of the female heart begin and end in love."[3] Eve seems to have had the truly womanly disposition—

"My author and disposer! what thou bid'st,
Unargued, I obey; so God ordains:
God is thy law, thou mine: to know no more
Is woman's happiest knowledge, and her praise."

But women did get a vote in 1870, for the Education Act of that year gave them a right to vote—for School Boards. Another doughty champion arose in Dr. Pankhurst, whose programme, when he was a candidate for Manchester in 1883, included Adult Suffrage for both sexes. It is recorded that, when Pankhurst was paying his addresses to his future

wife, "his courtship was mingled with high discourse in which a foremost place was accorded to the legal disabilities of women."[1] In October 1883 when 2000 delegates of Liberal Associations met at Leeds, with John Morley as Chairman, to demand the Franchise Bill, an Amendment to include women as voters was carried with less than thirty dissentients. But Dilke, who had been appointed President of the Local Government Board in 1882, was now the most powerful friend of the cause, Dilke who avowed "I had so strong an opinion in favour of Women's Suffrage that I could not undertake to vote against it, even when proposed as an Amendment to a Government Bill." In 1883 he appointed women as Local Government Board Inspectors.[2] The Local Government Bill of 1884 provided for women Councillors, and Dilke put women on the Metropolitan Asylums Board.[3] By the Local Government Act of 1888 women were enabled to sit on the London County Council; Miss Cons became an Alderman, Lady Sandhurst and Miss Jane Cobden Councillors—all three taking a prominent part in Council work. About this time it was stated that no less than 340 Members for Parliament were pledged to support Votes for Women. The Local Government Act of 1894 admitted women to vote for all local bodies—County, District and Parish. There were many who still maintained that a woman might fitly be allowed to vote at a County Council Election (and even to sit on a County Council), but not at a Parliamentary; just as many persons argue that there is a difference in principle between Municipal and State Socialism. But these distinctions scarcely stand the test of logic.

In Party views there were some cross-currents; but, generally speaking, the Conservatives were against Women's Suffrage. The great majority of Tories agreed with Henry Chaplin, who, on being asked his views at the Wimbledon Election of 1907, replied: "I may be very old-fashioned, but I draw the line at that." The Liberals were more friendly, but Gladstone had no sympathy with the cause. In 1892 he was in trouble with the Women's Liberal Federation. Labouchere's sentiments were the same as Henry Chaplin's: "From the time of Eve till now there has been a distinct difference between men and women. The question is whether the function of electoral power is a function which women would adequately discharge."[4]

And he put forward a weighty practical objection : " I am told that in every county, with the exception of Hampshire, more women would be put on the register than men, if we had Women's Suffrage."[1] He spoke against the Second Reading of the Enfranchisement Bill on May 12th, 1905.[2] Mr. Lloyd George's speeches were much interrupted by women. On one occasion he exclaimed, " I think the gag should be tried. I wonder how much she has been paid for coming here."[3] He was regarded by the women as not to be depended upon, " perpetually at the poles—now the saviour of women, now the contemner."[4] Mr. Winston Churchill, though he had once been struck by an infuriated Suffragette with a riding whip, was of a forgiving nature : " Trust me, ladies, I am your friend, and will be your friend in the Cabinet."[5] Asquith, who in 1892 had demolished a Suffrage Bill " with merciless logic," was for long a very stout opponent of the movement. In December 1910 he said that to grant votes to women would be " a political mistake of a very disastrous kind." In 1914, when interviewed by working-women, he remarked that " if we gave the vote, it must be on the same terms as for men." Miss Christabel Pankhurst noted that " Asquith has advanced from Never to If."[6] He surrendered completely during the War (August 4th, 1916), on the ground that women had earned the vote by their patriotic services—" I say quite frankly that I cannot deny their claim." Later, after his fall from power, he recognized that " some of his friends would say of him that like Stesichorus, his eyes which for years in this matter had been clouded by fallacies and sealed by illusions, at last had been opened to the truth." Thus Asquith, like Stesichorus, sang his palinode.

With Labour the movement had early associations. In 1889 there was in existence the Women's Franchise League, which supported Trade Unionism and advocated (*inter alia*) the abolition of the House of Lords. In September 1894 Dr. Pankhurst, a great leader of the movement, joined the Independent Labour Party. Lady Dilke founded a Women's Trade Union League whose members rapidly increased in number from 7,000 to 70,000, and it was owing to their efforts that the anti-Sweating Bill was passed.[7] The leaders of the Labour Party were not of one mind. Mr. Snowden, about 1903, was not only indifferent to the cause, but actually hostile ;[8] later on he became a supporter. Miss

Bondfield, in the early part of her career, deprecated Votes for Women as "the hobby of disappointed old maids."[1] Mr. Lloyd George was of opinion that the men of the working-classes feared a preponderance of women's votes. It was the ruthless activity of the Women's Social and Political Union that compelled politicians of all shades of opinion to define their views, and sometimes to recant them.

The W.S.P.U. was formed in 1903. In 1906-7 it had an income of £7000; in 1910-11 of £32,000, with 110 salaried officials and a Headquarters with 37 rooms. At first it was looked on as part of the Labour Movement, and it used to promote such causes as the protection of Natal natives and the mitigation of unemployment. It was Christabel Pankhurst who insisted on a Concentration upon the winning of Women's Rights. The Union from the first received the support of Keir Hardie, and his attachment to the cause was resented by the Labour Party. After a time the W.S.P.U. broke with the Labour Party and enlisted many wealthy supporters. In 1912 there was a split between the Militants and Moderates. The Militants committed every kind of excess, and of folly. Mr. H. W. Nevinson, a friend of the movement, said that "the whole Militant Suffrage movement was a well defined example of group neurosis" and a subject for study by social psychologists.[2] The disturbances began at the famous Albert Hall Meeting in December 1905, when the disturbers were thrown out. In 1908 two women chained themselves to the railings of the Prime Minister's house in Downing Street; stones were flung through his windows; a woman chained herself to the *grille* of the Ladies Gallery in the House of Commons; another carried a dog-whip with which to assault prominent politicians; another, where Haldane was speaking, "brandishing a hatchet, high up among the chimney-stacks, tore up slates and hurled them clattering on the roof of the hall"; well-dressed women smashed shop-windows. Worse things followed. Arson was secretly organized; there was an attempt to burn Nuneham House in Oxfordshire; a hatchet was thrown into Asquith's carriage; pictures in the Manchester Gallery were hacked; there was a conspiracy to blow up Lloyd George's house, for which Mrs. Pankhurst was condemned to three years' penal servitude; a woman threw herself in front of the horses running in the Derby and was killed; in 1913 there were hundreds of fires; in

1914 three castles were burnt in Scotland, and a bomb was placed in Westminster Abbey. Many other terrible outrages were committed. The Pankhurst sisters fell apart. Christabel excluded Sylvia's East London organization as plebeian. She "now hinged the greater part of her propaganda upon the supposed great prevalence of venereal diseases and the sex excesses of men. 'Votes for women and chastity for men' became her favourite slogan." She sought to dissuade women from marriage; women were pure, men in great need of purification. Militancy ended when the War began. Christabel was strong on the German Peril; Northcliffe said she ought to be in the Cabinet. Sylvia was against Conscription, and was repudiated by her mother who helped in recruiting.[1] Sylvia moved to the Left. "Under the leadership of Miss Sylvia Pankhurst, the Women's Suffrage Federation became the Worker's Socialist Federation, and the title of the official paper was changed from the 'Women's' to the 'Workers' Dreadnought.'"[2] She writes to the London Workers' Committee: "We think it important that the Soviet System of Government should be more considered and discussed in the Socialist Movement, and we therefore propose to organize a meeting to advocate Industrial Government and the Abolition of Parliament."[3]

If there had been no Great War, would women now be in enjoyment of the vote? Probably; for a very great legitimate pressure could have been exercised upon politicians (including that which would have proceeded from their wives and other female relatives). But it is unlikely that the British Parliament would have been coerced and overawed by cruel and criminal acts, which can only be palliated on the theory that those who were guilty of them were the victims of an epidemical hysteria. The inclusion of women "within the pale of the Constitution" was not a victory won *by* Democracy, for it was advocated by men and women of all Parties. But it was an enormous extension *of* Democracy. Austen defined Democracy as "any Government in which the governing body "is a comparatively large fraction of the whole nation." The Acts of 1917 and 1928 have added about 16 millions of women voters to the Register.

The turbulence of women, the pretensions of Labour,

and the disappointment of Nonconformists were causes of serious anxiety to Asquith's Government ; but the rejection by the Lords of Mr. Lloyd George's 1909 Budget invited concentration on a campaign in which, as in Sir Robert Walpole's post-prandial conversation, " everybody could join "—Liberals, Radicals, Imperialists, Little Englanders, Irishmen, Labour men and impatient Nonconformists. The reform or abolition of the House of Lords had long been advocated by advanced Liberals ; and indeed a Hereditary Chamber was clearly incompatible with Democracy. In 1868 Bradlaugh had proposed the removal of the Bishops, whose legislative function was naturally repugnant to an Atheist. In 1882 a Radical group, which included Chamberlain, John Morley and Shaw Lefevre, proposed abolition. Reform was part of the Newcastle Programme of 1891. Dilke's Radical Club in 1906 was for a restriction of powers or a Single Chamber. Asquith himself was in favour of a Second Chamber ; he admitted that " in a democratic country such a Chamber is needed." Reform was a problem on whose solution the Constitution-mongers could never agree. Some were for a Chamber of life-Peers ; some for a limited number of Peers to be nominated by the Crown ; some for a Chamber of experienced executive officers ; some for a Senate representative of different districts, and so forth. Lord Rendel wrote with perspicacity :

" How anyone can suppose that a mongrel House of Lords will take with the country I cannot understand. Representation it understands. Heredity it understands. But a jumble of both with exhausted bureaucrats and decayed or extinct ' men of mark ' will prove a Variety Show lamentably short of popular favour or acceptance."[1]

Asquith was wise in choosing the simpler solution of restriction of powers, and indefinitely postponing reform to a more convenient season. He proposed to leave to the Lords " the functions of initiation, revision, and, subject to proper safeguards, of delay." He often repeated this phrase, almost as if it were an incantation.[2]

Generally the House of Lords knew when it was wise to give way. Lord Salisbury, for instance, advised them against the rejection of Irish Disestablishment. He did this from policy ; for in reality he held the Burkian doctrine that the Lords themselves were representative :[3] " the House of

Lords, though not an elective, is strictly a representative assembly, and it does, in point of fact, represent very large classes in the country."[1] In 1880 the Lords threw out the Compensation for Disturbances Bill, and this caused very little excitement. In 1884 they rejected the Reform Bill (Second Reading) by a majority of 61, and thereby gained their point that Redistribution and Reform should be parts of the same settlement. They rejected many Government Bills in Gladstone's last Administration (1892-4) including the Home Rule Bill. Gladstone's last speech in the House of Commons (March 1st, 1894) was "a vigorous assault upon the House of Lords."[2] He said :

"The issue which is raised between a deliberative assembly, elected by the votes of more than 6,000,000 people, and a deliberative assembly occupied by many men of virtue, by many men of talent, of course with considerable diversities and varieties, is a controversy which, when once raised, must go forward to an issue."[3] Rosebery, who had tried in vain to induce the Lords to reform themselves,[4] wrote to the Queen (April 7th, 1894) : "When the Conservative Party is in power there is no House of Lords : it takes whatever the Conservative Government brings it from the House of Commons without question or dispute ; but the moment a Liberal Government is formed, this harmless body assumes an active life, and its activity is entirely exercised in opposition to the Government."[5] The Queen replied in her crashing style : "Some day even Lord Rosebery may be thankful for the power and independence of the Peers." He wrote again to her (October 26th, 1894) that he had "long believed that the House of Lords, as at present constituted, cannot continue to exist,"[6] and (on November 8th) that nearly half the Cabinet were in favour of a Single Chamber.[7] The Radical policy of "filling up the cup" was a failure. The country manifested no resentment against the Lords because of their rejection of Home Rule and other Liberal measures, for in 1895 it returned 411 Unionists and only 259 Liberals and Home Rulers ; and, for the next ten years, the Unionists being in power, the House of Lords was left in peace. The Liberal Lords were now a very small minority. In 1884, at the Second Reading of the Reform Bill, the numbers were Liberals 146, Conservatives 205. When the Lords rejected the Home Rule Bill in 1893, the vote was Liberals 41, Unionists 419.

In 1910 out of 600 Peers there were 26 Bishops and about 500 Tories.[1]

The question became very acute again soon after Campbell-Bannerman had taken office. The Lords killed the Plural Voting Bill, " severely mauled " the Agricultural Holdings Bill and the Irish Town Tenants' Bill, made vital Amendments in the Education Bill, and rejected the Licensing Bill. " The shadow of the Lords was over every proposal."[2] This opposition was harming the *morale* of the Liberal Party. Already, said Mr. Lloyd George,[3] " there are hosts of unreasonable people irritated and impatient and threatening to remove their custom to some other store. . . . We would have done more but for the malignant destructiveness of the House of Lords." So when the Lords actually did " fill up the cup " by throwing out the Budget, every warrior in the army of Progress buckled on his armour. The Nonconformist leader, Dr. Clifford, was " in the midst of the fight."[4] Mr. Lloyd George declaimed against " the sinister assembly "[5] and " an effete oligarchy."[6] A few Lords might be excepted, but " the rest of them are of no more use than broken bottles on a park wall to keep off poachers."[7] After the Election of January 1910 " 40 members of the Labour Party announced with threats to Mr. Asquith that they stood, not for the reform, but for the abolition of the House of Lords."[8] The Irishmen were only too eager to destroy any obstacle to Home Rule.

Here was an issue very attractive to the genius of Asquith, and on which he could exercise his sonorous eloquence and exhibit his lore of the Constitution. Who but Asquith could have argued for the rights of the Commons in such concise but weighty sentences and phrases, with their heavy adornment of Latinate words? He went back to Pym and Selden and Somers; he went still further back to 1628, even since which year " this House has asserted its exclusive right to determine the taxation and the expenditure of the nation."[9] Authentically Asquithian too are the following passages :

" One of the most absurd contentions that was ever advanced by a bankrupt controversialist."

" We shall ask the constituencies of the country (cheers and counter-cheers) to declare that the organ and voice of the free people of this country is to be found in the elected representatives of the nation."

"This is the body, hereditary in origin, except so far as its composition is tempered by the sporadic action of the Ministers of the day (laughter and cheers), irresponsible in the exercise of its powers, overwhelmingly partisan in its actual composition."

"The considered and deliberate decision of the elected representatives of the people."

"Their ancient constitutional supremacy over all matters of national finance."

"The most stupendous act of political blindness that has ever been perpetrated."

"An irresponsible and indissoluble authority, increasingly actuated by the most naked partisanship."

Great was the enthusiasm excited by these speeches. More than once we read that the peroration was followed by "loud cheers, a number of Ministerialists standing in their places and waving their hats and order-papers." A sort of ultimatum was presented to King George on November 15th, 1910, the Ministers advising him to create new Peers if the occasion arose.[1] In the following year the Lords gave way; the Veto Bill was passed.

So Asquith, who was supposed by some to have become lethargic and to have lost much of his democratic energy, achieved the triumph of his career and made history. He did something more than pass a Reform Bill; he altered the balance of our Constitution. (According to Balfour he dealt it "a felon stroke"). The Lords were deprived of any power to interfere with "Money" Bills. Their Veto was reduced to a temporary Veto. In order to make our Constitution wholly democratic, it only now remained to remove the Veto altogether, and then to abolish the Monarchy.

It is, however, noteworthy that the chief offence of the Lords was their rejection of Mr. Lloyd George's Land Value Duties. This rejection may have been unconstitutional, but the wisdom of the Lords was certainly justified by the event. "The author of these taxes" (writes Mr. Harold Cox)[2] "promised that they would pay for Dreadnoughts and Old Age Pensions. As a matter of fact, they paid for nothing—not even the salaries of the vast army of officials employed to collect them. They were finally abolished, with the consent of Mr. Lloyd George himself, after they had involved the nation in a net loss of over £3,000,000."

NOTES TO
THE LIBERAL REVIVAL

Page 235.
[1] *Letters of Queen Victoria* (1886-90), p. 42.
Page 236.
[1] Disraeli called Mill, one of Morley's heroes, " the finishing governess."
[2] *Life*, Vol. I, p. 97.
Page 237.
[1] *Life*, Vol. I, p. 186.
[2] When Mundella also was " converted " to Home Rule, C. B. said, " you are just in the position of a man who in the language of the Salvation Army has ' found Jesus.' "
[3] Labouchere wrote to a friend (November, 1905) : " Campbell-Bannerman is now absolutely certain to be the next Premier unless his health breaks down " (Labouchere's *Life*, p. 469). The King thought that Campbell-Bannerman in his talk was better than in his speeches (Haldane's *Autobiography*, p. 168).
[4] Rosebery's *Life*, Vol. I, p. 204.
[5] *Memoir of J. E. C. Bodley* (Shane Leslie), p. 45.
[6] *Punch*, December 20th, 1905.
[7] *Life of Dilke*, Vol. II, p. 552.
Page 238.
[1] Campbell-Bannerman's *Life*, Vol. II, p. 41. (Lord Shaw is given as the authority for this).
[2] *R. B. Haldane, an Autobiography*, pp. 157-8.
[3] *Life*, Vol. II, p. 4.
[4] *Ib*, p. 406.
Page 239.
[1] *The World Crisis* (1911-14), p. 30.
[2] *England under Edward VII*, p. 147 (quoted in *The Pre-War Mind*, p. 257.
Page 240.
[1] *R. B. Haldane, an Autobiography*, p. 175.
[2] *Twenty-Five Years*, 1892-1916, Vol. I, p. 63.
[3] *The Personal Papers of Lord Rendel*, p. 171.
[4] One was to the air of " Poor Old Joe " :—
" Gone are the days when I beat my little drum ;
Gone are the days when I made the bullets hum," etc., etc.
The organ was played by a Liberal candidate.
[5] *The Times*, December 22nd, 1905.
Page 241.
[1] *The Pre-War Mind in Great Britain*, p. 217.
[2] *Fifty Years of Parliament* (Earl of Oxford and Asquith), Vol. II, p. 31.
[3] In 1868 the Liberal majority was 112.
1874. 350 Conservatives, 245 Liberals, 57 Home Rulers.
1880. 347 Liberals, 240 Conservatives, 65 Home Rulers.
1885. 334 Liberals, 250 Conservatives, 86 Home Rulers.
1886. 316 Conservatives, 196 Liberals, 74 Liberal Unionists, 86 Home Rulers.
1892. 274 Liberals and Labour, 269 Conservatives, 46 Liberal Unionists, 81 Home Rulers.

1895. 411 Unionists, 259 Liberals and Home Rulers.
1900. 334 Conservatives, 68 Liberal Unionists, 168 Liberals and Labour, 82 Home Rulers.
1910. January—275 Liberals, 273 Unionists, 82 Home Rulers, 40 Labour.
1910. December—272 Liberals, 272 Unionists, 84 Home Rulers, 40 Labour.

Page 242.

[1] 1931. For National Government, 555; Against, 58; Majority, 497.
[2] *Life*, Vol. II, p. 471.
[3] *Last Essays* (1930), p. 6.
[4] *Ib.*, p. 166.
[5] *Life of Sir Michael Hicks Beach*, Vol. II, p. 224.
[6] *Twenty-Five Years* (1892-1916), Vol. I, p. 66.

Page 243.

[1] *Hansard*, March 12th, 1906.
[2] Campbell-Bannerman's *Life*, Vol. II, p. 184. Rosebery's *Life*, Vol. II, p. 593.
[3] *Nonconformists and the Education Act* (*The Nineteenth Century*, January, 1903).
[4] *The Eighteen Seventies*, p. 225.

Page 244.

[1] *A Writer's Recollections* (Mrs. Humphry Ward), p 105.
[2] *Ib.*, p. 133.
[3] Campbell-Bannerman's *Life*, Vol. I, p. 264.
[4] *Autobiography*, p. 114.
[5] Mr. Wells has said: "They are not the Webbs, but only Webby people."
[6] *Anthony Trollope* (Hugh Walpole), p. 120.

Page 245.

[1] When Lord Maxwell calls on Marcella to make her an offer of marriage he begins: "I trust I am not late. Your clocks, I think, are ahead of ours. You said eleven?" (*Marcella*, p. 556).

Page 246.

[1] *The New Machiavelli*, p. 314. Another remarkable maiden speech was made that night by Mr. F. E. Smith, of which Mr. Snowden himself said: "Every sentence was like the sting of a scorpion. As an effort of sustained smartness I have never heard it equalled." (*Philip Snowden*, by C. E. Bechofer Roberts, p. 126).

Page 247.

[1] *Hansard*, March 12th, 1906.
[2] *The British Liberal Party*, p. 232.
[3] *Memoir of J. E. C. Bodley*, p. 33.
[4] *My Diaries* (Wilfrid Blunt), Vol. II, p. 225.

Page 248.

[1] In a speech of August 8th, 1892, we have: "this disintegrating and anarchical doctrine"; "this fantastic development of an abstract separatist logic"; "an accidental and ephemeral combination," etc., etc.
[2] Dilke's *Life*, Vol. II, p. 551.
[3] *Portraits and Appreciations*, p. 67.
[4] Gladstone had enforced this rule against Rosebery, but was constrained to make Chamberlain an exception. Rosebery (*Life*, Vol. II, p. 391) said that in May, 1892, he (Gladstone) was averse to giving Cabinet office to Asquith.
[5] *The Autobiography of Margot Asquith*, p. 126.
[6] *Richard Burdon Haldane, an Autobiography*, p. 104.
[7] *Ib.*, p. 103.

Page 249.
[1] *The British Liberal Party*, p. 232.
[2] Morley's *Recollections*, Vol. I, p. 315. Morley asks, "Is this from *Peter Bell*?" The answer is in the affirmative.
[3] *A Writer's Recollections*, p. 183. *Early Life of Thomas Hardy*, p. 261. (Morley himself defined a Man of the World as "the greatest enemy of the World").
[4] *Recollections*, Vol. I, p. 293.
[5] *Ib.*, p. 270.
[6] *Ib.*, Vol. II, p. 46. (Morley observes on this, "Who knows?").

Page 250.
[1] *Personal Papers of Lord Rendel*, p. 167.
[2] *My Diaries* (Wilfrid Blunt), Vol. II.
[3] *The Morning Post*, November 26th, 1931.

Page 251.
[1] *House of Lords*, March 17th, 1932.
[2] *The Mugwumps and the Labour Party* (G. T. Garratt), p. 103.
[3] *Ib.*, p. 82.
[4] "To me, and I think to others, comfort, beauty and manners seem to be things specially worth having, and our sympathy is alienated by those who reject them as something unclean." (Letter to *The New Statesman and Nation*, May 7th, 1932).

Page 252.
[1] See, for instance, Frederic Whyte's *Life of W. T. Stead*, Vol. I, p. 79.
[2] *The British Liberal Party*, p. 134.
[3] *Ib.*, p. 198.
[4] *Portraits and Appreciations*, p. 70.
[5] *Speeches*, Vol. II, p. 95. "As to our measures, let our opponents 'wait and see.'"
[6] See *The Pre-War Mind of Great Britain*, p. 400.

Page 253.
[1] *The Personal Papers of Lord Rendel*, p. 173. Asquith said of him: "he was very good where he was good, but that he never looked at a figure, and could not be made to do so." *Ib.*, p. 179.
[2] *Wilfrid Blunt's Diaries*, Vol. II, p. 278.
[3] "As a matter of fact, the richest men in the House of Commons—I only mention the fact—happen to sit on the Liberal side of the House." Mr. Lloyd George at Newcastle, October 9th, 1909. (*Speeches*, Vol. IV, p. 688).
[4] *Life*, Vol. II, p. 621.
[5] *Last Essays*, p. 7.

Page 254.
[1] *Personal Papers of Lord Rendel*, p. 234.
[2] *Letters of Queen Victoria* (1891-5), p. 346.
[3] *Speeches*, Vol. IV, p. 683. Mr. Snowden tried more than 20 years later to revive this animosity when introducing a Land Tax—"the land not being given by the Creator for the use of Dukes" but times had altered and this shaft was ineffective.
[4] Limehouse, July 30th, 1909.
[5] *Ib.*

Page 255.
[1] *Ib.*
[2] *Ib.*
[3] Newcastle, October 9th, 1909.
[4] National Liberal Club, December 3rd, 1909.
[5] Carnarvon, December 9th, 1909.
[6] Reading, January 1st, 1910.
[7] City Liberal Club. February 3rd, 1912.

Page 256.
[1] Kennington, July 13th, 1912.
[2] House of Commons, May 20th, 1867.
[3] *The British Liberal Party*, p. 177.
[4] *Radicals and Whigs* (*The Fortnightly Review*, February, 1884).

Page 257.
[1] Mr. R. G. Emery (*The Morning Post*, January 12th, 1931).
[2] Cardiff, October 11th, 1906. (*Speeches*, Vol. IV).

Page 258.
[1] As to their private estimate of Radicals, see *The Transition from Aristocracy*, pp. 150-1.
[2] " Even then (1906) Burns, who had great oratorical gifts, but not much knowledge, was beginning to be out of date with Labour." (*Richard Burdon Haldane, an Autobiography*, p. 214).

Page 259.
[1] House of Commons, May 6th, 1913.
[2] *The Suffragette Movement* (Sylvia Pankhurst), p. 275.
[3] *Ib.*, p. 366.
[4] Gladstone's *Life*, Vol. II, p. 538.
[5] *The Saturday Review*, February 14th, 1857 (quoted in *Jane Welsh and Jane Carlyle*, p. 185).
[6] See *Victoriana* (Barber and Sitwell), p. 119. See also *The Transition from Aristocracy* (1832-67), pp. 237-9.

Page 260.
[1] *The Eighteen Seventies*, pp. 112-3.

Page 261.
[1] See *The Transition from Aristocracy* (1832-67), p. 239.
[2] Dilke's *Life*, Vol. II, p. 6.
[3] See *Victoriana* (Barber and Sitwell), p. 110.

Page 262.
[1] *The Suffragette Movement* (Sylvia Pankhurst), p. 56.
[2] Sir William Harcourt refused to follow this example at the Home Office, but Asquith appointed them in that department in 1895.
[3] Dilke's *Life*, Vol. II, pp. 13, 17.
[4] Labouchere's *Life*, p. 222.

Page 263.
[1] *Ib.*, p. 223.
[2] *Ib.*, p. 468.
[3] *The Suffragette Movement*, p. 287.
[4] *Ib.*, p. 298.
[5] *Ib.*, p. 371.
[6] *Ib.*, p. 574.
[7] Dilke's *Life*, Vol. II, p. 552.
[8] *The Suffragette Movement*, p. 167.

Page 264.
[1] *Ib.*, p. 178.
[2] See *The Pre-War Mind of Great Britain*, p. 288.

Page 265.
[1] See *The Suffragette Movement*, pp. 193-591.
[2] *The Morning Post*, October 23rd, 1931.
[3] *Ib.*

Page 266.
[1] To Sir Stafford Howard (*Personal Papers of Lord Rendel*, p. 237).
[2] Another form of it was " the functions of revision and consultation, and, if need arose, of reasonable delay."
[3] " So is the other branch of our public council, I mean the House of Lords. With us the King and the Lords are several and joint securities for the equality of each district, each province, each city. When did you hear in Great Britain of any province suffering from the inequality of its representation ; what district

from having no representation at all? Not only our monarchy and our peerage secure the equality on which our unity depends, but it is the spirit of the House of Commons itself." (*Reflections on the Revolution in France*, Vol. II, p. 548. Bohn.).

Page 267.

[1] *Life*, Vol. II, p. 28.
[2] *Life*, Vol. III, p. 511.
[3] *Ib.*, p. 512.
[4] In 1910 he moved a Resolution, "that the possession of a peerage should not of itself give the right to sit and vote," and carried it by 175 to 16. (Rosebery's *Life*, Vol. II, p. 629).
[5] *Ib.*, p. 451.
[6] *Letters of Queen Victoria* (1891-5), p. 429.
[7] *Ib.*, p. 447.

Page 268.

[1] So estimated by Lord Oxford (*Fifty Years of Parliament*, Vol. II, p. 41).
[2] *Life of Campbell-Bannerman*, Vol. II, p. 346.
[3] At Swansea, October 1st, 1908 (*Speeches*, Vol. IV, p. 638).
[4] *Life of Dr. Clifford*, p. 130.
[5] *Speeches*, Vol. IV, p. 697.
[6] *Ib.*, p. 710.
[7] *Ib.*, p. 706.
[8] *St. Loe Strachey, His Life and His Paper*, p. 226.
[9] *House of Commons*, December 2nd, 1909.

Page 269.

[1] *Fifty Years of Parliament* (Lord Oxford and Asquith), Vol. II, pp. 90-1.
[2] *The Sunday Times*, May 15th, 1932.

THE ADVENT OF THE LABOUR PARTY

" The working-men of England . . . will awake to a full sense of their power. They will say, ' we can do better for ourselves. Don't let us be any longer cajoled at elections. Let us set up shop for ourselves.' "—Robert Lowe (House of Commons, March 13th, 1866).

" When Mr. Gladstone, with true political prescience, announced that the conflict was between the Classes and the Masses, the middle-class Liberal hailed the declaration with joy, forgetting that he himself was one of the Classes."—Sidney Webb (*Wanted a Programme*, 1888).

" Labour realizes that it now possesses political power to such an extent as to make it independent of either Party in the State. . . . We are now come, or are coming fast, to a time when Labour laws will be made by the Labour interest for the advantage of Labour."—Lord Randolph Churchill (*Letter to Arnold White*, 1892).

" The Liberal Party may through some of its members find itself permanently connected with hostility to property in all its forms. If so, I venture to predict that, at no distant time, it will find itself squeezed out between Socialism and Conservatism."—Lord Rosebery, 1907.

Cranborne in favour of Labour M.P.'s 1866—Dilke supports Odger—Alexander Macdonald—Burt—Broadhurst—Chamberlain's support—Gladstone on Labour representation and Parliamentary expenses—" Lib-Labs "—Parliaments of 1895, 1900, 1906—Subsequent Parliaments—The N.L.F. 1877—Chamberlain's view changes 1900—Joseph Arch—Henderson, MacDonald, Snowden—Labour becomes independent—Keir Hardie—The Newcastle Conference 1903—Mr. Lloyd George and Socialists—Dilke and Labour men—Partly a religious movement—Labour Teetotallers—Trades-Unionists and Intellectuals—State Socialists—The S.D.F.—Sidney Webb, Bernard Shaw, their permeating policy—The I.L.P.—Conversions to Socialism—Mrs. Webb's development—Sympathy with the poor—Degrading conditions of life—Hopes of a Golden Age—Intellectuals and Trades Unionists Combine—The Taff-Vale judgment—The Trade Disputes' Act—A Liberal surrender—The Osborne judgment—Payment of Members—Views of Gladstone and others thereon—New paths to Parliament—New democratic spirit—Socialism condemned by Gladstone and others—Socialists and Communists—Asquith and Socialism—The Monarchy, Aristocracy and Middle Classes affected by Democracy—Apprehensions of War—Conscriptionists and Pacifists.

THE working-men of England did in the end, as Lowe had prophesied, determine to " set up shop for themselves." But some years were to pass before any of them found their way into Parliament (" the talking-shop " as it was sometimes called) ; and, having so far succeeded, they had still to serve a long apprenticeship as shop-assistants. But, before our period ended, they had gained a considerable control of the business.

Lord Cranborne, in 1866, said he would be glad to see working-men in the House of Commons : " I believe that the natural leaders of the working classes—the prominent men among them—would make better representatives than some persons of a higher class who, for reasons best known to themselves, desire to identify themselves with those classes."[1] In 1868 J. R. Green supported a working-man as candidate for the Tower Hamlets. In 1869 Dilke supported Odger as a Labour candidate for Southwark. Dilke's opinion was that working-men " should not make themselves too much the slaves of any political party, but should take care of the means of seeking representatives in Parliament."[2] It was not till 1874 that two working-men were elected—Alexander Macdonald for Morpeth, and Thomas Burt for Stafford ; both were officials of the Miners' Union, and were brought in by the Labour Reform League which was founded by Radicals in 1869.[3] They were considered to be members of the Liberal Party.

In 1880 there were returned Henry Broadhurst (Stoke-upon-Trent) and Burt—" that perfect gentleman," as Lord Gladstone calls him.[4] Burt excused himself from staying with the Prince of Wales because he had no dress-clothes ; but he did wear a top-hat (*Punch*, August 27th, 1887). Gladstone wrote to the Queen (February 1st, 1881) about Forster's Coercion Bill : " Mr. Broadhurst, a working-man, and one of the representatives of his class, delivered a manly speech, highly honourable to his character, in support of the Bill."[5] He was classified by Dod, with Chamberlain, Dilke and others, as a Radical.[6] Lord Randolph Churchill in 1883 said that he hoped before long to see Tory working-men in Parliament, but Burt was of opinion that a Tory working-man must be " either a fool or a flunkey."

In 1885 Chamberlain spoke at Birmingham in favour of Labour representation. He thought Burt and Broadhurst ought to have more colleagues, and—as a corollary—supported Payment of Members. Twelve working-men candidates were successful at the General Election in November and December, including Joseph Arch. Queen Victoria spoke of them to Goschen as " good men but very ignorant."[7] They were classed as " Gladstonians." Lord Oxford writes of them as a group with no parliamentary organisation.[8]

On October 2nd, 1891, in his Newcastle speech, Gladstone

(not very enthusiastically it would seem) spoke in favour of more working-men M.P.'S :

"There ought to be a great effort of the Liberal Party to extend their (*sic*) Labour representation in Parliament. . . . Let us give scope and room enough to choose a few more men, who, I doubt not, will be of the same kind. I say a few—I hope they will not be a very few, but a good many, and I believe that that sentiment is a sentiment that the whole Liberal Party entertains." He said that the sentiment should be encouraged at Liberal headquarters. He recognized what this entailed. "Are they to be fined for conferring this boon upon the public ? . . . Men whose private means are inadequate to the performance of the public duty put upon them," ought to receive such aid from the public treasury as would enable them to fulfil it. In 1892 there were again twelve Labour M.P.'s, praised by Viscount Gladstone as "the most stable and reliable element of *the Liberal Party*."[1] These were "Lib-Lab" Trade Unionists. There were also three Independents—John Burns, Keir Hardie and Howell Wilson ; Lord Oxford writes that Burns and Keir Hardie had "no Liberal affiliations."[2] There was also Mr. Cunninghame Graham, a free-lance. In 1895 there were 28 I.L.P. candidates who were all defeated ; these included G. N. Barnes, Keir Hardie, Ramsay MacDonald, Tom Mann, Dr. Pankhurst and Ben Tillett. John Burns, Havelock Wilson and 10 "Lib.-Lab." M.P.'s were returned. In 1900 out of 15 candidates who stood under the auspices of the Labour Representative Committee only two were returned—Keir Hardie (Merthyr) and Richard Bell (Derby). In this Parliament there were three Labour M.P.'s and nine "Lib.-Labs."

In 1906 the Labour Party in the House of Commons may be said to have come into existence. "The really important thing connected with the Election" (writes Labouchere to Edward Thornton) "is the rise of a Labour Party. I do not think, however, that there are above six M.P.'s returned who are *bona-fide* Socialists, and they are all jealous of each other."[3] He under-estimated the Socialists. In all the Party numbered 53. Of these 24 were allied to the Liberals—"to all intents and purposes Liberals" (writes Lord Oxford) ; of these 14 were miners who sat with the Liberals, and the rest were survivors of the "Lib.-Labs."[4]

The 29 Socialists, who were led by Keir Hardie, were nominees of the L.R.C.; amongst them were Ramsay MacDonald (whom Chamberlain congratulated on his maiden speech), J. R. Clynes, Philip Snowden and Arthur Henderson.

In the Election of January 1910, 40 Labour M.P.'s were returned; in that of December 1910, 42. The results of subsequent Elections were as follows:

1918 70 Labour M.P.'s.
1922 143
1923 191 (A Labour Government then came into office.)
1924 151
1929 284, of whom more than 150 were Trade Unions nominees—mostly Trade Unions officials. (A second Labour Government came into office.)
1931 52.

It is to be noted that the Labour Party was not represented at the Constitutional Conference of 1910, nor at the Home Rule Conference of July 1914.

For long the Labour men were no more than a wing of the Liberal Party; they were the left wing, just as the Whigs had been the right. Radicals founded the Labour Reform League in 1869 which brought Macdonald and Burt into Parliament in 1874. The Trade Unionists were for many years reluctant to start an independent Party, though they occasionally kicked against the Liberals; in 1874, for instance, their leaders directed them to vote against Liberal candidates, in revenge for Gladstone's lukewarmness about the legalization of picketing.[1] The first meeting of the National Liberal Federation (May 1877), which had Gladstone's support, encouraged working-class representation both in Parliament and on Municipal Councils and helped Broadhurst to become M.P. for Stoke. Chamberlain, we have seen, supported this movement in 1885; but in 1900 he had changed his view. He said that since 1875 "not a single one of those gentlemen (the Labour M.P.'s) had ever initiated or ever carried legislation for the benefit of the working classes. But they have hindered it occasionally. . . . When they come into Parliament they are like fish out of water; their only use

is as items in a voting machine." He made this attack in the middle of the Boer War (September 29th, 1900), and the Labour M.P.'s were all "pro-Boers."

Joseph Arch was President of the Birmingham Radical Union in 1883 and visited Gladstone at Hawarden in 1884. He had trained his mind on the speeches of Gladstone and Bright. In *Punch* (February 13th, 1886) there is a picture of a newly-elected Labour M.P. welcoming his friends: over his mantelpiece is the portrait of Gladstone, and the M.P. himself wears a frock-coat and a Gladstonian collar and tie. Up to the later 'Eighties both Ramsay MacDonald and Keir Hardie believed there was still a place for Labour in the Liberal Party.[1] Ramsay MacDonald was for a time Secretary to Thomas Lough, who became a Liberal M.P., and it was not till 1894 that he finally despaired of Liberalism and offered his services to Keir Hardie. Arthur Henderson has been a Liberal agent, and he supported Sir Christopher Furness in a bye-election in 1897. Keir Hardie, Ramsay MacDonald and Arthur Henderson, all, at one time or another, wished to stand as Liberal candidates, but could not secure adoption; Henderson was ambitious of being John Morley's colleague at Newcastle. Philip Snowden, when a boy, was an ardent Liberal. His conversion took place in the early 'Nineties. "Like St. Paul on the road to Damascus, he suddenly saw the light and knew himself a Socialist."[2] As in St. Paul's case there was a complete change of heart, for in 1895, when opposing Brigg, the Liberal candidate for Keighley, he denounced self-made men like his opponent "trampling and crushing every human instinct, and by that means seeking to rise to a pinnacle where the stench of their putrefying victims could not reach them."[3] As for the Liberal Party in Parliament, it consisted of "horse-racing aristocrats, like Rosebery; sinecure-hunting lawyers, like Gully; speculative company-promoters like Mundella; brewers, like Sir James Stansfeld; and of millionaire labour-exploiters, like Sir Isaac Holden."

There were three stages in the relation of the Labour Party to the Liberals: (1) Subordination. (2) Independence and Co-operation. (3) Independence without Co-operation—an Independence that was instinct with hostility. The third stage was manifest after the War. The Miner M.P.'s continued to sit with the Liberals during Campbell-Bannerman's Administration. "Mabon" (the Rt. Hon.

William Abraham) sat in Parliament from 1885 to 1920, first as a Radical then as a Labour Member. Tom Richards, also created a Privy Councillor, became Secretary of the South Wales Miners' Federation on its creation in 1898, "Mabon" being its President. The Miners then turned from Welsh Liberalism and became attached to the Labour Party. On the death of Sir William Harcourt in 1904 Richards stood successfully for West Monmouth and entered the House with the declared intention of joining the Labour group, though the Miners were not yet affiliated to the Labour Party.[1] There was a general move towards an independent position. After his defeat at West Ham in 1895 Keir Hardie wrote to *The Manchester Guardian*: "The Labour and Socialist Parties will henceforth vote so as to sweep away the only obstacle in their path—the historic Liberal Party." Keir Hardie was ever sensitive to Liberal patronage and condescension: "We are only guys to them all the time. We must not lose touch with our own folk." A very important date for the Labour Party is 1903, when at a Newcastle Conference it declared its independence of both the other Parties. But Campbell-Bannerman laboured for co-operation and united action against the Tories; this (says his biographer), was "a fixed point in his policy." Keir Hardie was his admirer: "Sir Henry has earned, and fully deserves, all the praise that is heaped upon him."[2] Dr. Clifford's idea was "to create a Party, if we can, composed of the most level-headed of the Socialists and the most radical of the Radicals."[3] The Liberals received a jar in 1907 when two of their vacant seats were captured by Socialists. In the next year Mr. Lloyd George expressed resentment at the action of certain Socialists: "Whilst it was extending the mercy of a small pension to the aged who have won it by a life of toil, Liberalism was assailed with blind fury by the Tory Party in front. Incredible as it may seem, it was attacked with spiteful savagery by Socialists in the flank."[4] Snowden remarked in 1913 that four-fifths of the Labour Members held their seats by arrangement with the Liberals; but it was equally true that many Liberal seats would have been in jeopardy, if the Labour Party had had the funds necessary to put up their own candidates. As late as 1924 Lord Oxford was pleading for a common action: "But in the important sphere of social legislation, where progressive thought has

grasped the same ideals, and is ready to proceed for their attainment to great lengths on common lines, there is no reason why there should not be co-operation."[1] This was part of Lord Oxford's *apologia* for putting a Labour Government into power.

Dilke, on his return to the House of Commons in 1892, was a kind of *liaison* officer between Liberalism and Labour. "Mabon" described him as "a real Labour leader."[2] "He came to fill a unique position as counsellor, friend and adviser to the Labour Cause," said the Rt. Hon. George Barnes.[3] Dilke was then a Municipal Socialist, but not a State Socialist. Labouchere wrote: "He fancied that he would be able to become the leader of the Labour M.P.'s. They were ready to profit by his speeches, but it soon became clear that they would only have a Labour M.P. for their leader."[4] But Dilke always held that Labour should have its own leaders.[5] He only proposed to be their temporary spokesman. Moreover, on foreign politics and naval and military matters Dilke and the Labour Party were poles asunder.

To a certain extent the Labour movement had been a religious movement. Snowden once said he believed it to be both a religious and a moral movement. Canon Barnett's Settlement, Toynbee Hall, was an expression of Christian Socialism, and so were the many East-End Settlements that followed. Most of the leaders of the Agricultural Labourers' Strike were Methodist local preachers, and religious sentiments were expressed at the strikers' meetings. Joseph Arch himself used to contribute parodies of hymns:

"What though our souls are lighted with wisdom from on high,
Shall we to men benighted the Gatling gun deny?"

"Blow gently, blow, ye breezes! Let the war-smoke upward curl!
While bathed in blood and glory stands forth our Premier Earl."

Thorold Rogers said: "I do not believe that the mass of peasants could have been moved at all, had it not been for the organization of the primitive Methodists."[6] Teetotalism and Labour were often allied. Snowden, himself the son of a devout Methodist, took the pledge early. He was a Sunday School teacher, and a Temperance worker.

Arthur Henderson, Ben Tillett and Tom Mann were Temperance lecturers. Liberals welcomed the help of these Labour men in promoting Temperance legislation ; here, at any rate, Philip Snowden and Dr. Clifford could join forces. But of course there were also many Secularists in the Labour Party, and only a small percentage of working-men are church-goers or religious, while the vast majority of them are fond of a glass of beer. The non-industrial portion of the Party, which was gradually to make its influence felt and aspired to supply the Party with brains and direction, the Fabians and Socialists who looked for guidance to Bernard Shaw and the Sidney Webbs and H. G. Wells and Sydney Olivier, had no ties with Nonconformity. Writing of the men who joined the Party soon after the War, Mr. G. T. Garratt remarks : " Their lives were as varied as their politics. There were Christian Socialists who made their politics their religion, and at the other end there was a little group, whom we may call the Labour Amoralists, who followed the precepts of Mr. Bertrand Russell with a fidelity which must have been slightly embarrassing to that philosopher. . . . For some years the public remained ignorant as to whether the Labour movement was Puritan or Hedonist, tophatted or *sansculottes*, thrifty or spendthrift. It is doubtful whether it is even yet fully enlightened."[1]

The Labour Party is divided into two parts—the hand-workers and the brain-workers. The former call themselves " the Workers," assuming that all work worthy of the name is manual labour. They are suspicious of the brain-workers ; and yet they are attracted by them—" Labour adores Highbrows," says Mr. J. A. Spender. They are the men of the Trades Unions, which for long maintained a " Lib.-Lab." tradition ; but they have always been distrustful of the Liberals. They regard the Tories as their hereditary foes. Their Trades Unions brought them over to the Labour Party *en masse ;* they were converted by platoons, as savage nations were converted to Christianity. They profess to represent the interests of only one class of the nation—the manual-workers. This is sometimes expressed crudely and in terms of Internationalism. " To Hell with everybody bar my class ! " (exclaimed Mr. Cook, the miners' representative, during the Great War). " To me, the hand of the German and the Austrian is the same as the hand of my fellow-workmen at home."[2] The matters

with which they are concerned are Wages, Strikes, Trade Union legislation, and all that affects the standard of living of " the Workers."

On the other hand the brain-workers or Intellectuals are State Socialists, whose creed is pure Socialism. They aim at enlisting in the cause men of all classes. They look for benefits from State action, and are not afraid of encroachments on individual liberty. In this sense Matthew Arnold, the Liberal, was a Socialist. He writes to M. Fontanes (March 25th, 1881) : " The State has not enough shewn a spirit of initiation, and individuals have too much thought that it sufficed if they acted with entire liberty and if nobody had any business to control them."[1] Arnold felt this especially in the matter of Education, admiring the Prussian system of uniformity. For the same reason Sidney Webb and R. B. Haldane refused to join the opposition to the Education Bill of 1902 ; they thought the Bill acceptable because it tended to centralize Education. Many Conservatives have Socialistic leanings. Mrs. Humphry Ward in a novel of politics describes a Conservative Government which is bitterly attacked by the " Die Hard " Tory Lord Fontenoy : " They call themselves Conservatives—they are really State Socialists, and the mere catspaws of revolutionary Socialists."[2] The same criticism is now often directed against Mr. Baldwin. The Intellectuals consider it their function to supply the direction to the Labour movement. In another of Mrs. Ward's novels an unscrupulous leader puts this bluntly : " It is our brains and their feelings that do the trick."[3] They are the experts in Economics. " The economic side of the democratic ideal " (said Sidney Webb, October 1889), " is, in fact, Socialism itself."[4] They are converted to Socialism singly, or in small groups. Their position from the first was one of complete independence of the Liberals.

The Democratic Federation, afterwards called the Social Democratic Federation, was founded by Hyndman in 1881. The Social Democratic Federation later developed into the Fabian Society. Mr. Ramsay MacDonald was a Fabian. In 1924, five out of twenty Cabinet Ministers were Fabians. According to Lord Passfield (Sidney Webb) his own wife has been for many years " on the whole the dominating personality in the Fabian Society." Haldane in the 'Eighties, though never himself a Fabian, was intimate with

members of the Fabian Society—Webb, Bernard Shaw and others of mark ; he believed that, if Sidney Webb's ideas had been more studied in Campbell-Bannerman's day, " Labour and Liberalism, might have come to dwell under a common roof."[1] In 1888 Webb wrote *Wanted a Programme*, which was " printed for private circulation among leading London Liberals." This Programme inspired the Newcastle Programme, which was adopted by the National Liberal Federation in 1891 and to which Gladstone was constrained to subscribe. Webb's plan was that Liberals should turn their backs on the more or less educated Middle and Upper Classes and concentrate all their efforts on securing the votes of the manual workers. He really aimed at " the gradual extinction of the receipts of rent and interest and the gradual public organization of labour for all public purposes and the elimination of the private capitalist and middle-men." He was then " a Socialist camouflaged as a Liberal." Bernard Shaw described himself as " a permeative Fabian on the Executive of the South St. Pancras Liberal and Radical Association." Bernard Shaw contrived to insinuate Fabian articles into *The Star*, a Liberal paper. " We urged our members " (he writes) " to join the Liberal and Radical Associations of their districts, or, if they preferred it, the Conservative Associations. . . . We permeated the Party organizations, and pulled all the wires we could lay our hands on with our utmost adroitness and energy." By these devices a majority was returned to the new London County Council of members who were full of Fabian ideas.[2] Men who saw through these clever tactics called the Fabians " revolutionaries." A real revolutionary has expressed his contempt for them in no measured terms : " Bombastic authorities, pedants, arrogant and ranting poltroons . . . self-satisfied pedants, gabbling eclectics, sentimental careerists, upstart liveried lackeys of the *bourgeoisie*."[3] " By my troth, Captain, these are very bitter words "—as Mrs. Quickly said to Ancient Pistol.

In 1892 a Parliamentary Fund was started for bringing Socialists into the House of Commons. In 1893 the Independent Labour Party was established at Bradford ; Keir Hardie was the founder and had the help of Ramsay MacDonald. " To the I.L.P. came women and men from the ranks of Tories, Liberals, Radicals, Nonconformists and Marxians. . . . There were Free Traders, Home Rulers,

Local Optionists, Republicans, Roman Catholics, Salvationists, Church and Chapel-goers, and believers in 'the Cosmopolitan Brotherhood of the Workers.' "[1] Amongst the early members were Keir Hardie, Kate Conway, Robert Blatchford, Bruce Glasier, Tom Mann, Liebknecht, Eleanor Marx, Edward Aveling, James Sexton, Pete Carran, Ben Tillett.[2] Philip Snowden and Dr. Pankhurst joined in 1894; Pankhurst was described by *The Spectator* as "a French Red of the humane type." The aim of the I.L.P. was "the collective ownership and control of the means of production, distribution and exchange." Amongst the present items on its programme are an Eight Hours Day, no overtime, provision for the aged and disabled, universal Free Education, work for unemployed, Arbitration, Disarmament. In 1895 it put forward 28 candidates who were all defeated, but at that General Election both Harcourt and Morley owed their defeats to the interposition of I.L.P. candidates. These candidates stood for a complete separation from the Liberal Party. In more recent times the I.L.P. has fallen under the control of extremists like James Maxton M.P.; it has now broken with the Labour Party altogether. For this reason Philip Snowden resigned in 1927. The I.L.P. spread far and wide. By the time Campbell-Bannerman came into power Socialist Societies were springing up everywhere, and Socialism was rife in the Universities. In 1907 there were 800 members of the I.L.P. on elective bodies in Great Britain.

"Conversions" to Socialism were sometimes quick, sometimes gradual. Philip Snowden "suddenly saw the light and knew himself a Socialist." With Mrs. Sidney Webb the process was slower. She arrived at Socialism through studying such subjects as the economic control of landlord and capitalist, Education, Health, the national minimum of civilized existence for every citizen, co-operative Capitalism, Trades Union organization, Municipal Trading.[3] Sidney Webb (to whom she became engaged in 1891), led her on. His "first token of personal regard" was a newly-published pamphlet on the Rate of Interest. Dr. Pankhurst, as the reader may remember, mingled his courtship "with high discourse" about the Emancipation of Women. Sidney Webb's courtship had lighter moments, for in the course of it (writes Mrs. Webb) "he occasionally would forget the Inevitability of Gradualness."[4] The Rubicon

was crossed on February 1st, 1890 : " I dimly see individual freedom and public property, instead of class slavery and private possession of the means of subsistence of the whole people. *At last I am a Socialist.*"[1] Then followed a time of activity : " My brain whirls with constitutions, executives, general councils, delegate meetings, district delegates, branches, lodges, socials." Mrs. Besant adopted Socialist principles in 1885, but her friend Bradlaugh remained a firm Individualist. Lady Warwick's " conversion " began after a ball at Warwick Castle in 1895. Blatchford of *The Clarion* had commented on its expense, and Lady Warwick called on him. He persuaded her that this great ball and all its preparations " had not added one iota to the national wealth."[2] But, before entering the Socialist ranks, she went through a novitiate of Liberalism : " My middle-class period—when I made friends with Stead . . . I was a reformer, if you like, but not yet an avowed Socialist."[3] Are any of these " conversions " due to mundane motives, on the principle that " Paris is worth a Mass " ? Let us assume sincerity, but it must be admitted that some of the rewards are rather tempting, and, in view of the principles of the recipients, surprising. In twenty-one and a half months (June 10th, 1929, to March 31st, 1931) the Socialist Attorney-General received £12,654 in Salary and £26,564 in Fees, making £39,218. In sixteen months the Socialist Solicitor-General received in all £12,762.[4] When these figures were given to the House of Commons a Member inquired, " May I ask if this is ' Socialism in our time ? ' " Hatred of injustice, or a sudden revelation of poverty, accounts for many converts. E. D. Morel was influenced by horror of African atrocities ; Mr. Lansbury by seeing a woman whose only clothing was a sack ; there are cases of Colonial officials who have been converted because they have had to carry out instructions which their consciences disapproved ; an Admiral has been recruited by reason of a naval *cause célèbre*.[5]

It was the unequal distribution of wealth and the terrible contrast between the lot of the rich and the lot of the poor that impelled feeling men and women to become Socialists. Charles Booth's *Life and Labour of the People of London*, on which he spent 17 years and which he published in 17 volumes, showed that about 30 *per cent.* of the nation was living at or beneath the level of bare subsistence. (Campbell-

Bannerman caused some stir in 1903 by stating that 12 millions were "underfed and on the verge of starvation.") The death-rate in the East End of London was stated to be double that of the West End. In October 1883 appeared Stead's *Bitter Cry of Outcast London*, with its dreadful account of Housing conditions. The Queen wrote to Dilke that she had been "much distressed by all she has heard and read lately of the deplorable condition of the homes of the poor in our great towns."[1] Dilke's report on the subject was followed by the Royal Commission on Housing. "Slumming" for a time was a fashionable craze. A young lady in *Punch* (December 22nd, 1883) is made to say: "Lord Archibald is taking us to a dear little slum which he has found near the Minories, such a fearful place! Fourteen poor things sleeping in one bed!" What this overcrowding really meant was known to Beatrice Potter (Mrs. Sidney Webb) who, in order to investigate such conditions of life, found employment in 1888 as a "plain trouser-hand" in the East End:

"Some of my workmates, young girls who were in no way mentally defective, who were, on the contrary, just as keen-witted and generous-hearted as my own circle of friends, could chaff each other about having babies by their own fathers or brothers. . . . The violation of little children was another not infrequent result. To put it bluntly, sexual promiscuity, and even sexual perversion, are almost unavoidable among men and women of average character and intelligence crowded into the one-room tenement of slum areas."[2]

The Maiden Tribute of Modern Babylon, articles published by Stead in *The Pall Mall Gazette* (July 6th-12th, 1885), made a tremendous sensation. Messrs. W. H. Smith stopped the circulation of the paper, and an indirect result of their publication was that Stead was sent to prison. But they shed a lurid light on certain degrading conditions of the life of the poor, and resulted in legislation. Chamberlain, at the Eighty Club (April 28th, 1885), affirmed that, in spite of our great national wealth, nearly a million persons were in receipt of Poor Relief.[3] He quoted Professor Thorold Rogers to the effect that our working-classes were worse off in the 19th Century than they were at the close of the 15th.[4] Manning wrote in 1888 that "millions are living in an inhuman state without Christianity and civilization." In

1890 General Booth published *In Darkest England and the Way Out.* He quoted Chamberlain as having said that "there is a population equal to that of the Metropolis" (then between four and five millions) "which has remained constantly in a state of abject destitution and misery." (Giffen put the figure at 1,800,000). General Booth (p. 55) describes the Woolwich "Dusthole": "The women living and following their dreadful business in this neighbourhood are so degraded that even abandoned men will refuse to accompany them home. . . . A policeman never goes down this street alone at night—one having died not long ago from injuries received there. . . . Filth and vermin abound to an extent to which no one who has not seen it can have any idea. The 'Dusthole' is only one, alas, of many similar districts in this highly civilized land." Booth records (p. 158) that Huxley, who had been a medical officer in the East of London, declared that "the surroundings of the savages of New Guinea were much more conducive to the leading of a decent human existence than those in which many of the East-Enders live." Asquith deplored the lot of "the work-girl, old before her time, who lives a life worse than that of a mediæval serf in the squalor of the sweater's den."[1] Lloyd George affirmed that "seven *per cent.* of the people in the local cities live in a state of chronic destitution—a hand to mouth existence. Thirty *per cent.* or nearly one third, live on or below the poverty line."[2] In his celebrated Limehouse speech (July 30th, 1909) may be found a passage whose imagery reminds one of Blake: "It is rather hard that an old workman should have to find his way to the gates of the tomb, bleeding and footsore, through the brambles and thorns of poverty."[3] He spoke of the class for whom, "the moment they are deprived of employment either by bad trade or by sickness, the security of bread disappears."[4] He referred to Rowntree's York enquiry, which showed that the physical condition of 80 *per cent.* of the children was under the average standard.[5] Snowden, in his House of Commons maiden speech, said that the rich were getting richer and the poor poorer, and that with increasing wealth and trade there was more starvation.

The ills of the poor, though severe, were probably more tolerable in the Nineteenth century than in the Eighteenth. It is true that the Industrial Revolution had brought into

existence many great cities in which the operatives were badly housed and underpaid and often out of work ; the lot of the rural labourer had not improved, and agricultural depression made improvement impossible. But there was more philanthropy, organized and unorganized ; and the criminal law was far milder. The Eighteenth-century view had been that in this world inequality was inevitable. " Such is the constitution of human society " (wrote Gibbon) " that, whilst a few persons are distinguished by riches, by honours, and by knowledge, the body of the people is condemned to obscurity, ignorance, and poverty."[1] Burke wrote of the general mass of mankind as " those whom Providence has doomed to live on trust." Even a century later Robert Lowe echoed this sentiment, when he told the House of Commons that the sufferings of the poor were a matter which " most of us believe to be beyond the reach of legislation."[2] Pious people thought the same, founding themselves on the text—" the poor always ye have with you." But generous souls were not content to leave things as they were.

Lothair wished to devote his existence " to the extinction of pauperism." Nor would he neglect the Housing question: " The moment I am master I shall build two thousand cottages on my estate." As a private effort this would have been a substantial contribution, even if it only benefited Lothair's own people. The Socialist of the 'Nineties set out to be a benefactor with a wider scope, and was quite optimistic about the prospects of universal happiness. " What you want " (said Hyndman to his audience) " is good hats, good homes, and good beef-steaks—enjoyment, contentment in life, comfort, and, beyond all these, public amusements of every kind. . . . From the misery we see around us there is necessarily arising a glorious future, the Golden Age which all the greatest of the sons of men from Plato to Moore onward have desired and foreseen, in which men will co-operate for the greater advantage and enjoyment of all."[3]

More than five centuries ago John Ball had proposed the Socialistic remedy : " Good people, things will never go well in England *so long as goods be not in common*, and so long as there be villeins and gentlemen." There was then the same glaring inequality : " They are clothed in velvet and warm in their furs and their ermines, while we are covered

with rags. They have wine and spices and fair bread; and we eat oat-cake and straw, and water to drink."[1] Five centuries had passed, and public opinion was not yet in favour of goods being in common. None but the Socialists advocated a National redistribution of wealth, but much could be done by Municipal activity. It was idle to expect Parliament to nationalize the railways, but it was quite feasible for a Town Council to get control of gasworks and waterworks, and even to deal with slums and sewage. Chamberlain, in his Municipal days, limited the Socialist enterprise of Municipalities to "those things which the community can do better than the private individual." (Opinions might be sharply divided as to what those things are.) No doubt he would have included Education. The enterprise was sure to be expensive—"high rates and a healthy city." Lord Randolph Churchill, in 1883, adopting Beaconsfield's motto *Sanitas Sanitatum*, added wash-houses, open spaces, dwellings for the poor, people's parks and libraries.[2] The Local Government Act of 1888 opened up new avenues for the Municipal Socialist; Borough and County Councils extended their operations more and more. Sidney Webb, in 1888, was advocating the Municipal ownership of water, gas, trams and docks for the profit of the ratepayers—besides extensive Education and Health services. The result was a "Progressive" majority on the London County Council in 1889. The movement spread; in 1901 Dilke said that "all English Parties had practically, if not in theory, accepted Municipal Socialism."[3] Rosebery, when first a candidate for the L.C.C., spoke for economy and a non-political attitude;[4] but in 1892, addressing the electors of East Finsbury, he "dwelt on the present impossibility of non-political candidates."[5] For "Progressive" soon came to mean Radical-Socialist. *Punch* was not deceived; he puts words into Bumble's mouth:

"Pooty nice state of things, sir, now ain't it? No politics! That was the word,
And they fought it all round just like cats, and the Rads they 'ops in like a bird . . .
Those blessed Progressists! New name, but it means the old thing, and that's bad;
A Progressist's a Socialist sometimes, and always a rampaging Rad."[6]

Punch also comments (June 3rd, 1893) on a meeting of

the Lambeth ratepayers to protest against " the alarming, the extraordinary unexampled and unexpected increase in the rates of that parish." The L.C.C. remained " Progressive " until 1907, by which time the Party had made itself unpopular not only by its extravagance but by its Puritan campaigns led by those once celebrated persons Mrs. Ormiston Chant and Mr. John McDougall. The figures showing the strength of Parties for 1904 and subsequent years are interesting, because they incidentally indicate how in the municipal sphere, as in the political, Labour has ousted Liberalism :

	Municipal Reformers.	*Liberals.*	*Labour.*
1904	35	81	1
1907	79	37	1
1910	60	55	3
1913	67	49	2
1919	68	40	15
1922	82	26	16
1925	83	6	35
1928	77	5	42
1931	83	6	35

Liberalism has become as negligible on the L.C.C. as in the House of Commons. Also interest in the L.C.C. has greatly decreased ; at the last elections (1931) only 31.3 *per cent.* of the electors recorded their votes.

There were, then, two considerable and increasing political forces which were not yet united ; both might be labelled " Progressive," but neither of the two was in accord with traditional Liberalism. The manual labourers, brigaded in their Trade Unions which derived a considerable revenue from the enforced contribution of their members, had begun to send representatives to Parliament who acted generally with the Liberals. These were inclined to suspect the Liberals of duplicity ; they were given fair words, but felt they were being used. They produced no outstanding leaders, though one or two of character and ability. Their duty was to the Trade Unions—to obtain for their clients the highest possible wages, and any other benefits that might be procurable for working-men.

But the Intellectuals or Socialists belonged to all classes of society. They attracted wealthy and aristocratic followers, and gained a footing in artistic and literary

circles. They were gaining strength on the L.C.C. and other Municipal bodies. Though some of them had started as Liberals, their principles led them on to become independent of the Liberal Party. Many, who continued to be Liberals, were infected with doctrines which were quite contrary to the Liberalism of Bright and Gladstone and Asquith.

"Labour adores Highbrows"—in the sense that Labour has often felt grateful to these clever, theorizing, idealistic men for putting its aspirations into eloquent language, and its Programme into coherent shape. And the idealists naturally felt it to be their function to become the staff officers and generals of Labour's well-drilled and well-filled battalions; in other words their aim was to unite "our brains and their feelings." The Trade Unions had been at first adverse to starting an Independent Party, while independence was the very essence of Socialism; therefore the great effort of the I.L.P. was directed towards the conversion of the leaders of Trade Unionism. At last, in 1900, a conference was held of (1) the I.L.P., the S.D.F., and the Fabian Society—all Socialists, and (2) the Trade Unions; the outcome of this was the Labour Representation Committee, whose function was to nominate candidates, and raise funds if possible from the Trades Unions. In 1906 the L.R.C. became the Labour Party. But the real fusion was a slow process. According to a biographer, Mr. Ramsay MacDonald was working from 1899 to 1906 at bringing the Trade Unions into politics.[1]

Thus was effected a combination of Brains and Brawn, if the expression may be used; but there has always smouldered a mutual jealousy. The Intellectuals have been necessary because of their brains, the Industrials because of their funds; but of late years the Industrials have become more and more impatient of the Intellectuals. In 1931 it was partly because the General Council of the T.U.C. wished to demonstrate the superior strength of the industrial side, that it refused consent to the Government's proposed economies. Mr. Ramsay MacDonald and Mr. Snowden, who never belonged to the industrial side, became the objects of bitter attack, and the Labour Government fell.[2]

In 1899 the principle of Labour representation, independ-

ent of existing Parties, was adopted at the Trades Union Congress. Keir Hardie then established an independent Party in Parliament with its own Chairman and Whips. The Conference of 1900 and the measure of unity thereby achieved opened up new possibilities for the Labour Party. In 1903 Labour's independence of both Parties was declared at a Newcastle Conference. In 1904 the Trades Union Congress definitely committed itself to Socialist representation in Parliament. In 1903 a judgment of the House of Lords[1] gave a new impetus to the industrial side of the movement. It has been said that the Taff Vale judgment virtually brought the Labour Party into existence. The House of Lords decided that a Trades Union could be sued and held liable for the tortious acts of its agents. The effect of the judgment was that "the use of civil remedies in the form of a representation action was now declared to be feasible and could be employed to paralyze the action of Trades Unions, or, if not in time to do that, to ruin them afterwards."[2] A great outcry arose, in which both Liberal and Labour Parties joined. At the great Albert Hall meeting, which preceded the election of 1906, Campbell-Bannerman was loudly cheered when he promised to "amend the law of Combination which had been affected by legal decisions." The agitation did much to ensure a Liberal victory. "One of the things Democracy had pledged itself to get rid of," writes Lord Haldane, "was the result of the judgment of the House of Lords in the Taff Vale case." The decision, he said, was unepexected, because a Trades Union was not a Corporation. If the decision stood, "the money set aside for benefits and pensions could be taken to satisfy a judgment."[3] The electors returned to the House of Commons 377 Liberals, and 53 Labour men of whom 29 were nominees of the L.R.C. and pledged to independence. "It was not till 1905" (writes Mr. J. A. Spender) "that the pent-up Liberal movement was released in another flood." But (writes Caroline E. Playne, referring to this statement), "that flood was the flood of Labour pushing its way under the guidance of the I.L.P. The full significance of the arrival of the workers at a general and political consciousness is not even now fully appreciated."[4] The shrewd Labouchere recognized that the importance of the Election lay in the rise of the Labour Party.[5] It is arguable that the triumph

of 1906 was at least as much a Labour as a Liberal triumph.

No time was lost in introducing a Trades Disputes Bill. "We therefore prepared a Bill" (writes Lord Haldane)[1] "which sought to restrict the technical operation of the law of Agency, so that a distant Trade Union in a different part of the Kingdom which had had nothing whatever to do with the dispute might be able to feel secure about its benefit funds, leaving those who had actually behaved illegally to bear the brunt of having done so." Lawson Walton, the Attorney-General, in introducing the Bill, said that such a violation of principle as placing Trade Unions above the law was inconceivable. "Do not let us create a privilege for the proletariate and give a sort of Benefit of Clergy to Trade Unions." The bulk of the Liberals loudly cheered these truly Liberal sentiments. A correspondent of *The Times* describes the sequel: "But the Trade Unions cracked the whip, 'C—B' hastened to take cover, and within three weeks Lawson Walton was thrown over by his own Solicitor-General; the Government ate the leek, and Trade Unions were exempted from responsibility for the civil consequences of their own acts if done 'in contemplation or in furtherance of a trade dispute.'"[2] Lord Haldane comments on this retreat: "A new spirit was disclosing itself, a spirit that was moving the Democracy to go beyond the old-fashioned Liberal tradition, and to show that it would be content with nothing short of a demonstration that the Democracy was for the future to have the last word."[3] It would seem that Democracy (or rather Labour) and Liberalism were now at odds. In any case, as Lord Birkenhead points out, the Government "made themselves responsible for legislation which provided that no action should lie against the funds of a Trade Union, even if that Trade Union had officially ordered illegal acts which involved His Majesty's subjects in admitted loss. . . . For the first time a body was placed by Parliament above the law."[4] This new departure was approved by Mr. John (now Sir John) Simon in a maiden speech (November 9th, 1906) on the Third Reading, which exhibited clever special pleading:—no action had been launched against a Trade Union from 1871 to 1901, there was a popular view that Trade Union funds were immune, etc., etc.[5] Twenty years later Sir John denounced the General Strike as illegal, on the ground that it was not concerned with a Trade Dispute within the Act of 1906, but

was an offence against the State. But the fact remains that the Trade Union leaders believed that the Act of 1906 had legalized their action in supporting the General Strike. "It is a matter for serious thought, most of all in Liberals" (writes Lord Birkenhead), "that an Act so designed could be used seriously in order to justify so outrageous a proceeding as the General Strike."[1]

This Act also (S.2.) legalized "peaceful picketing," which may amount to any degree of persecution and intimidation short of personal violence.

The Osborne judgment, (House of Lords, 1909), afforded the Trade Unions another opportunity of proving their power in Parliament. The House of Lords decided against the lawfulness of a compulsory levy on members of Trade Unions for political purposes.[2] This was a vital matter for the Trade Unions, for upon this compulsory levy their finances depended. An Act of 1913 made the levy legal, the effect of it being that Conservative and Liberal members of Trade Unions were obliged to contribute towards the parliamentary salaries and expenses of representatives to whose principles they were opposed.[3]

After the first General Election of 1910 the Liberal Party in the House of Commons was much more dependent upon the votes of the Labour Party. Labouchere said that but for his large majority Campbell-Bannerman might have found the Labour men more difficult to deal with than the Irish.[4] Campbell-Bannerman led 377 Liberals, and the rest of the House numbered 293. After January 1910 the Liberals were reduced to 275; there were 273 Unionists, 82 Nationalists and 40 Labour men; Asquith was no longer in a dominating position, and the Labour Party was able to exert pressure with regard to the Payment of Members. Sir Henry Maine, writing in 1885 of the American system of payment for legislative services, had condemned it as "a point of marked inferiority to the British system, *even in its decline*."[5] But it had long been advocated by British Radicals. "Payment of Members" (wrote Labouchere in 1884) "would do more to democratize our Legislature than any other measure that can be conceived."[6] His colleague at Northampton, Bradlaugh, thought the same: "A democratic Parliament can only come when M.P.'s are paid."[7] Chamberlain had supported it in 1885. Lord Randolph Churchill voted for it in 1890.[8] Gladstone was

obliged to bless the proposal in 1891 as part of the Newcastle Programme—at any rate as regards poor men. He also approved the payment of election expenses from public funds. "Are they to be fined for conferring this boon upon the public?" Aid from the public treasury should be given to "men whose private means are inadequate to the performance of the public duty put upon them."[1] A Motion for the Payment of Members had been carried in the House in 1893 by a majority of 47; in 1895 by 176 votes to 158. Mr. R. G. Emery, who had observed Parliament from the Press Gallery from 1881 to 1931, writes: "The turning-point in the development of the character and tone of the Commons was when, in 1911, the Asquith Government introduced Payment of Members—not in Constitutional fashion by a Bill, but by a Motion followed by the necessary Supplementary Estimate."[2]

Thus Members of Parliament were provided with salaries; "the journey-money" was soon to be added, as Lord Salisbury had prophesied in the 'Sixties. And the reversal of the Osborne judgment was soon to restore to the Labour Party its political levy upon the Trade Unions. A Parliamentary career was now opened to all. A century ago "an Eton reputation" was a great step towards a seat in the House—a training in the Classics and the study of the great orators of Greece and Rome.[3] Throughout the Nineteenth century the Public Schools, the Universities and the Bar were recognized as fitting stages of preparation. Ritchie and Chamberlain and Cross and W. H. Smith had proved the usefulness of a business or Municipal training; but the man of business generally had to make his fortune before he could wholly devote himself to politics. Mr. Spender describes very different ladders of promotion: —miner, check-weigher, miner's agent, member of Urban Council, County Councillor, M.P.; or carman, general secretary of Union, Borough Councillor, M.P.; or elementary teacher, County Councillor, M.P.[4] Nor is it surely a matter for regret, but rather an advantage to the country, that men from all ranks of society and with all sorts of previous experience, should sit in the House of Commons, provided always that each accepts the doctrine of Blackstone which Mr. Spender quotes: "Every Member, though chosen by a particular district, once he is elected and returned, serves for the whole Nation . . . not merely to

advantage his constituents, but the Commonwealth as a whole."[1]

The Liberal Party had stood for Democracy, and had supported or carried extensions of the Franchise as democratic measures, Democracy being according to Austin's definition "any Government in which the governing body is a comparatively large fraction of the entire nation." Gladstone, the great Liberal, founded himself on the principle that "it is good for the State that the largest possible number of capable citizens should be invested with the Parliamentary Franchise."[2] The result of these enfranchisements bore out Aristotle's definition of Democracy: "a Government where the supreme power in the polity is vested in those who possess no considerable property, i.e. the poor."[3] Lord Salisbury described it as a system under which "the rich would pay all the taxes, and the poor make all the laws."[4] But Democracy and Liberalism were now at the parting of the ways. Haldane's comment, already quoted, on the Trade Disputes Bill is very significant—that "a spirit was moving the Democracy to go beyond the old-fashioned Liberal tradition." It was indeed; and, if a legal decision went against this new Democracy, the Liberal Government was compelled to reverse it by Act of Parliament:

"They said: 'Who is irked by the Law? Though we may not remove it,
"'If he lend us his aid in this raid, *we will set him above it*!'"

One Minister went so far as to speak threateningly of the Law Lords who had interpreted the law adversely to the Trade Unions. Lawson Walton, the Attorney-General, having swallowed his principles, permitted himself, in the Taff Vale debate, to say of the Judges: "There might be some prejudice against Trade Unionists in the tribunals before whom they appeared." It was certainly not consonant with old-fashioned Liberal principles that a Corporation, or (if the word is more correct) a Trade Combination, should be placed above the Common Law of Torts, nor that it should be immune when inciting individuals to break their contracts, nor that men, in order to exercise a moral compulsion, should be entitled systematically to beset other men in their homes and at their

occupations, nor that men should be compelled to make enforced contributions for purposes of which they disapproved.

The Socialist or Fabian wing of the Labour Party rejoiced at these neo-democratic developments, for they all helped towards the destruction of Capitalism. But Socialism also had always been denounced by orthodox Liberals. Gladstone, writes his son, "from his earliest years was an Individualist. . . . For a long time Collectivism requiring and justifying State action was to him heretical and dangerous."[1] In 1885 he wrote to Acton of the Liberalism of that day: "Its pet idea is what they call construction—that is to say, taking into the hands of the State the business of the individual man. Both the one and the other have much to estrange me, and have had for many, many years."[2] He saw the process commencing, and disliked it—as did the philosopher Herbert Spencer, who a year or two previously (writes Mary Gladstone) "threw a bombshell into the camp by excusing himself from qualifying as a voter on account of the great change in Liberalism, that whereas its great object *was* the protection and freedom of the individual, it now coerced the individual to benefit the masses. He looks on Joe (Chamberlain) as a type. W.E.G. demurred."[3] Harcourt once created quite a sensation by saying, "We are all Socialists now." He was probably thinking of Municipal Socialism which appealed both to Liberal and Conservative reformers; Lord Randolph Churchill's policy was "to borrow from Socialism its large general conception of Municipal life." Labouchere championed Individualism in his debate with Hyndman the Socialist: "I say it (Socialism) would be the greatest danger to our liberties. Why is the Anglo-Saxon race the master-race of the world? Why has the Anglo-Saxon race maintained its liberties? It is because of that Individualism, that self-reliance, which exists in this country."[4] His colleague at Northampton, Bradlaugh, was also an Individualist, and on this question parted company with his friend Mrs. Besant.[5] Campbell-Bannerman felt an instinctive aversion to the theories of Sidney Webb. Sir John Simon demonstrated to the House of Commons (July 16th, 1923) that Socialism means the sacrifice of liberty. "What will be the effect of the new system on reasonable individual freedom of choice? Is there going to be any right to strike

under the Socialistic State? A democratically controlled and publicly managed industrial army must surely exact the obedience of its members, and refusal to work on the task assigned under such circumstances becomes mutiny. . . . I am quite unable to see how in a Socialistic State you can avoid conscription of labour and how you can avoid penal labour institutions for those who refuse to accept the occupation assigned to them."[1]

For the Socialist, generally a benevolent man, often a Christian who attends Pleasant Sunday Afternoon services in Nonconformist Chapels and expects a millenium of human kindness, must in time of Revolution give place to the grimmer and more ruthless Communist. Mr. Bernard Shaw has told the members of the October Club, an undergraduate Communist society which has its home at Oxford (of all places), that Communism is a tremendous extension of government, and consequently a great encroachment on liberty. All the things which an Englishman regarded as safeguards had been thrown overboard by the Soviet Government. "You may complain as much as you like in Russia, provided you are sound on Communism. If you are not, then look out for the back of your head."[2] As Lord Salisbury put it: "The Girondin always has a Jacobin behind him ready to trip him up; and further back still stands a Hebertist anxious to perform the same service to the Jacobin."[3]

Asquith may fitly complete our array of eminent British Liberals who have condemned Socialism. At the Paisley election in 1920, when he was asked for his views on Nationalization, he replied:

"It would sap the free-flowing life-blood of British industry. It would enthrone the rule of bureaucrats. It would tend to stereotype process, and stand in the way of new inventions, and arrest mechanical and managerial improvement. It would paralyze individual initiative and enterprise, and, sooner or later—and sooner than later—it would, in my judgment, impoverish the community. Therefore I would give a very plain answer to the question put to me whether I am in favour of the Nationalization of industry. The answer is in the negative."[4] He also spoke of "the poison of Socialism." Brave words! And it might well have been expected that he would have regarded with horror the very idea of a Socialist Government. But four

years later he put one into office, and poured ridicule on those who were fearful of the consequences—" I have never come across more virulent manifestations of an epidemic of political hysteria."[1] (If this sentence were discovered centuries hence as a fragment of oratory, would not its Johnsonese style—without any other clue to the orator—stamp it as an utterance of Asquith ?) And he still professed to believe in the possibility of a kind of Lib-Lab alliance. " In the important sphere of social legislation, where progressive thought has grasped the same ideals, and is ready to proceed for their attainment to great lengths on common lines, there is no reason why there should not be co-operation."[2] But in 1926 he must have realized at last the vital difference between true Liberalism and Socialism when he made a firm stand for Law and Liberty against the General Strike.

With the establishment of this small but insistent Labour Party in the House of Commons the triumph of Democracy was complete. But the voice of Democracy now frequently spoke through the Trade Unions, uttering decrees which the Liberal Party had to obey. It was long since any statesman had challenged the democratic principle ; power was now definitely in the hands of the Many. Lowe said in 1867 : " We have instituted two Parties of competition, who, like Cleon and the sausage-seller of Aristophanes, are both bidding for the support of Demos." But Demos now had his own Party, treating with the two old ones on almost equal terms.

The Monarchy, towards the close of this period, had suffered some slight diminution ; for a Victorian halo no longer crowned the Monarch, and King George had been constrained to consent to a large creation of Peers in the event of the House of Lords repelling Asquith's " felon-stroke " at the Constitution. But the Monarchy retained its ancient and latent strength. The House of Lords was shorn of its unqualified power of Veto, and reduced to impotence as regards Money Bills. The Landed Interest had lost its feudal prestige and political sway, and much of its wealth. The Middle Classes, once so influential, but as ever unorganized and now hopelessly out-voted, were beginning to be the victims of depredatory taxation ; but the burden of this taxation was not yet intolerable. The

Conservatives in Opposition, though divided on the Tariff question, were more united than any other Party and preserved their traditional discipline. The Liberal Party might be compared to the man of whom the Chorus in the Agamemnon sang, the man who reared a lion-cub which grew up to devour his household. The Liberal Party had reared the lion-cub of Labour, and at first this Labour cub had been the Party's pet ; but now it was growing big and showing its teeth, and unbaring its claws to tear its old master.

A very bitter political warfare was continuously rife on Protection, Education, Welsh Disestablishment, Home Rule and Licensing. And gradually all these enmities and struggles,

" Hi motus animorum et haec certamina tanta,"

were being overshadowed by fears and anticipations of a tremendous European catastrophe in which the country might be involved. But this prospect, or possibility, only provided a new issue to divide the Parties almost in the same way as the old ones had divided them. Some were for preparing for the danger ; some for ignoring it, or deriding it as unreal and the very notion of it as fantastic. The former were denounced by the latter as Militarists or Conscriptionists ; the latter by the former as Pacifists or Internationalists.

NOTES TO

THE ADVENT OF THE LABOUR PARTY

Page 276.
[1] *Hansard*, April 27th, 1866. (See Salisbury's *Life*, Vol. I, p. 195).
[2] 1871. (Dilke's *Life*, Vol. I, p. 143).
[3] *Philip Snowden* (C. E. Bechofer Roberts), p. 41.
[4] *After Thirty Years*, p. 176.
[5] *Letters of Queen Victoria* (1879-85), p. 187.
[6] *After Thirty Years*, p. 177.
[7] *Letters of Queen Victoria* (1886-90), p. 83.
[8] *Fifty Years of Parliament*, Vol. II, p. 163.

Page 277.
[1] *After Thirty Years*, p. 94.
[2] *Fifty Years of Parliament*, Vol. II, p. 163.
[3] *Life*, p. 480.
[4] *Philip Snowden* (Bechofer Roberts), p. 121.

Page 278.
[1] *The British Liberal Party* (Fyfe), p. 69.

Page 279.
[1] *J. Ramsay MacDonald* (" Iconoclast "), p. 72.
[2] *Philip Snowden* (Bechofer Roberts), p. 8.
[3] *Ib.*, p. 16.

Page 280.
[1] Obituary notice in *The Times*, November 9th, 1931.
[2] Campbell-Bannerman's *Life*, Vol. II, p. 225-6.
[3] Dr. Clifford's *Life*, p. 147.
[4] Swansea, October 1st, 1908. (*Speeches*, Vol. IV, p. 644).

Page 281.
[1] *Speeches*, p. 300 (January 17th, 1924).
[2] Dilke's *Life*, Vol. II, p. 281.
[3] *Ib*, p. 343.
[4] Labouchere's *Life*, p. 483.
[5] Dilke's *Life*, Vol. II, p. 347.
[6] Joseph Arch's *Life*, p. 240.

Page 282.
[1] *The Mugwumps and the Labour Party*, pp. 46-7.
[2] *Last Essays* (Lord Birkenhead), p. 191.

Page 283.
[1] *Letters*, Vol. II, p. 149.
[2] *Sir George Tressady*, p. 39.
[3] *Marcella*, p. 311.
[4] *My Apprenticeship* (Beatrice Webb), p. 406.

Page 284.
[1] *R. B. Haldane, an Autobiography*, p. 114.
[2] See *The Firm of Webb*, pp. 8-16.
[3] Trotzky on the Fabian Society, see *Last Essays* (Lord Birkenhead), p. 375.

Page 285.
[1] *My Eighty Years* (Robert Blatchford), p. 199.
[2] *The Suffragette Movement*, p. 126.
[3] *My Apprenticeship*, p. 391.
[4] *Ib.*, p. 410.

Page 286.
[1] *Ib.*, p. 408.
[2] *My Eighty Years* (Robert Blatchford), p. 211. See also *Life's Ebb and Flow* (Countess of Warwick), p. 90.
[3] *Life's Ebb and Flow*, p. 193.
[4] *The Times*, April 16th, 1931.
[5] *The Mugwumps and the Labour Party*, pp. 14-15.

Page 287.
[1] October 30th, 1883. Dilke's *Life*, Vol. I, p. 509. It is sometimes alleged against Queen Victoria that she had little feeling for the working classes. In proof of this being untrue, she wrote to Lord Salisbury on the outbreak of the Boer War: "I sincerely hope that the increased taxation, necessary to meet the expenses of this war, will not fall upon the working classes; but I fear they will be much affected by the extra 6d. on beer." (It was actually 1/-). What would she have thought of a Beer Duty of 114/- per barrel, as compared with 6/9 before the Boer War?
[2] *My Apprenticeship*, p. 321.
[3] *Speeches*, Vol. I, p. 163.
[4] Glasgow, September 15th, 1885. (*Speeches*, Vol. I, p. 196).

Page 288
[1] National Liberal Federation, January 20th, 1893.
[2] *Speeches*, Vol. IV, p. 618. (Newcastle, April 4th, 1903).
[3] *Ib.*, p. 679.
[4] Reading, January 1st, 1910. (*Speeches*, Vol. IV, p. 748).
[5] City Temple, October 17th, 1910. (*Ib.*, p. 769).

Page 289.
[1] *Decline and Fall*, Ch. 15.
[2] *Hansard*, May 20th, 1867.
[3] In his debate with Labouchere, see Labouchere's *Life*, pp. 439-442.

Page 290.
[1] J. R. Green's *Short History of the English People*, Vol. II, pp. 483-4.
[2] See *Elijah's Mantle* (*Fortnightly Review*, May, 1883).
[3] *Life*, Vol. II, p. 499.
[4] *Life*, Vol. I, p. 330.
[5] *Ib.*, Vol. II, p. 385.
[6] *The Same Old Game* (*Punch*, February 16th, 1889).

Page 292.
[1] *The Man of To-morrow, J. Ramsay MacDonald* ("Iconoclast"), p. 78.
[2] See *The Morning Post* (*Future of the Labour Movement*), September 22nd, 1931.

Page 293.
[1] Taff Vale Company v. the Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants (1903, A.C., p. 426).
[2] *Last Essays* (Lord Birkenhead), p. 182.
[3] *R. B. Haldane, an Autobiography*, p. 211.
[4] *The Pre-War Mind in Britain* (1928), p. 27.
[5] *Life*, p. 480

Page 294.
[1] *Autobiography*, p. 212.
[2] J. R. Fisher, letter to *The Times* dated January 12th, 1931.
[3] *Autobiography*, p. 212.
[4] *Last Essays*, p. 167.
[5] *Comments and Criticisms* (Sir John Simon), p. 12.

Page 295.
[1] *Last Essays*, p. 179.
[2] *Amalgamated Society of Railway Servants v. Osborne* (L. R. Appeal Cases, 1910, p. 87). Lord Halsbury : " This levy is, to my mind, manifestly beyond the powers possessed by a Trade Union."
[3] This Act was repealed in 1927.
[4] Labouchere's *Life*, p. 480.
[5] *Popular Government*, p. 251
[6] *Radicals and Whigs* (*The Fortnightly Review*, February 1884).
[7] Bradlaugh's *Life*, Vol. II, p. 412.
[8] Lord Randolph Churchill's *Life*, Vol. II, p. 429).

Page 296.
[1] *Political Speeches*, Vol. X, p. 383.
[2] *Fifty Years in Parliament* (*The Morning Post*, January 12th, 1931).
[3] Mr. G. M. Trevelyan gives Canning and Whitbread as examples. (*Lord Grey of the Reform Bill*, p. 6).
[4] *The Public Life*, Vol. I, p. 156.

Page 297.
[1] This is almost an exact repetition of the words of Coke, quoted by Lord Shaw in his judgment on the Osborne case : " And it is to be observed, though one be chosen for one particular county or borough, yet when he is returned and sits in Parliament he serveth for the whole realm."
[2] House of Commons, April 7th, 1884.
[3] *Politics*, Book III, Ch. 8. Aristotle saw one of the consequences : " For suppose the poor, as being a majority, distribute among themselves the property of the rich, is such action not unjust ? " No, it may be said, for it was decreed by the supreme authority in the State, " and *therefore* justly decreed." (*Ib*, Ch. 10).
[4] *Life*, Vol. I, p. 149.

Page 298.
[1] *After Thirty Years*, pp. 88-9.
[2] *Life*, Vol. III, p. 173.
[3] *Diaries and Letters*, p. 255.
[4] Labouchere's *Life*, p. 434.
[5] Bradlaugh's *Life*, Vol. II, p. 15.

Page 299.
[1] *Comments and Criticisms*, p. 74.
[2] *The Times* and *The Morning Post* (May 30th. 1932).
[3] *Life*, Vol. I, p. 283.
[4] *Speeches*, p. 252 (January 17th, 1924).

Page 300.
[1] *Ib.*, p. 297.
[2] *Speeches*, p. 300.

DEMOCRACY AND WAR

" Men's musings are busy with forecasts
Of musters and battle,
And visions of shock and disaster
Rise red on the year."
Thomas Hardy, *The Dynasts.*

The danger of War—Why our Diplomacy was weak—Envy of our wealth and territory—Russia—The Crimean and Russo-Turkish wars—Penjdeh—Relations with France—French Colonial activities—Siam and Morocco—Fashoda—The Boer War—The Entente—Liberal anti-Militarism—Gladstone—Campbell-Bannerman—Liberals and Russia—Wolseley and the War Office—Salisbury's fatalism—Dilke's warnings—Stead and the Navy—The Franco-German War—Literary men pro-German—Dilke and Bismarck—Bismarck master of Europe—Germany's Colonial expansion—The Kaiser's impulsiveness—Germany's fleet—War with Germany regarded as inevitable—Warnings of Blatchford the Socialist—Was Great Britain the aggressor ?—Mr. Lloyd George's two voices—Haldane and Army Reform—Difficulties of Conscription—The voluntary system—Hague Conferences and Germany's attitude—Internationalism—Nationalism decried after the War—Danger of pre-War idealism—Kitchener made War Minister—Democracy goes to War.

THIS Essay would be incomplete without some attempt to enquire how our British Democracy, and more especially its leaders of all Parties, faced the danger of being involved in a war with a great Continental Power, or in an Armageddon. And firstly, was such a danger real ? If it existed, to what extent did our statesmen appreciate it ? Did those who understood it succeed in convincing the people of the need for preparation ? Did some who understood it shrink from this effort ? Were some wilfully blind to the danger ? some genuinely—it might be said constitutionally—incapable of perceiving it ? And what were the reactions of Democracy to those who gave warning of the danger ?

In the end it was Germany who obsessed the national mind ; but throughout our period there was scarcely any season when a war with some powerful nation was not to be apprehended—it might be with France, it might be with Russia, it might even be with the United States. We were conscious of weakness, and this weakness was reflected in our diplomacy. Lord Salisbury wrote to the Queen (August 29th, 1886) :

"The third cause is even more irremediable. As land forces go in these days, we have no army capable of meeting even a second-class Continental Power; that is, we could never spare force enough at any one point to do so. The result is that, in all places at a distance from the sea, our diplomatists can only exhort, they cannot threaten; and this circumstance often deprives their words of any weight."[1]

At the same time the extent and wealth of the Empire provoked universal jealousy. The Crown Princess of Germany wrote to Queen Victoria (December 19th, 1877):

"The feeling is so strong now abroad that England is quite powerless, has no army, a fleet that has no use, because the time for naval battles is past, has no statesmen, and cares for nothing any more but making money, because she is too weak to have a will, and if she *had* one, has *no* power of enforcing it." The Crown Princess, having remarked that some Englishmen thought that England should not pretend to be a Great Power, continued: "This may be true, but then England ought *not* to *possess half* the world, as she does now!"[2] Lord Rosebery, at a later date, reminded his countrymen that England was "viewed with such jealousy, with such hostility, with such foiled ambition, by the great Empires of the world, so friendless among nations who count their armies by embattled millions."

For many years Russia was the *bête noire* of our foreign politics. Russia had been our enemy in the Crimean War. The Treaty of Paris in 1856 had stipulated for the neutralization of the Black Sea; but in October 1870 this part of the Treaty was repudiated by Russia. It was said that Bismarck connived at the repudiation.[3] In the Russo-Turkish War our sympathies were with our old ally the Turk; we feared a Russian advance upon Constantinople. The Queen was bellicose. "Oh, if the Queen were a man," (she wrote to Beaconsfield), "she would like to give those Russians, whose words we cannot believe, such a beating." She told her Minister, "War with Russia is, the Queen believes, inevitable now or later."[4] Russia was always pushing eastward, and by gradual advances threatening Afghanistan and our Indian Empire. The Russian General Kaufmann captured Samarkand and subdued Bokhara in 1868, reduced Khiva in 1873, and conquered Khokand in 1875; in 1870 he opened communications with the Ameer.[5] In 1884 Russia occupied Merv, and, when a joint Anglo-Russian

Commission was appointed to define the Afghan frontier, exhibited much procrastination and bad faith. In March 1885 occurred the Penjdeh incident. There was a collision between Russian and Afghan troops and England was on the brink of war with Russia. Gladstone obtained a Vote of Credit for £11,000,000. But Russia accepted arbitration, and demarcation was effected. Later Austro-Russian rivalry in the Balkans relieved the situation for ourselves, but Russia was still believed to be a menace. In 1896 Balfour asked Stead, " What kind of a world will it be when Russia, which has already 120 millions of inhabitants, exercises an enormously dominating influence over the whole of the South-East of Europe? " When Russia occupied Port Arthur, Chamberlain made the celebrated observation —" He who sups with the Devil must have a long spoon." But her reverses in the war with Japan left Russia much less formidable.

Thrice then since 1867—in 1870 when Russia repudiated the Treaty of Paris, in 1878 when our fleet passed the Dardanelles, and in 1885 over the Penjdeh collision—was war with Russia possible or probable. With France our relations had been equally critical. France was already our traditional foe when the Muscovite was an outlandish barbarian. We had fought against France in The Hundred Years War, in the War of The Grand Alliance, in The Seven Years War and in The Napoleonic War. In the Crimean War she was our ally ; but in the year following the Peace of Paris the vapourings of certain French Colonels caused another war scare—and incidentally the formation of the Volunteer Force. France was brought low by Germany, but about ten years after the Franco-German War her Colonial activities began again to embroil her with England. Jules Ferry was in power, and (in 1882) :

" In order to divert attention from both internal divisions and the Eastern Frontier, he plunged into a series of adventures in China, in Tonquin, in Burmah, in Siam, in Madagascar, and in Central Africa. . . . It was part of the same policy to keep up a continual series of patriotic annoyances against England in Egypt and in the basin of the Mediterranean."[1]

Granville's comment on this is characteristic :

" It is a bore having a row with the French. I always try to console myself by an observation of my mother, who

was popular at Paris for eleven years, but said that in order to get on well in Paris society it was necessary to insult somebody once a month."[1]

Granville and his successors were to be "bored," on and off, for the next twenty years. In 1884 there was more friction with France concerning Indo-China and Pacific waters; between 1884 and 1904 there was a peril of war breaking out from disputes about Siam or Morocco or Niger territory. In 1898 there was the alarming incident of Fashoda. In 1888 Salisbury wrote to the Queen, "France is, and must always remain, England's greatest danger."[2] Between 1887 and 1895 the fortunes of France were at their lowest; but in 1891 a French Naval squadron visited Cronstadt, and in 1895 the Franco-Russian Alliance was concluded. The Anglo-French tension continued. Throughout the Boer War French feeling against England was extremely strong; the Queen was constantly lampooned in the French Press. France was still our potential enemy, and a book that made something of a sensation—*The Battle of Dorking* (published in 1900)—had for its subject a French invasion of England. The real turn came in 1903, when King Edward visited France and by his charm of manner overcame all anti-English feeling. On April 8th, 1904, Lansdowne and Cambon signed the Entente Agreement, which was a settlement of all Colonial differences and by which we gave France a free hand in Morocco in return for our own free hand in Egypt. There was no more apprehension about France.

This very brief account of our prolonged uneasy relations with France and Russia is yet enough to show that only those who lived in a Fool's Paradise could be confident about England's enjoyment of a perpetual peace wherein

"The war-drum throbbed no longer, and the battle-flags were furled
In the Parliament of man, the Federation of the world."

Again and again war was only averted by skilful diplomacy, sometimes by concessions that were manifest signs of national weakness.

The Liberal Party was by tradition anti-militarist, and Gladstone faithfully upheld the tradition. At the end of his career he declared, "during sixty-two years I have uniformly opposed Militarism." Nor did he interest himself

in naval and military matters. "No man" (he told Lord Rendel) "can know less of military questions than I do." In 1874, when he promised to abolish the Income Tax, it was part of his plan to save nearly £1,000,000 on the Army and Navy; but Cardwell and Goschen refused their consent.[1] In 1894 he resigned on Spencer's proposals for naval expenditure:

"He would not minister to the alarming aggression of professional elements. He would not break the continuous action of his political life, nor trample on tradition received from every colleague who had ever been his teacher. . . . England's part was to help Peace and Liberty, of which Peace is the nurse. The proposed policy was the foe of both."[2] "The plan," said he, "is mad; and who are they who propose it? Men who were not born when I had been in public life for years . . . Ripon is a calm and peaceful man, and I should like to know how he can justify such a policy."[3] Ripon justified himself in a letter to West: "I am not dreaming of aggression, I am not thinking of an ambitious policy, I am looking only to what I believe to be required for the defence and security of our present position."[4]

Chamberlain reflected Radical opinion on Conscription: "You would not be eager, or even willing, to pay the blood-tax which is levied on your brethren in Continental countries;" but in the same speech, referring to Bismark's recent acquisition of N. Guinea, he declared that when necessary "the English Democracy would stand shoulder to shoulder throughout the world to maintain the honour and integrity of the Empire."[5] Campbell-Bannerman was as anti-militarist as Gladstone. In 1890 he objected to the appointment of a Chief of the Staff because "in this country there is, in truth, no room for general 'military policy' in the larger and more ambitious sense of the phrase." He wrote to Bryce (January 1903): "The truth is we cannot provide for a fighting Empire, and nothing will give us the power."[6] He was fond of France, and faithful to the Entente, but he probably interpreted it as did Ripon: "Our engagements to France are, I understand, confined to a promise of full diplomatic support."[7] Except that the Nonconformists were suspicious of France as a godless and immoral nation, the Liberals as a Party were well-disposed towards that country, for France was democratic and the

French Revolution was regarded as the birth of Democracy. Russia was another matter. It is true that anti-Turkism almost implied pro-Russianism, and that Gladstone for long was inspired by a Russian Egeria ; but the Czar was an autocrat and guilty of the persecution of Russian Liberals. When the Douma was dissolved in July 1906, Campbell-Bannerman, then Prime Minister, caused some diplomatic embarrassment by exclaiming in the House of Commons, " La Douma est morte, vive la Douma ! " But the Radicals applauded the sentiment. Mr. Ramsay MacDonald violently condemned the visit paid by King Edward to the Czar at Reval in 1908—it was " an insult to our country," for the Czar was " a common murderer ; a miserable blood-stained creature."[1] To some democrats the very idea of war was unspeakable, unthinkable. When the Great War broke out, John Burns " took the line that war was something he could not bring himself to have anything to do with. Morley shared this feeling, but held in addition that Grey ought not to have let the situation arise."[2] Both Ministers resigned office.

But it was not only the Radicals who objected to making proper preparation for war, or who encouraged a feeling of security in the face of national danger. Lord Randolph Churchill extolled the benefits of our voluntary system of military service, without any consideration as to whether it were adequate or inadequate to our needs. " An Englishman " (he said) " possesses over Europeans one immeasurable and inestimable advantage. Out of the life of every German, every Frenchman, every Italian, every Austrian, every Russian, the respective Governments of those countries take three years for compulsory military service." At eight hours a day for six days a week he reckoned that each citizen of those countries lost 7,500 hours which might have been spent in " contributing to the wealth of the community as a whole by his labour. But in our free and happy country, where the freedom of existence has practically no reasonable limits and where only a very minute portion of the population voluntarily embraces a military career, every man who lives to the age of 23 or 24 possesses as an advantage over the inhabitants of foreign countries an extra capital of at least 7,500 hours." This favourable handicap combined with a good educational system ought to free us, he said, from the fear of foreign competition.[3] Disraeli

himself dilated on the "inexhaustible resources of the Empire." If England entered into a war, she had not "to ask herself whether she can support a second or third campaign. She enters into a campaign which she will not terminate, till right is done."[1] Forty years later this proved to be a true forecast; the resources were indeed proved to be almost inexhaustible, but had they been properly organized? Wolseley, the reforming soldier, accused both Parties of remissness. He wrote to the Queen (March 22nd, 1885):

"Our Army is already so ridiculously small for all the varied duties it has to perform all over the world. . . . The people of England lack the public spirit that would cause them to support the burden of an Army and a Navy of a strength commensurate to our duties and responsibilities. No Government, Whig or Tory, has the honesty to tell the people the truth and to take them into their confidence on Army and Navy measures. And when professional soldiers or sailors warn the people on these serious subjects, professional politicians jump up and pooh-pooh all their warnings. The foolish public prefer believing the tradesman who has become a politician to the gentleman who wears your Majesty's uniform."[2]

No one knew better than Wolseley that, besides the shortcomings of Whig and Tory "professional politicians," the War Office itself was a chief source of weakness. In 1898 the Queen was urging Lord Salisbury to expedite War Office reform. The "weary Titan" replied:

"Lord Salisbury is very far indeed from disputing generally the justice of your Majesty's complaints against the War Office. . . . He remembers that similar complaints were, very justly, he believes, made against the War Office under the administration of Mr. Stanhope, of Colonel Stanley, of Mr. Hardy. It would seem therefore that there is some special difficulty in the subject, or some special defect in the machinery, and that the fault cannot in the main be charged to individual Secretaries of State. Lord Salisbury will do all he can to remedy these defects, though he is not sanguine of succeeding where so many have failed."

Next year the Boer War began, and, largely because of these defects, the country had to endure the Black Week of disaster. Salisbury in the House of Lords reviewed the

situation in the same mood of fatalism—"I do not believe in the perfection of the British Constitution as an instrument of war. . . . It is evident that there is something in the machinery that is wrong." There was certainly "something wrong" with the machinery of the Army and the Army Command, too much insularity and too great a lack of ideas. It was said that in 1871 Cardwell asked the Crown Prince of Germany to teach him how to move 30,000 men 30 miles. Army manœuvres, "a novel experiment", were not tried till 1871. The Duke of Cambridge was a perpetual difficulty. Wolseley wrote to Sir Henry Ponsonby (August 2nd, 1890): "Hartington and all the Secretaries of State here in my time have had all needful reforms in the Army so blocked by him, that one and all were determined never to have another Prince here who might prove equally immovable and irremovable."[1] The Army, in brief, was very expensive and very inadequate. Harcourt compared the country to "a man who has £10,000 a year, sixteen horses and ten carriages, and yet, if one guest comes, he has difficulty to find a dog-cart to meet him, and, if two come, a fly has to be hired."[2]

Of all the politicians it was the Radical Sir Charles Dilke who saw most clearly our dangerous drift, and endeavoured by speech and pen to make the country realize her want of preparation. Writing (in 1887) on *The Present Position of European Politics* he pointed out that it was one "in which sheer force holds a larger place than it has held in modern times since the fall of Napoleon." . . . "England is of all powers the most unprepared for War." We were too weak, even if we gave up our treaty obligations to defend Turkey and Belgium. At an annual cost of £19,000,000 the Germans could put into the field nineteen Army Corps each of 37,000 men. At a cost of twice £19,000,000 we could only put in the field two Army Corps in India, and scarcely one in Great Britain. Politicians were allowed to play with our national safety, and the serious needs of self-defence were sacrificed to the poor aim of keeping constituencies in good humour. When Sir Edward Hamley brought before Parliament his proposals for the defence of London, a Radical member protested that "we could not afford to lavish our treasures upon expensive armaments if we were to supply the people with free schools and technical instruction." "In England our Army in a modern sense may be

said to be non-existent." Dilke admitted that we had those vast resources and that stubborn power of endurance of which Disraeli had boasted, but pointed out that " in these days of rapid mobilization it is the first few weeks of a war that count, and England, being unable to rapidly mobilize large forces, could do nothing in the first months of a Continental conflict." He recognized that Conscription was impossible and advocated a professional army for India, a Citizen army for Home Defence, and a Militia liable to foreign service. Writing on the British Army he admitted that Radicals like Sir Wilfrid Lawson and Mr. Picton had, through their abilities and characters and services, great and well-deserved influence with the electorate ; but he lamented that Englishmen avoided the subject of national defence " just as men in general abstain from living over undertakers' shops, or in streets where many funerals pass." He also pointed out " the wisdom of trying to make up our mind as to whether we intended to defend Belgian neutrality, or whether we did not."[1] These warnings produced no practical result. In the House of Commons (December 19th, 1893) he said : " Liberals should give up thinking of this question of National Defence as a hateful one, and as one against which they ought to close their eyes and ears."[2]

Stead, the Radical publicist, agitated strenuously for a stronger Navy. As to our Army, he wrote that " we have ceased to be a military power in the European sense of the word. We are out of the game, and it is a good thing that we are." But he was in favour of universal military service for women as well as for men. Generally speaking, the Liberal and Radical Party was averse to preparing for a war with a Continental Power, even to contemplating such a thing. The Party was composed largely of idealists to whom the very idea of war was abhorrent and every soldier was a reactionary foe of Progress. Gladstone saved on the Services purely from motives of economy ; the later Radicals were for saving in order that more money might be available for Social Reform—money spent on National Defence being, from their point of view, so much money wasted.

When we joined in the Entente the danger from France and Russia faded ; but the danger from Germany, now suspicious that she was threatened with *Welteinkreisung*, proportionately grew. In the Franco-German War the

sympathies of most of our men of light and leading had been with Germany. Matthew Arnold prophesied that "France would beat the Prussians all to pieces", but when Germany was victorious he wrote of France that "her fall is mainly due to that want of serious conception of righteousness and the need of it, the consequences of which so often show themselves in the world's history."[1] (This is the sort of utterance that tends to militate against our popularity with foreigners.) Carlyle was Germany's most powerful British champion. He wrote a letter to *The Times* (November 18th, 1870) which now reads strangely:

"That noble, patient, deep pious and solid Germany should at length be welded into a nation and become Queen of the Continent, instead of vapouring, vainglorious, gesticulating, quarrelsome, restless and over-sensitive France, seems to me the hopefullest public fact that has occurred in my time."

It is not surprising that he received a grateful letter from Bernstorff the Prussian Ambassador, enclosing an admiring telegram from Hamburg. "In fact" (writes Froude), "Carlyle's letter had most effectually served its purpose. There was no more talk of English interposition."[2]

He wrote to Froude (September 1870):

"Germany, from of old, has been the peaceablest, most pious, and in the end most valiant and terriblest of nations. Germany ought to be President of Europe, and will again, it seems, be tried with that office for another five centuries or so."[3]

He wrote in his *Journal* of "the amazing German-French War, grandest and most beneficent of Heavenly providences in the history of my time."[4]

Froude followed his master: "the French and German War, an exhibition of Divine judgment after Carlyle's own heart."[5] Meredith pronounced that "the War is chargeable upon France, and the Emperor is the Knave of the pack;" but some of Morley's Positivist friends were ardently pro-French.[6] Charles Kingsley considered that the German victory was "the triumph of Christianity and the Gentle Life." As affecting British opinion it was a great asset for Germany in those days that she was supposed to be a *moral* nation. French literature, said Carlyle, was "a new kind of Phallus-worship, with Sue, Balzac and Co., for prophets, and Madame Sand for a virgin."[7] But the

Germans (as Mr. Hugh Kingsmill writes) were regarded as "a nation composed exclusively of chaste and corpulent and tearful dreamers, whose only temptations were a glass of beer and a well-filled pipe."[1] It was probably to the *Germania* of Tacitus that the Germans first owed their reputation for chastity, and the reputation lasted long; but on this point the French who lived in provinces invaded by Prussians suffered from no illusions.

Dilke was at first a pro-German, but "with the fall of Napoleon and observation of the Germans as conquerors, Sir Charles became wholly French in his sympathies, and before long his close study of events showed him that the war had really been of Bismarck's making."[2] In September 1889 this view was confirmed, for Bismarck himself told him that he had deliberately "cut down a telegram of 200 words which meant peace into a telegram of 20 words which meant war."[3] It may be added here that Lord Salisbury, writing in *The Quarterly Review* (October 1870) of "pacific Germany", observed that "there is nothing in history to justify such a pretension."[4]

Queen Victoria wrote in her *Journal* (July 9th, 1870): "A powerful Germany can never be dangerous to England, but the very reverse."[5] But Germany, having vanquished three nations, was to be ruled by Bismarck who was not troubled by scruples. In 1865, referring to Belgium, he had told the Dutch Minister that "a guarantee in these days was of little value."[6] (A fear of the violation of Belgium was in Dilke's mind in 1887, Liége and Namur being then unfortified.)[7] Bismarck became not only master of the German Empire, but arbiter of Europe. Schouvaloff wrote to Beaconsfield (October 10th, 1877): "Bismarck is complete master, Andrasy only his Viceroy; and Russia and Austria are moved about by him like pieces of chess."[8] In 1879 Lady Emily Russell (Lady Ampthill) wrote to the Queen that the old Kaiser "now yields in everything to Bismarck, whom he allows to do as he pleases with the Government and the German Empire, in all its branches."[9] In 1880 he was at the height of his power, controlling the foreign policy of Germany and France and Austria. "At St. Petersburg his word is gospel, as well as at Paris and Rome." At Constantinople "he carried the Sultan in his pocket."[10]

However as yet there were no occasions for world-wide

friction with England. In 1873 Odo Russell reported to Granville that Bismarck "desired neither colonies nor fleets."[1] But a Colonial Party, known as *die Kolonial-Menschen*, was gradually growing in Germany and by the year 1884 had gained such strength that Bismarck was constrained to adopt their policy. This, as Dilke saw, meant a loss of British markets. "Bismarck, you know," said the Prince of Wales on the occasion when he lunched with Lady Warwick and Stead, "was much against the Colonial policy; it was the best thing about him. He was always opposed to that, but afterwards when it got too strong for him, it went on, but he had a great hatred of England."[2] The story of the beginnings of Germany's Colonial expansion is told in detail in the *Life of Granville* (Vol. II. Ch. 10). In 1884 she annexed the N. coast and adjacent islands of New Guinea and New Ireland, Angra Pequena, and the Cameroons. In January 1885 she hoisted her flag in Samoa. Both the Liberal and the Conservative Press condemned our Government for their vacillation in the face of these proceedings. Bismarck appeared in one of *Punch's* Cartoons (January 10th, 1885) as "The Greedy Boy". There was great indignation in those of our Colonies that felt their interests threatened. We can imagine what the Queen thought of Granville's plea—"it may be found that there is no great objection to the acts of Germany in themselves, but only in the careless impropriety which attaches to the manner of them."[3] Questions relating to the interior of Africa were settled by the Berlin Act of February 24th, 1885. As to those annexations which had excited such strong resentment in Australia, Gladstone decided that the continued hostility of Germany was a greater danger than the irritation of our Australian colonists;[4] these matters were accordingly settled with more large concessions to Germany.[5]

In 1890 Lord Salisbury made another settlement with Germany including the cession of Heligoland, which (said Dilke) "if Mr. Gladstone had given, they would have destroyed him for giving." From 1890 to 1897 our relations with Germany were friendly while Caprivi and Hohenlohe were her Chancellors. But the incident of the Kaiser's telegram to Kruger (1896) was an unpleasant one, and the Boer War impaired the prospects of a permanent understanding; nor was von Bülow so well-disposed to England

as his predecessors. In 1892 Germany had notified us that, if we constructed railways in Asia Minor, she would make trouble for us in Egypt. In 1902 there was a decisive moment in Anglo-German relations. Von Bülow informed us that the Anglo-German treaty of October 1900 did not apply to Manchuria. Great Britain replied with the Anglo-Japanese treaty.[1] After this there were ominous events—the Kaiser's visit to Tangiers in April 1905 followed by the Algeciras Conference, the annexation of Bosnia-Herzegovina by Austria in the autumn of 1908, and the "Panther's" arrival at Agadir in 1911.

There was danger also in the impulsive, unstable character of Kaiser Wilhelm II—"such a hot-headed conceited and wrong-headed young man," as the Queen described him to Lord Salisbury.[2] Prussian soldiers entertained a well-grounded belief that Prince Wilhelm was "a belligerent Junker who would attack France the moment he came to the German throne."[3] The Kaiser sincerely believed that his people were under the special protection of Almighty God, who was to lead them on to some great destiny:

"To this are added the sense of our responsibility to our Supreme Lord above, and my unshakable conviction that He, our former ally at Rossbach and Dennewitz, will not leave me in the lurch. He has taken such infinite pains with our ancient Brandenburgh and our House, that we cannot suppose He has done this for no purpose."[4] This "hotheaded young man" was the War-Lord of a prodigious army. In 1887 Germany was spending 21 millions on her Army and Navy, France 29 millions, England and India 51 millions. But Germany had one and a half million of men and reserves, as also had France; England had only 150,000. Lord Randolph Churchill justly deduced from this the "utter and glaring folly to talk about the ascendancy of England in the counsels of Europe."[5] Then there was Germany's ship-building effort. In 1904 the Kaiser styled himself "the Admiral of the Atlantic." In 1905 Great Britain built four ships to Germany's two. In 1906 each built three; in 1907 Great Britain decreased to two, Germany increased to four. And there was a persevering permeation of Great Britain by Germany—a social, commercial, financial, and political permeation. The Germans here worked harder than ourselves. *Punch* (April 16th, 1887) introduces us to young Müller from Hamburg, a

pianist who speaks six languages, is employed in an office at £1 a week and is ready to dispense with an annual holiday. The German nation was becoming more and more inclined for violent action.

"Aus einem Lehrnvolk wollen wir ein Thatvolk werden," and the doctrines of Bernhardi, Treitschke and Nietzche became more and more popular.

By the time that Campbell-Bannerman came into office and power with his great Radical majority, it was beginning to be felt that a conflict with Germany was, sooner or later, inevitable. This may be gathered from the utterances of men of all Parties, and of men who stood outside ordinary Party politics :—

Dilke thought that an Armageddon might possibly be avoided by skilful diplomacy "combined with proper measures of defence."[1] The German peril was always in his mind.[2]

St. Loe Strachey : "Looking back on our lives in the first fourteen years of this century, I see them overshadowed from year to year by the German menace."[3]

Wilfrid Blunt : "We were already sated like a lion surrounded with the carcasses of its prey, while Germany was alert and hungry. Well might we want peace ! Almost as well might Germany prepare for War ! "[4]

George Wyndham (in 1907) : "It was certain there would be war with Germany, perhaps in five years, perhaps in thirty."[5]

Lord Roberts : "Contrasted with our own apathy, our puerile and spasmodic efforts, how impressive is this magnificent and unresting energy ! It has the mark of true greatness ; it exhorts admiration from those against whom it is directed."

Lord Northcliffe "simply believed the War was inevitable."[6]

Lord Rosebery in the House of Lords (July 10th, 1906) : "I confess I sometimes despair of the country ever becoming alive to the danger of the unpreparedness of our present position until too late to prevent some fatal catastrophe."

Frederic Harrison : "How idle are fine words about Retrenchment, Peace and Brotherhood, whilst we lie open to the risk of unutterable ruin, to a deadly fight for national existence, and to war in its most cruel and destructive form."[7]

Robert Blatchford was one of those Socialists who "did not believe that foreign workers would turn against their rulers in case of international disputes."[1] He wrote of the German peril: "Our statesmen did not know, or dared not speak. Our politicians were obsessed with politics. Most of our popular newspapers were twittering about universal peace and the burden of armaments."[2] In 1909, after visiting Germany and attending the German manœuvres, he wrote a series of articles in *The Daily Mail* to show that Germany was deliberately preparing to destroy the British Empire, his object being "to arouse the public from the fatal apathy and complacent optimism which blind them."[3] The articles made a great impression, but "they had no permanent effect on the political mind" because the necessary action, i.e. Compulsory Service, would have been unpopular.[4] Mr. McKenna called it "a got-up War-scare," but declared that "it has not lost us a single vote." The official organ of the Labour Party said the articles made that Party "rock with laughter."[5]

All detached observers at the beginning of this century were agreed that the danger from German aggression was real and ever-present. Some minds now entertain with great acceptance the theory that we were as much the aggressors as the Germans—the "war-guilt" must be equally shared by both. The idea that a Campbell-Bannerman or an Asquith Government would initiate a European War is sufficiently ludicrous. But all the documents published since the War go to prove that, while we were working for peace, the enemy Governments were working for war. Herr Maximilian Harden wrote in *Die Zukunft* (August 1st, 1914): "Why not admit what is and must be the truth—namely, that between Vienna and Berlin everything was jointly prepared?" Four months later he said: "Cease the pitiful attempts to excuse Germany's action. Not as weak-willed blunderers have we undertaken the fearful risk of this war. We wanted it. . . . We are waging it for ourselves alone."[6] Germany precipitated the Great War, as Bismarck and Prussia had precipitated the Wars of 1864, 1866 and 1870.

There can, in fact, be no clearer proof of our complete innocence of aggressiveness than may be obtained from examining the manner in which our democratic leaders faced, or (in some cases) refused to face, the now

manifest danger. Asquith characteristically oscillated between acknowledging the need for preparation and condemning alarmism.[1] But of course his powerful mind grasped the reality of the situation. Addressing a Peace Conference, at a dinner on July 31st, 1908, he remarked that the annual expenditure by civilized nations upon armaments was between four and five hundred million pounds. "These things" (he said) "are intended to be used. They are not accumulated, and they do not exist, for ornament and display. They are intended to be used, and at some moment, by a sudden outburst, possibly of an accidental fit of passion and temper, they will be let loose on the world."[2] Asquith might have gone further: he might have put the same question to his audience as Demosthenes put to the Athenians at the time of the Macedonian menace—"Do you for a moment imagine that these preparations are not directed against *you?*" Mr. Lloyd George gibed at the supporters of a strong Navy:

"And we said 'we have actually got in men and material something like three to one in the German fleet.' 'What!' they said, 'have you only got three to one against the German fleet? Traitors! Little Englanders! Are you going to send three poor Britishers to face one big German? You might have known that a German could eat three British sailors as if they were Frankfurt sausages.'"[3]

Yet at the Mansion House, on July 21st, 1911, he made a strong patriotic declaration:

"But if a situation were to be forced on us in which peace could only be preserved by the surrender of the great and beneficent position Britain has won by centuries of heroism and achievement, by allowing Britain to be treated where her interests are vitally affected as if she were of no account in the Cabinet of the Nations, then I say emphatically that peace at that price would be a humiliation intolerable for a great country like ours to endure."[4]

He also said he would raise 100 millions in a single year for the British Navy if its supremacy were really challenged.[5] Lord Birkenhead wrote of this mercurial and incalculable statesman:

"One notes the disharmony, masked by outward conformity, between Mr. Lloyd George, and, perhaps, the bulk of his party in the country. He shocked the Radicals by his

firm attitude towards Germany over Agadir : as a member of the 'Inner Circle' of the Cabinet in conjunction with Mr. Asquith, Mr. Churchill, Sir Edward Grey, and Lord Haldane, he realized the necessity for precautions against the German threat to European peace. Yet, as late as the New Year of 1914, he gave a pacifist interview to *The Daily Chronicle*, proposing a reduction of armaments on account of the marked improvement in our relations with Germany. This was a futile and inexplicable speech."[1]

The Man in the Street might well be bewildered by these alternating words of comfort and warning. As regards the Navy the First Lords did not waver. Mr. McKenna and Mr. Churchill between them raised the Naval Estimates from 30 to 51 millions. But for a Continental war a great Army was as necessary as a predominant Navy. How was our Army to be strengthened in efficiency and numbers? No British Government, least of all a Radical Government which depended for its majority upon the Socialists and the Irish, dared to introduce Conscription or any form of universal liability to service. The War Minister was Haldane, to whom Campbell-Bannerman had offered the Attorney-Generalship in December 1905. "What about the War Office?" asked Haldane. "Nobody will touch it with a pole." "Then give it to me," replied Haldane.[2] Haldane was a distinguished Equity lawyer. He was also a philosopher who had been educated at a German university, and continued to be attracted by German culture. "See him arrive" (said King Edward at a garden party) "in the hat he inherited from Goethe."[3] Germany, he once said, was "his spiritual home"; and when the Great War broke out that saying was remembered against him to his great detriment. But Lord Birkenhead rightly praised him as "a sturdy patriot."[4]

Haldane's "Appreciation of the Situation" (to use a military term) was published after the War in his *Autobiography* and his book *Before the War*. These books are his *apologia* wherein he explains what he believed to be the limiting factors of our military policy. The main object of British foreign policy from 1905 to 1914 was (he wrote) "the prevention of the danger of any outbreak with Germany."[5] The endeavour made was directed in the first place to averting war, and in the second place to preparing for it *as well as was practicable* if it should come."[6]

But " Compulsory Service in a period of peace was out of the question for us. Moreover, it would have taken at least two generations to organize, and meanwhile we should have been weaker than without it."[1] " It was highly improbable that the country would have looked at anything of the sort."[2] " Even if the country had assented to the attempt being made . . . it is probable that the result would have been a failure, and it is almost certain that we should have provoked a preventive war on the part of Germany."[3] It was said that we should have raised two million of men, and it was pointed out that this had to be done in the end. To this Haldane replies, " you can do things in war which are impossible in peace."[4] (True, but at a much more terrible price.) Nor was it possible " to possess in integrity two great conflicting military traditions."[5] But why could the two not have been harmonized ?

Haldane also had for his guidance a report of the General Staff that " to raise an army by Compulsory Service was impracticable. . . . It would take several years before a new compulsory system could possibly be got into shape and substituted for the existing system."[6] Much was said, in addition, about the difficulty of finding officers for such a large army. There was very great force in all these arguments against Conscription. Professional soldiers pronounced it impracticable. Public opinion was believed to be enormously against it. In any case the Government in office would have refused " to touch it with a pole "—to use Campbell-Bannerman's expression. And yet, in those days, we could not but feel very uneasy about the resulting situation. The likelihood, almost certainty, of our being involved in a great war was admitted by all far-seeing and unprejudiced men, and we were bound to prepare for it " as far as was practicable." But the limits of our preparations were to be set by the very Power that we feared ; for if we went too far in our preparations we would " provoke a preventive war on the part of Germany." (The same argument was used against the Tariff Reformers, viz, that to adopt Protection might provoke Germany to attack us.) Germany meanwhile, undeterred by any apprehensions of provoking *us*, was making whatever preparations she deemed to be necessary for her struggle for world-supremacy. Great Britain in those years might

almost be compared to a rabbit that is hypnotized by a snake, or perhaps to another helpless animal,

"Cervæ luporum præda rapacium."

Haldane therefore recognized that in the existing state of public opinion it was impossible to introduce Conscription. He did the next best thing; he prepared the Regular Army for the part it might have to play, and he reorganized the Auxiliary Forces. He has recorded that, when he became War Minister, "a careful enquiry disclosed that, in order to put even 80,000 men on the Continent, preliminary preparations requiring at least two months would be required."[1] For the Egyptian campaign of 1882 a month had been required for the mobilization of a single Army Corps.[2] It was owing to his efforts that when the crisis arrived, the Expeditionary Force of seven Divisions was ready for embarkation and immediate service. The Yeomanry and Volunteers were reconstituted into the Territorial Force. This was a great step forward; but the system was still voluntary, and all who have borne arms in voluntary soldiering know the difficulties—one might add, the absurdities—of the voluntary system. In the end the voluntary soldier's efficiency depends upon the goodwill of his employer. The great majority of employers are patriots; but, before the War, there were some who in their hatred of "Militarism" discouraged applications for leave to attend Camp by threats of dismissal. Few Englishmen are aware that there is an ancient Common Law obligation to bear arms in defence of the Country (which long survived in the Militia Ballot). The true democrat ought to regard this obligation as a privilege. Dilke quoted from a pamphlet written by a French Naval officer:

"To have in the day of danger his place among the defenders of his country is for a German, for a Frenchman, for a Russian, an inalienable right; but for an Englishman to go for a soldier is a weakness."[3]

The same writer compared England to Carthage. Both possessed incalculable wealth and unrivalled fleets. Would England's fate be as the fate of Carthage?

Haldane's efforts in the cause of Army Reform did not endear him to his colleagues, many of whom ostentatiously dissociated themselves from taking any interest in the matter. Keir Hardie, the Socialist, wrote to Stead of

"Mr. Haldane's scheme for introducing Militarism into our Schools and Universities."[1] But, a few days after the outbreak of war, Asquith (who in 1915 was obliged to abandon Haldane on account of anti-German feeling) wrote to him: "If the country is prepared for this war, it is to you more than to any other person that it owes it."[2] General Grierson said of him that he was "the best War Minister since Cardwell."[3] Haig wrote to him (November 19th, 1918): "Until you arrived at the War Office no one knew for what purpose our Army existed. . . . You then sowed the seeds which have developed into the tremendous instrument which has vanquished the famous German Army and brought about a victorious peace." Haig, after his triumphal ride with King George along the Mall, called on Haldane and left for him a copy of his Despatches in which he had written: "To Viscount Haldane of Cloan—the greatest Secretary of State for War England has ever had."[4]

To the Idealist every kind of preparation for war—naval or military, voluntary or compulsory—was hateful; to him, an Armageddon, in which England might be involved, was too dreadful to be conceivable. He pinned his faith on the pacific desires of men of all nations, on Internationalism and Hague Conferences, on Peace Crusades and a reduction of armaments by mutual agreement. There was a time when even Thomas Hardy indulged a belief that the God of Battles was a sick God:

> "Let men rejoice, let men deplore,
> The lurid Deity of heretofore
> Succumbs to one of saner nod;
> The Battle-God is God no more." [5]

Internationalism was ever a Liberal aspiration. It was to be furthered, perhaps effected, by Free Trade amongst the nations: Cobden, wrote Lord Morley, was "essentially the international man."[6] Wars continued to be waged but Gladstone remained hopeful:

"Whatever we may say amidst the clash of arms and amidst the din of preparation for warfare in time of peace—amidst all this yet there is going on a profound mysterious movement, that, whether we will or not, is bringing the nations of the civilized world, as well as the uncivilized,

morally as well as physically nearer to one another, and making them more and more responsible before God for one another's welfare."[1] And, as the years went on, though the great nations were arming themselves to the teeth, enthusiasts refused to be disillusioned. In 1896 there was held an Inter-Parliamentary Conference at Buda Pesth (at which Russia was not represented). But in the autumn of 1898 the Czar's Peace Rescript excited fresh hopes.[2] Stead, who had organized the Anglo-American Arbitration campaign in 1896, rushed off to Livadia, full of fervour, and had three interviews with the Czar. Thence he travelled to Rome to engage Papal sympathy, and returning to London proclaimed the International Crusade of Peace on December 18th.[3] In May 1899 there followed the Peace Conference at the Hague, at which Germany proved obstructive. Percival, the Radical Bishop of Hereford, preached a sermon at the English Church under the title *The Peacemakers, or the Influence of Christian Principles on International Relationships.*[4] In 1906 there was a visit of German Editors to England, followed in 1907 by a return visit of English Editors to Germany. On the latter occasion Stead declared that "what Bismarck did for Germany some still greater Bismarck has yet to do for the entire human family."[5] The second Hague Conference took place in 1907, but Prince von Bülow had announced in the Reichstag that Germany would decline to discuss thereat the question of disarmament ;[6] nor at the Conference would she discuss the limitation of armaments. About this time *The Spectator* was advocating International agreement, and proposing that no war should be begun without due notice.[7] In spite of Germany's ominous attitude the promoters of the Peace movements persevered, but alas ! they might well have chosen for their motto Psalm 120 v. 6. We have seen how Asquith, speaking of armaments to the guests at a Peace Conference dinner, reminded his audience that "these things are intended to be used." But much continued to be said about the Democracy of Germany joining hands with our own Democracy. On the eve of the Great War the good Bishop Percival, having recently visited that country, sent a message to the National Peace Congress at Cardiff in which he stated :

"We were assured that the masses of the working men are solid for peace. Here, then, we have a great and growing

people, the greatest on the Continent of Europe, like ourselves industrially and commercially, and of the same stock, equally with us desirous of unbroken peace and friendship."[1] How much pleasanter to believe this than to heed Blatchford's warning that foreign workers would not "turn against their rulers in case of international disputes."[2] While the War was raging Lord Morley wrote :

"In our present overwhelming days such hope as is left to Europe and America seems to yearn for some formal confederacy of States that shall keep the world's peace. There are many reasons for suspecting illusion. The dream is old, and historic awakening has been rude."[3] Since the War Internationalism has developed into a strong condemnation of Nationalism. "The sovereignty of a State," writes a post-War author, "is a provincialism which cannot endure." *The Times* in an article on *The Interdependence of Nations* has asserted as an axiomatic truth that "the individual Nation has become too small to be the basic unit. . . . A rigid concentration upon narrowly National interests can only in the long run hurt those interests." It is true that "language and customs and outlook must obviously always give separate regional entity to large groups of men and women ; in that sense the Nation is no doubt as indestructible as the Family ;" but "almost certainly the Nationalists, even when they temporarily predominate, are in a minority in their respective countries."[4] And an eminent Bishop has lately pronounced that "Nationalism is utterly discredited in Church and State alike."

So Internationalism still makes its appeal, perhaps now a stronger appeal than ever ; it may be that Nationality is discredited in some quarters but it is a burning fire in Italy, Germany and Russia. At any rate in the imperfect pre-War world, Idealism had its dangers. The world of 1914, with nearly all Nations feverishly arming for offence or defence, was no place for the Idealists. They had exerted great influence, and so when the crash came we had to rely upon such preparations as our democratic Government had thought it possible or prudent to make. A man in difficulties, when his affairs become critical, must at last have recourse to the stern advice of his banker or solicitor. So, on the outbreak of the Great War, our rulers did the only thing left to be done—they called in Kitchener the Realist

and made him War Minister. Kitchener was less impressed by the preparations that had been made for war than by what he found lacking ; and as yet he had had no experience of the peculiar conditions of democratic government. Lord Denbigh, at an interview, told him that the Honourable Artillery Company had only 15 Pounders. Kitchener exclaimed, " What ! only 15 Pounders ! " Then, clenching his fist, he stamped round the room, saying, " Good Lord, here we are, no guns, no rifles, no boots, no clothing, no anything, and we call ourselves an Empire ! "[1] And his first comments at the War Office were : " There is no Army. Not a scrap of Army, and not a pen which will write ! Whatever can be said of my colleagues, no one at any rate can deny them courage. They have no Army, and they have declared war against the mightiest military nation in the world."[2]

And so our British Democracy, under its Radical Government, went to war, the greatest war of European history—

" Eheu ! quantus equis, quantus adest viris,
" Sudor ! "

NOTES TO
DEMOCRACY AND WAR

Page 306.
[1] Queen Victoria's *Letters* (1886-90), p. 195.
[2] Queen Victoria's *Letters* (1870-78), p. 578.
[3] Disraeli's *Life*, Vol. VI, p. 8.
[4] Queen Victoria's *Letters* (1870-78), p. 597.
[5] Disraeli's *Life*, Vol. V, p. 408.

Page 307.
[1] Granville's *Life*, Vol. II, pp. 313-4.

Page 308.
[1] To Lord Bath (December 29th, 1882), *ib.*, p. 314.
[2] August 25th, 1888 (Queen Victoria's *Letters*, 1886-90), p. 438.

Page 309.
[1] Disraeli's *Life*, Vol. V, p. 274.
[2] Sir Algernon West's *Diaries*, p. 257.
[3] *Ib.*, p. 255.
[4] *Ib.*, p. 259.
[5] Birmingham, January 5th, 1885. (This was the famous " Ransom " speech).
[6] *Life*, Vol. II, p. 88.
[7] *Ib.*, p. 251.

Page 310.
[1] *The Tragedy of King Edward the Seventh* (W. H. Edwards), p. 272.
[2] Haldane's *Autobiography*, p. 280.
[3] *Life of Lord Randolph Churchill*, Vol. II, p. 429.

Page 311.
[1] Guildhall, Lord Mayor's Day, November, 1876.
[2] Queen Victoria's *Letters* (1879-85), p. 632.

Page 312.
[1] Queen Victoria's *Letters* (1886-90), p. 625. Wolseley, however, added, " I know the Duke of Connaught would make the Army a fighting reality, make it an efficient military machine " (*Ib.*, p. 629). With regard to the Duke of Cambridge's appointment, it was Stockmar's belief that, in order to avert revolution, Royal authority over the Army should be exercised through a Prince and not through a Minister responsible to Parliament. (Dilke's *Life*, Vol. II, p. 413).
[2] Dilke's *Life*, Vol. II, p. 406.

Page 313.
[1] Dilke's articles appeared in *The Fortnightly Review* ; on *The Present Position of European Politics* (June, 1887) ; on *The British Army* (November and December, 1887) ; and a third in 1888. See also Dilke's *Life*, Vol. II, pp. 387-99.
[2] *Life*, Vol. II, p. 416.

Page 314.
[1] To his Mother, *Letters*, Vol. II, p. 48.
[2] Carlyle's *Life* (1834-81), Vol. II, pp. 404-5.
[3] *Ib.*, p. 400.
[4] *Ib.*, p. 407.
[5] *Ib.*, p. 399.
[6] Morley's *Recollections*, Vol. I, p. 45.
[7] *Life* (1834-81), Vol. II, p. 399.

Page 315.
[1] *Matthew Arnold* (Hugh Kingsmill), p. 206.
[2] *Life*, Vol. I, p. 133.
[3] *Ib.*, p. 157. (The words within the inverted commas were Bismarck's. He admitted the same to Sir E. Malet. See Queen Victoria's *Letters*, 1886-90, p. 565).
[4] *Life*, Vol. II, p. 34.
[5] Queen Victoria's *Letters*, 1870-78, p. 62.
[6] Gladstone's *Life*, Vol. II, p. 320.
[7] Dilke's *Life*, Vol. II, p. 256.
[8] Disraeli's *Life*, Vol. VI, p. 185.
[9] Queen Victoria's *Letters*, 1879-85, p. 59.
[10] Lord Odo Russell to Granville (Granville's *Life*, Vol. II, p. 207).

Page 316.
[1] *Ib.*, p. 337.
[2] Stead's *Life* (Frederic Whyte), Vol. II, p. 113.
[3] Queen Victoria's *Letters*, 1879-85, p. 591.
[4] Granville's *Life*, Vol. II, p. 430.
[5] *Ib.*, p. 432.

Page 317.
[1] Dilke's *Life*, Vol. II, p. 498.
[2] February 15th, 1888. Queen Victoria's *Letters*, 1886-90, p. 441.
[3] Dilke, *The British Army* (*Fortnightly Review*, November, 1887).
[4] Speech at Banquet of Diet of Brandenburgh, 1892.
[5] *Speeches*, Vol. II, pp. 182-3.

Page 318.
[1] *Life*, Vol. II, p. 499.
[2] *Ib.*, p. 261.
[3] *St. Loe Strachey, His Life and His Paper*, p. 235.
[4] *My Diaries*, Vol. I, p. xix.
[5] *Ib.*, Vol. II., p 177.
[6] *Northcliffe* (Hamilton Fyfe).
[7] Letter to *The Times*, March, 1909.

Page 319.
[1] *My Eighty Years* (Robert Blatchford), p. 199.
[2] *Ib.*, p. 223.
[3] *Fleet Street and Downing Street* (Kennedy Jones), p. 252
[4] *Ib.*
[5] *My Eighty Years*, p. ix.
[6] Quoted in Prof. Hearnshaw's Letter to *The Times*, February 11th, 1932

Page 320.
[1] *The Pre-War Mind in Britain*, p. 101.
[2] *Speeches*, p. 106.
[3] Reading, January 1st, 1910 (*Speeches*, p. 746).
[4] *Speeches*, p. 791.
[5] *The World Crisis* (Winston Churchill), p. 54

Page 321.
[1] *Last Essays*, p. 8.
[2] Haldane's *Autobiography*, p. 173.
[3] *Ib.*, p. 209.
[4] The full phrase is " a sturdy patriot, surrounded by mealy-mouthed traitors " (*Last Essays*, p. 281).
[5] *Before the War*, p. 35.
[6] *Ib.*, Prefatory Note.

Page 322.
[1] *Ib.*, p. 34.
[2] *Ib.*, p. 175.
[3] *Ib.*, p. 6.
[4] *Ib.*, p. 170.
[5] *Ib.*, p. 174.
[6] *Autobiography*, p. 196.

Page 323.
[1] *Autobiography*, p. 188.
[2] Sir Charles Dilke, *The British Army* (*The Fortnightly Review* December, 1887).
[3] *The British Army* (*The Fortnightly Review*, November, 1887).

Page 324.
[1] Stead's *Life* (Frederic Whyte), Vol. II, p. 289.
[2] Haldane's *Autobiography*, p. 269.
[3] *The British Liberal Party* (Fyfe), p. 195.
[4] Haldane's *Autobiography*, pp. 288-9.
[5] But " the War destroyed all Hardy's belief in the gradual ennoblement of man." He would not have ended *The Dynasts* as he did, if he had foreseen the War. (*The Later Years of Thomas Hardy*, p. 165).
[6] *Recollections*, Vol. I, p. 135.

Page 325.
[1] *Life*, Vol. II, p. 596 (at Edinburgh, 1879).
[2] The Kaiser had had no notice of this Rescript (*Personal Papers of Lord Rendel*, p. 185).
[3] *Life* (Frederic Whyte), Vol. II, pp. 122-46.
[4] Percival's *Life* (Temple), p. 256.
[5] *Life*, Vol. II, p. 283.
[6] Campbell-Bannerman's *Life*, Vol. II, p. 331.
[7] *St. Loe Strachey, His Life and His Paper*, p. 209.

Page 326.
[1] Percival's *Life*, p. 257.
[2] *My Eighty Years*, p. 199.
[3] *Recollections*, Vol. I, p. 134.
[4] *The Times*, August 8th, 1931.

Page 327.
[1] *The H.A.C. in the Great War* (Major Goold Walker).
[2] *Last Essays* (Lord Birkenhead), p. 239.

CHRONOLOGY

1865.

April 30. Manning made Archbishop of Westminster.
July 6. Dissolution of Parliament. Result of General Election :—a Liberal majority of 70.
John Stuart Mill, M.P. for Westminster.
Oct. 18. Death of Palmerston.

1866.

March 12. Gladstone introduces Reform Bill.
May 21. Great Reform demonstration on Primrose Hill.
June 18. Government defeated on Lord Dunkellin's Amendment.
,, 26. Resignation of Government.
July 2. Cranborne Secretary of State for India.
Hyde Park railings pulled down.
Autumn. Violent Reform demonstrations in large towns.

1867.

Feb. 11. Disraeli introduces Reform Resolutions.
March 2. Resignations of Cranborne, Peel and Carnarvon.
March 18. Reform Bill introduced.
26. The Bill read a second time.
April 8. "Tea Room" revolt against Gladstone.
16. Labouchere M.P. for Middlesex.
May 9. Resignation of Walpole.
17. Hodgkinson's Amendment to abolish Compounding accepted.
July 15.—Cranborne moves rejection of Reform Bill, which passes Third Reading without a division.
Aug. 15. The Bill receives Royal Assent.
Dec. 13. Clerkenwell prison blown up.

1868.

First number of *The Echo*.
Abolition of Public Executions.
Joseph Chamberlain elected Chairman of the Birmingham National Education League.

Feb. 21. Derby asks Queen's permission to retire.
27. Disraeli kisses hands as Prime Minister.
April 26. News of success of Abyssinian expedition.
30. Gladstone carries his first Irish Church Resolution by 330 to 265.

July 31. Parliament prorogued.
Sept. 30. Queen Isabella of Spain dethroned.
Autumn. General Election ; a Liberal majority of 112.
Nov. 24. Gladstone defeated in S.W. Lancs. (but returned for Greenwich).
Mrs. Disraeli made a Peeress.
Dec. 1. Resignation of Disraeli.
Gladstone becomes Prime Minister.
24. Lord Bute received into the Church of Rome.

1869.

The Ring and the Book.
Culture and Anarchy.
The Subjection of Women.
Phineas Finn.
Girton College founded.
Honour School of Theology instituted at Oxford.
Chamberlain enters the Birmingham Town Council.
Radicals found *The Labour Representation League.*

March 1. Irish Church Bill introduced.
4. Second Reading of the Bill.
April 29. Henry Chaplin's maiden speech.
May 31. Third Reading of Irish Church Bill.
June 19. The Bill read a second time in the Lords, 179 to 146.
July 26. The Bill receives Royal Assent.
Oct. 23. Death of Lord Derby.
Nov. Acton made a Peer.
Dec. Oecumenical Council assembled at Rome.

1870.

Lothair.
Lord Salisbury Chancellor of Oxford University.

Feb. 12. Education Bill introduced by W. E. Forster.
June 9. Death of Dickens.
27. Death of Clarendon.
July 6. Granville becomes Foreign Secretary.
18. Infallibility of the Pope acclaimed in St. Peter's.
19. France declares war against Germany.
Aug. 4. Weissenburg.
6. Wörth.
Sept. 3. Bazaine beaten at Metz.
4. Fall of French Empire.
The French Army surrenders at Sedan. The Emperor a prisoner.
7. Jowett becomes Master of Balliol.

Oct. 31. Russia repudiates neutralization of Black Sea.
Nov. 18. Carlyle's pro-German letter to *The Times*.
Dec. 18. The King of Prussia proclaimed German Emperor.
19. John Bright resigns from Board of Trade.

1871.

The Descent of Man.
Desperate Remedies.
Songs before Sunrise.
The Bank Holiday Act.
The first horse-tram appears in London.
Japan abolishes Feudalism.
Repeal of Ecclesiastical Titles Act.
Treaty of London revises Treaty of Paris.
Disraeli Rector of Glasgow University.

Jan. 28. Armistice between France and Germany.
Feb. 22. Preliminaries of Peace signed.
March 21. Wedding of Princess Louise and Lord Lorne.
March 18.) The Paris Commune.
May 28.)
29. Opening of the Albert Hall.
June Paris insurrection crushed.
Nov. Campbell-Bannerman Financial Secretary to the War Office.
Nov. 6. Dilke lectures at Newcastle on the Queen's income.
25. Irving presents *The Bells* at the Lyceum.
Dec. Illness of the Prince of Wales.
Death of Hudson, the railroad "King."

1872.

Erewhon.
Under the Greenwood Tree.
The Ballot Act.
The Alabama Award.
The Shah visits London.
Law and History made separate Schools at Oxford.

Feb. 7. 2,000 agricultural labourers meet at Wellesbourne.
27. Public thanksgiving for recovery of the Prince of Wales.
March 19. Dilke's Motion for Civil List Returns.
April 3. Disraeli's Manchester Speech—"a range of exhausted volcanoes."
6. Wedding of Mary Arnold and Thomas Humphry Ward.
May MacMahon succeeds Thiers.
29. First Congress of agricultural labourers, 60 delegates representing 50,000 members.

June 24. Disraeli's Crystal Palace speech, against "cosmopolitan" and "continental" opinions.
Oct. 15. Roundell Palmer appointed Lord Chancellor.
Dec. 15. Death of Viscountess Beaconsfield.

1873.

Studies in the History of the Renaissance.
Typewriters first used.
Moody and Sankey Revival 1873-5.
Schnadhorst Secretary of Birmingham Liberal Association.
Chamberlain Mayor of Birmingham (till 1875).
The Judicature Act.
Jessel succeeds Romilly as Master of the Rolls.

Jan. 9. Death of Napoleon III.
18. Death of Lord Lytton.
March 12. Government defeated on Irish University Bill, 287-284.
13. Gladstone resigns, but
16. undertakes to resume.
May 8. Death of Mill.
16. Miall's Motion for Disestablishment lost, 61 to 356.
26. Fall of Thiers.
July 19. Death of Wilberforce.
20. Death of Westbury.
Sept. 5. France pays Germany the last instalment of her War Debt.
Oct. Disraeli's letter to Lord Grey de Wilton—"Plundering and Blundering."

1874.

Rousseau and *Compromise* (by John Morley).
Far from the Madding Crowd.
The Short History of the English People.
Ruskin road-making at Oxford.
Chamberlain contests Sheffield.
Parnell defeated for Dublin County.
Asquith President of the Oxford Union Society.
Income Tax reduced to 2d.

Jan. 23. Wedding of the Duke of Edinburgh and the Grand Duchess Marie Alexandrovna.
24. Dissolution of Parliament.
Feb. 7-16. General Election. Conservative majority of 50 over Liberals and (57) Home Rulers.
12. Carlyle receives Prussian Order of Merit.
28. "The Claimant" sentenced to 14 years penal servitude.

May 11. The Public Worship Bill read a second time in the Lords.
22. Lord Randolph Churchill's maiden speech.
Sept. Lord Ripon received into the Church of Rome.
Oct. 10. Lawn Tennis first depicted in *Punch*.
Nov. The Prince and Princess of Wales entertained by Joseph Chamberlain, Mayor of Birmingham.
Dec. 27. Carlyle declines Disraeli's offer of a Baronetcy.

1875.

German war-scare in France. The Queen intervenes.
Manning made a Cardinal by Pope Pius IX.

Jan. Gladstone retires from leadership of the Liberal Party.
Our Boys begins, and runs till April 1879.
Jan. 23. Death of Charles Kingsley.
April Parnell returned for Meath.
May Revolt in S. Bulgaria.
July Revolt in Herzegovina.
Nov. 25. Contract signed for purchase of Suez Canal shares.

1876.

Trevelyan's *Life of Lord Macaulay*.
Trollope's *The Prime Minister*.
The Royal Titles Bill.
Chamberlain enters Parliament.
Telephones come into use.

Jan. Disraeli accepts Andrassy's note demanding Turkish reforms.
April. Massacre of Turkish officials in Bulgaria.
May Massacres of Bulgarians.
May-July Risings in Herzegovina, Bosnia and Bulgaria.
May 24. Government sends Fleet to Besika Bay.
June 23. *The Daily News* articles on Bulgarian Atrocities begin.
June 30. Servia declares war on Turkey.
July 1. Montenegro does the same.
Aug. 4. Chamberlain's maiden speech (on an Education Bill).
10. Balfour's maiden speech (on Indian Currency).
11. Disraeli's last speech in the House of Commons (on the Eastern Question). He is created Earl of Beaconsfield.

Sept. 6. Gladstone's pamphlet on Bulgarian Atrocities.
9. His speech at Blackheath.
Dec. Lord Salisbury represents Great Britain at Constantinople Conference.
8. St. James' Hall meeting on Eastern Question—Gladstone, Duke of Westminster, Liddon, Freeman, Trollope, etc.

1877.

The Unknown Eros.
Invention of the Phonograph.
Retirement of Delane from *The Times.*

Jan. 1. Queen Victoria proclaimed Empress of India.
First number of *Truth.*
20. End of Constantinople Conference.
March 31. Joint Protocol rejected by Porte.
April 12. Annexation of the Transvaal. Union Jack hoisted at Pretoria.
16. *Queen Mary* produced at the Lyceum.
21. Czar orders his armies to cross Turkish frontier.
May 6. Despatch proclaiming England's neutrality.
May First meeting delegates National Liberal Federation, Schnadhorst its Secretary.
June Russians cross the Danube and capture Tirnova.
July 10. Russian reverse at Plevna.
Sept. 1. Parnell ousts Butt from Presidency of Home Rule Confederation of Great Britain.
Oct. Gladstone in Ireland for three weeks.
Nov. 11. Fall of Kars.
Dec. 9. Osman Pasha capitulates at Plevna.
15. The Queen visits Beaconsfield at Hughenden.

1878.

Pinafore.
Poems and Ballads (*Second Series*).
The Return of the Native.

Jan. 10. Mehemet Ali capitulates in the Shipka.
20. Russian army enters Adrianople.
23. Fleet ordered to send ships to Constantinople.
Feb. 7. Death of Pope Pius IX, succeeded by Leo XIII.
9. Fleet sent into Sea of Marmora.
March 3. Treaty of San Stefano. End of Turkish rule in Bulgaria.
20. Wedding of Lord Rosebery and Miss Hannah de Rothschild.
27. Lord Derby resigns.

May 28. Death of Earl Russell.
June 13. to July 13. Congress of Berlin.
July 13. Berlin Treaty signed.
Nov. 20. British troops cross Afghan frontier.
Dec. 14. Death of Princess Alice.

1879.

A Defence of Philosophic Doubt.
Newman made a Cardinal.
Dual Control established in Egypt.
The harvest ruined by rain.

Jan 22. The disaster of Isandhlwana.
March 13. Wedding of the Duke of Connaught and Princess Louise Marguerite of Prussia.
May 5. Death of Isaac Butt.
12. The Queen becomes a great-grandmother.
26. The Khedive deposed and succeeded by his son Tewfik.
July Chamberlain disclaims Hartington's leadership.
Sept. 3. Cavagnari assassinated as Kabul.
18. Disraeli addresses Royal Bucks Agricultural Association at Aylesbury.
Oct. 27. Karolyi announces to Salisbury the Austro-German Alliance.
Nov. 24. Gladstone opens his Midlothian campaign.

1880.

Endymion.
The Trumpet Major.
Beginning of Parnell's intrigue with Mrs. O'Shea.
Chamberlain closes his municipal career.
John Morley becomes Editor of *The Pall Mall Gazette* with Stead as Assistant-Editor.
The Ground Game Act.

Jan. Whigs begin to secede from Liberal Party.
Feb. 4. Southwark Election, Conservative majority 853.
March 16. Gladstone departs for his Midlothian campaign.
April General Election. Result :—353 Liberals, 237 Conservatives, 62 Nationalists (of whom 40 were Parnellites).
April 12. Beaconsfield resigns.
22. Hartington summoned to Windsor.
23. Gladstone again Prime Minister.

May		Parnell elected leader of Irish Parliamentary Party.
	3.	Bradlaugh claims to affirm.
	21.	He appears to take the Oath. Opposition thereto.
June	23.	Bradlaugh heard at Bar of the House.
July	1.	Gladstone's Motion in favour of Affirmation carried, 303 to 249.
Sept.	1.	Roberts' victory at Candahar after a march of 318 miles from Kabul.
Sept.	19.	Parnell's speech on boycotting.
	25.	Murder of Lord Mountmorres.
Dec.	22.	Death of George Eliot.

1881.

Morley's *Cobden.*
Rosetti's *Ballads and Sonnets.*
John Inglesant.
Army flogging abolished.
Women admitted to Tripos examinations.

Jan.		Evacuation of Candahar.
Jan.	24.	Coercion Bill introduced.
	28.	Colley repulsed at Laing's Nek.
Feb.	2.	Speaker suspends Parnellite M.P.'s.
	5.	Death of Carlyle.
	8.	Ingogo.
	27.	Majuba.
March	11.	Mr. Justice Mathew decides against Bradlaugh.
	13.	Assassination of the Czar.
April	7.	Gladstone introduces Irish Land Bill.
	19.	Death of Lord Beaconsfield.
	26.	Bradlaugh presents himself again to the House of Commons.
May	9.	Salisbury elected Conservative leader in the Lords.
July	18.	Death of Dean Stanley.
Aug.	3.	Bradlaugh expelled from House of Commons.
	22.	Irish Land Bill becomes Law.
Sept.	9.	Arabi Pasha deposes Egyptian Ministry.
Oct.	7.	Gladstone's speech on "the resources of civilization."
	13-15.	Arrest of Parnell and his friends.
	22.	First number of *Tit-Bits.*
Nov.	10.	Gambetta succeeds Ferry.

1882.

Society for Psychical Research founded.

Feb.	1.	Fall of Gambetta.
	21.	Bradlaugh again appears in the House of Commons.
	22.	He is expelled.

May 2. Gladstone announces release of Irish suspects. (The Kilmainham Treaty). Forster resigns.
6. Murder of Lord Frederick Cavendish and Mr. Burke.
The Queen opens Epping Forest.
11. Crimes Bill introduced.
June 11. Armed rebellion at Alexandria.
Bombardment of Alexandria.
Resignation of John Bright.
Aug. 16. Parnell receives the Freedom of the City of Dublin.
Sept. 3. Tel-el-Kebir.
Nov. 11. Production of *The Promise of May.*
Dec. Dilke enters Cabinet (President of Local Government Board).
Dec. 1. Childers becomes Chancellor of the Exchequer.
Death of Archbishop Tait.
4. Opening of the new Law Courts.
6. Death of Anthony Trollope.
31. Death of Gambetta.

1883.

The Expansion of England.
Stead becomes Editor of *The P.M.G.* with Milner as principal assistant.
Birth of the Fabian Society and of the S.D.F.
The Triple Alliance (afterwards joined by Italy).
April 13. John Morley's maiden speech.
19. Unveiling of Lord Beaconsfield's statue.
May 4. The Affirmation Bill thrown out.
June Birmingham celebrates John Bright's twenty-five years' Membership of Parliament for the City.
Rosebery resigns his office.
Aug. Matthew Arnold awarded a pension by Gladstone.
Sept. Sir Evelyn Baring arrives at Cairo as British Agent and Consul-General.
Sept. 8-23. Gladstone cruises with Tennyson on *The Pembroke Castle.*
Oct. Federation of Liberal Associations pronounces for Rural Franchise.
Dec. Hicks Pasha and 10,000 men annihilated at El Obeid.
The Primrose League advertized in *The Times* and *The Morning Post.*

1884.

Royal Commission on Housing.
Bismarck accepts a German Colonial policy.

Jan.		Announcement that Lord Randolph Churchill would contest Birmingham.
Jan.	18.	Gordon, entrusted with a mission, leaves London.
	26.	He leaves Cairo.
Feb.	18.	He reaches Khartoum.
	26.	Motion to exclude Bradlaugh carried, 226 to 173.
	28.	Gladstone introduces Reform Bill.
March	18.	Mahdists close round Khartoum.
	28.	Death of the Duke of Albany.
April		Gordon cut off by rising of the tribes.
April	7	Second Reading of Reform Bill carried, 340 to 210.
May	1.	Sydney Olivier and Sidney Webb join Fabian Society.
	7.	A difference arises between Lord Salisbury and Lord Randolph Churchill.
June	22.	The Government recognizes German sovereignty at Angra Peguena.
	26.	The Reform Bill read a third time in the Commons.
July		Hartington's Memorandum as to necessity of an expedition to rescue Gordon.
		National Conservative Association at Sheffield.
		Churchill's fight about organization.
July	9.	The Lords throw out Reform Bill on Second Reading, 146 to 205.
	21.	Great Franchise demonstration in London.
	30.	Death of Mark Pattison.
Aug.	25.	Death of Lord Ampthill.
	26.	Wolseley receives command of Nile Expedition.
		The Truth about the Navy in *The P.M.G.*
		Germany seizes the Cameroons.
Oct.	13.	The Birmingham riots.
	15.	Campbell-Bannerman succeeds Trevelyan as Chief Secretary.
Nov.	6.	Death of Fawcett.
Dec.	6.	Reform Bill becomes Law.

1885.

Marius the Epicurean.

Jan.		Germans hoist their flag at Samoa.
Jan.	1.	1st number of *The Methodist Times*.
	5.	Chamberlain's " Ransom " speech at Birmingham.
	17.	*Abu Klea*. Colonel Burnaby killed.
	24.	Simultaneous explosions at The Tower, Westminster Hall, and House of Commons.
	26.	Death of Gordon. Fall of Khartoum.
Feb.	5.	The news reaches London.

Feb.		Rosebery joins the Cabinet.
	24.	The Berlin Act signed (as to spheres of influence in West Africa).
March	24.	Robert Blatchford joins *The Clarion*.
	30.	Penjdeh occupied by Russians.
April	2.	Death of Cairns.
	27.	Gladstone asks for Vote of Credit for £11,000,000.
June	8.	Government defeated on Beer Duty.
	23.	Salisbury kisses hands as Prime Minister.
July	4.	Cabinet decides to let The Crimes Act drop.
	6.	Carnarvon's interview with Justin McCarthy. Bradlaugh again presents himself to House of Commons.
	6-12.	*The Maiden Tribute of Modern Babylon* articles in *The P.M.G.*
	18.	Dilke first hears that he will be proceeded against in Divorce.
	23.	Wedding of Princess Beatrice and Prince Henry of Battenberg.
Aug.	1.	Carnarvon and Parnell meet in an empty house.
	10.	Criminal Law Amendment Act passes the Lords.
Sept.	3.	Dilke marries Mrs. Pattison.
	8.	Chamberlain's first "Unauthorized Programme" speech at Warrington.
	18.	Gladstone's Manifesto.
Oct.	7.	Salisbury's Newport speech. (Parnell afterwards orders Irish to vote for Tories).
Nov.	10.	Stead sentenced to imprisonment by Mr. Justice Lopes.
Nov. to Dec.	23 to 19.	General Election. Result:—333 Liberals, 251 Conservatives, 86 Parnellites.
Dec.	17.	Herbert Gladstone's "Hawarden Kite" in *The Standard*.
Dec.	21.	John Morley, in a speech to constituents, supports Home Rule.

1886.

The Mayor of Casterbridge.

Haldane makes friends with Fabians.
Philip Snowden gets employment in the Excise.

Jan.	26.	Government announces Coercion policy, and is beaten on the "Three Acres and a Cow" Amendment.
	30.	Hartington refuses to accept Gladstone's Irish Policy.

Feb.	6.	Liberal Ministers sworn in at Osborne.
	12.	Divorce suit against Dilke dismissed with costs—"no case for him to answer."
March.		Chamberlain and Trevelyan resign. The Caucus repudiates Chamberlain. (Trevelyan afterwards accepts Home Rule).
April	5.	Death of W. E. Forster.
	8.	Home Rule Bill introduced.
	14.	Unionist Meeting at Opera House—Salisbury, Cowper, Hartington, Goschen, etc.
	16.	Land Purchase Bill introduced.
	21.	Chamberlain carries the Liberal Two Thousand at Birmingham.
May	4.	The Queen opens Indian and Colonial Exhibition.
	10.	Second Reading of Home Rule Bill; debate begins.
June	3.	Belfast riots begin and last four months.
	8.	Home Rule Bill thrown out on Second Reading, 343 to 313. 94 Liberals vote against the Bill.
	28.	Gladstone at Liverpool—"Classes v. Masses." General Election. Result:—316 Conservatives, 196 Liberals, 74 Liberal Unionists, 86 Parnellites.
July		Lord Randolph Churchill made Chancellor of the Exchequer.
July	16-23.	Dilke's second Divorce suit. Queen's Proctor fails to prove his innocence.
Sept.		Decision to move N.L.F. to London.
Oct.	2.	Churchill's Dartford speech.
Nov.		Balfour admitted to Cabinet.
Dec.	23.	Churchill's resignation announced.

1887.

The Woodlanders.

The Bodley Press opens in Vigo Street.
Opening of the Liberal Publication Department.

Jan.		The Round Table Conference.
Jan.	1.	Coercion Bill read a first time.
	3.	Goschen becomes Chancellor of the Exchequer on the understanding that "he had not become a Conservative."
	12.	Death of Lord Iddesleigh.
	31.	Lord Curzon's maiden speech in the House of Commons.
Feb.	8.	Lord Grey of Falloden's maiden speech.
March	5.	Balfour's appointment to be Irish Secretary announced.
	7.	*Parnellism and Crime* begins in *The Times*.

April 18. *The Times* publishes a letter alleged to be written by Parnell, and excusing the murders of Cavendish and Burke.
June 21. Holborn has electric street-lighting.
Sept. 9. The affray at Mitchelstown.
Nov. 13. "Bloody Sunday" in Trafalgar Square. John Burns and R. B. Cunninghame Graham in the riot.

1888.

Miss Beatrice Potter employed as "plain trouser-hand."
Lord Salisbury introduces typewriters into Foreign Office.
The Queen refuses to read typewritten documents.
Mr. Ramsay MacDonald appointed secretary to T. Lough, M.P.
Joseph Arch elected a Warwickshire County Councillor.
Jan. 17. First number of *The Star*.
March 8. Death of Kaiser Wilhelm I.
Bradlaugh moves to expunge Resolutions which excluded him in 1880.
19. Ritchie introduces Local Government Bill.
21. Second Reading Affirmation Bill, House of Commons.
April 8 & 9. Gladstone converses with Mrs. Humphry Ward at Oxford about *Robert Elsmere*.
15. Death of Matthew Arnold.
May 5. Parnell at the "80" Club.
June 2. First number of *Answers*.
12. Licensing Clauses of Local Government Bill dropped.
15. Death of the Emperor Frederick of Germany.
July 27. Local Government Bill read a third time.
Aug. *Wanted a Programme* (by Sidney Webb).
13. Local Government Bill receives Royal Assent.
Sept. 17. Parnell Commission, first meeting of the Judges. (The Commission sat till November 20th, 1889).
Dec. Third Reading of Affirmation Bill in the Lords.

1889.

John McDougall's campaign against Music Halls.
Lady Sandhurst, Miss Jane Cobden and Miss Cons elected to the London County Council. "Progressive" majority on the Council until 1907.
Mr. Lloyd George an Alderman for Carnarvonshire.
Chaplin enters Cabinet as Minister for Agriculture.

340 M.P.'s pledged to support Votes for Women.
The Women's Franchise League.
The Naval Defence Act.
Royal Commission on Agriculture.

Feb. 21-2. Cross-examination of Pigott before Parnell Commission.
25. Pigott signs confession of forgery (witnesses Labouchere and Sala).
March 1. Pigott commits suicide.
8 Parnell entertained at the "80" Club.
27. Death of John Bright.
April 4. Stead makes acquaintance of Rhodes.
May 28. Reception to Parnell given by Sir Charles and Lady Russell.
July 25. Golden Wedding Day of Mr. and Mrs. Gladstone.
Aug. The Dock Strike.
Local Government (Scotland) Bill passed.
Oct., Nov. Stead's *Letters from the Vatican.*
Nov. 20. Parnell Commission terminates.
Dec. 12. Death of Browning.
19. Parnell at Hawarden.

1890.

Plain Tales from the Hills.
Mrs. Humphry Ward founds the University Hall Settlement.
Lord Salisbury's African settlement with Germany.
Mr. Lloyd George enters Parliament for Carnarvon Boroughs.

Jan. 15. First number of *The Review of Reviews.*
Feb. Asquith becomes a Q.C.
1. Gladstone lectures on Homer to the Oxford Union Society.
March 11. Lord Randolph Churchill denounces the Parnell Commission.
17. Bismarck tenders his resignation.
Nov. 17. Divorce Court decree against Parnell.
18. Leinster Hall Meeting at Dublin supports Parnell.
19. Stead writes to Gladstone denouncing Parnell.
22. Harcourt writes to Gladstone that the Nonconformists are against Parnell.
23. Price Hughes denounces Parnell from the pulpit.
24. Gladstone writes to Morley that Parnell's continuance in leadership would be disastrous.
25. Parnell's Party, ignorant of Gladstone's views, re-elects him Chairman.
29. Parnell's Manifesto to the Irish people.

Dec. 1. The struggle in Committee Room 15 begins, and lasts about 12 days. At the end 26 are for Parnell, 45 against him.

1891.

Tess of the D'Urbervilles.
Peter Ibbetson.
The Speaker.
The Clarion.
The French Naval Squadron at Cronstadt.

Jan. 27. The Bradlaugh Resolutions expunged from the House of Commons Journals.
30. Death of Bradlaugh.
March 31. Death of Granville.
June 11. Dilke consents to stand for Forest of Dean.
July 25. Parnell's last speech in England.
Aug. 5. Wedding of Parnell and Mrs. O'Shea.
Sept. 9. Death of Canon Liddon.
Oct. 6. Death of Parnell.
Death of W. H. Smith. Balfour becomes Leader of the House of Commons.

1892.

Lady Windermere's Fan.
The Pall Mall Gazette changes hands.
Dilke returns to House of Commons.
A fund created for the Labour Party.
The Franco-Russian alliance.

Jan. 7. Death of the Khedive Tewfik.
July. General Election. Result :—274 Liberals and Labour, 81 Home Rulers, 269 Conservatives, 46 Liberal Unionists.
Wedding of Sidney Webb and Miss Beatrice Potter.
27. Death of Robert Lowe, Viscount Sherbrooke.
Aug. 11. Asquith's Amendment carried, 350 to 310.
Lord Salisbury resigns.
Gladstone's fourth Ministry.
Oct. 6. Death of Tennyson.

1893.

The Second Mrs. Tanqueray.
A Woman of no Importance.
The Liberal Magazine.
Russian fleet visits Toulon.

Jan. The Khedive dismisses his Ministers; afterwards yields to Baring.
Keir Hardie founds the I.L.P. at Bradford.

Feb. 13. Gladstone brings in his Home Rule Bill.
April 6. Gladstone moves Second Reading of Home Rule Bill.
July 400,000 miners strike. Strike lasts till November.
July 6. Wedding of the Duke of York (afterwards King George V.) and Princess Mary of Teck.
Aug. The Featherstone Riots.
Sept. 1. Home Rule Bill passes Third Reading in Commons, majority 34.
8. The Bill rejected in the Lords, 419 to 41.

1894.

The Green Carnation.
Esther Waters.
Marcella.
Philip Snowden joins the I.L.P.
The Navy League founded.
The District Councils Act.
Harcourt's Budget—Death Duties.
Jan. A clash between Khedive and Baring.
Jan. 9. Difficulty in Cabinet about Navy Estimates.
31. The *P.M.G.* announces Gladstone's impending resignation.
Feb. 19. Announcement of Asquith's engagement to Miss Tennant.
March 1. Gladstone's last speech in the Commons ; he warns the Lords.
His last Cabinet Council.
3. He resigns the Premiership.
Rosebery becomes Prime Minister.
13. Government defeated by 2 on Labouchere's Amendment.
May 10. Wedding of Asquith and Miss Tennant.
Aug. 31. Alfred Harmsworth acquires *The Evening News.*

1895.

The Woman who did.
The Importance of being Earnest.
Trouble with the United States about Venezuela.
The Oscar Wilde Trials.
The Franco-Russian Alliance.
Acton appointed Professor of Modern History at Cambridge.
Jan. 24. Death of Lord Randolph Churchill.
April Snowden opposes Brigg at Keighley.
May 4. Death of Lord Selborne.
25. Oscar Wilde sentenced at the Old Bailey to 2 years hard labour.

June 21. Resignation of the Duke of Cambridge; a few hours later the Government beaten on the Cordite Vote.
22. Resignation of Rosebery.
General Election. Result:—411 Unionists, 177 Liberals, 82 Home Rulers. In Cabinet 15 Conservatives, 4 Liberal Unionists (Devonshire, Chamberlain, Lansdowne, James).
Dec. 31. The Jameson Raid.

1896.

Sir George Tressady.
Jude the Obscure.
Jan. The first number of *The Savoy.*
2. Jameson surrenders.
3. The Kaiser's telegram to Kruger.
March 3. Stead's great meeting for the Anglo-American Arbitration campaign.
May 4. The first number of *The Daily Mail.* 367,215 copies sold.
July. Trial and condemnation of the Jameson Raiders.
Sept. 24. Gladstone's last public speech, on Armenia, at Liverpool.
Oct. 3. Death of William Morris.
8. Rosebery resigns Liberal leadership. Kimberley Liberal leader in the Lords.
11. Archbishop Benson dies in Hawarden Church.
Dec. 8. Lady Warwick entertains the Prince of Wales and W. T. Stead to luncheon.

1897.

The Ballad of Reading Gaol.
Engineers' Lock-Out lasts 6 months.
The Workmen's Compensation Act.
Feb. The Committee on the Jameson Raid (sits till June).
March 26. The Queen and Gladstone meet at Cannes.
27. A great complimentary banquet to Milner.
June. John Morley's Romanes lecture on Machiavelli in the Sheldonian.

1898.

Wessex Poems (Thomas Hardy's first volume of poetry).
Jan. 16. Death of Charles Villiers.
March 16. Death of Aubrey Beardsley.
April Death of "the Claimant."
April 7. Atbara.

May	19.	Death of Gladstone.
May		Chamberlain's speech—" Who sups with the Devil must have a long spoon." (Port Arthur ceded to Russia).
Aug.		Death of Bismarck.
		The Czar's Peace Rescript.
Sept.	2.	Omdurman.
	4.	Occupation of Khartoum.
		Marchand at Fashoda.
Oct.	26.	Stead's first of three interviews with the Czar in Livadia.
Nov.		Chamberlain at Manchester advocates closer relations with Germany.
Dec.	13.	Harcourt resigns from leadership of Liberal Party in the House of Commons ; Morley approves.
	18.	Stead proclaims International Crusade of Peace in India.

1899.

		Trades Union Congress pronounces for a Labour representation independent of other Parties.
Jan.	17.	Morley withdraws from taking active part in Liberal Party.
Feb.	6.	Campbell-Bannerman chosen leader of Liberals in House of Commons.
April		Herbert Gladstone made Liberal Chief Whip in the Commons.
May		Peace Conference at the Hague.
Aug.	26.	Chamberlain on the Boer crisis :—" The sands are running down in the glass."
Sept.	15.	Morley addresses Manchester Liberals. Leonard Courtney says Milner is " a lost mind."
Oct.	9.	Kruger's ultimatum :—(1) British troops must be withdrawn from S. Africa. (2) None on the high seas must be landed.
	11.	The Transvaal declares War. Boers invade Natal and Cape Colony.
	29.	Chamberlain offers Germany an alliance.
Dec.		Stormberg, Magersfontein, Colenso.

1900.

The Daily News and *The Daily Chronicle* change hands, ousting Sir Edward Cook and Mr. Massingham.

Mr. Winston Churchill returned for Oldham.

Joint Conference of Socialists and Trades Unionists. Labour Representation Committee founded.

The Prince of Wales wins the Grand National with Ambush II. and the Derby with Diamond Jubilee.
Germany's Fleet Law.

Jan. 2. Death of Schnadhorst.
May 21. Relief of Mafeking.
"Mafficking" in London.
June 14. Death of Mrs. Gladstone.
Sept. 18. Dissolution announced in *The Gazette*.
General Election. Result:—334 Conservatives, 68 Liberal Unionists, 186 Liberals and Labour, 82 Nationalists. (Unionist majority less by 18 than in 1895; greater by 4 than before the Election).
Oct. 24. Automobile Club run, London to Southsea.
Oct. 29. March of the C.I.V.'s through London.
Nov. On account of motors Sir Walter Gilbey gives up driving on the Cambridge road.
Nov. 30. Death of Oscar Wilde.

1901.

The Anglo-Japanese Alliance.
Jan. 22. DEATH OF QUEEN VICTORIA.
May 24. Milner created a Peer.
June 14. Campbell-Bannerman's speech on "methods of barbarism."
July 7. Reform Club meeting. Vote of confidence in Campbell-Bannerman.
Dec. 16. Rosebery's Chesterfield speech.

1902.

National Service League founded.
Feb. Liberal League formed (Rosebery, Asquith, Grey, Fowler, etc.).
Feb. 11. Anglo-Japanese Alliance.
14. Lord Rosebery at Liverpool advocates "clean slate" as regards Home Rule.
March 1. Asquith abandons Home Rule.
24. Education Bill introduced in House of Commons.
May 31. End of Boer War. Terms of peace signed at Vereeniging.
April Hicks-Beach imposes a duty of 1/- upon foreign corn.
June 19. Death of Lord Acton.
July 11. Resignation of Lord Salisbury.
Balfour becomes Prime Minister.
Ritchie becomes Chancellor of the Exchequer.

Oct. P.S.A. Fellowship formed.
Dec. 8. Lord Rosebery encourages Passive Resistance.

1903.

The Way of all Flesh.
House of Lords' judgment in Taff Vale Case.
Newcastle Conference resolves on independence of Labour Party.
The London Education Bill.
March 14. Chamberlain returns from S. Africa.
April 23. Ritchie drops the 1'- Corn Duty.
May 15. Chamberlain opens his Tariff Reform Campaign.
June 10. Murder of the King and Queen of Servia.
Aug. 22. Death of Lord Salisbury.
Sept. 9. Resignation of Chamberlain.
18. Resignations of Ritchie, Elliott and Balfour of Burleigh.
Oct. 2. Resignation of the Duke of Devonshire.
Nov. Passive Resistance campaign opened.
Dec. 8. Death of Herbert Spencer.

1904.

Jan. W. T. Stead's Daily Paper (last issue February 9).
Feb. 8. Beginning of the Russo-Japanese war.
April 8. Anglo-French agreement signed.
Aug. 23. Alfred Harmsworth created a Baronet.
Oct. The Dogger Bank incident.
1. Death of Sir William Harcourt.

1905.

Jan. 1. Fall of Port Arthur.
March 13. Wedding of Philip Snowden and Ethel Annakin.
Aug. Czar proclaims the creation of the Duma.
Peace of Portsmouth ends Russo-Japanese War.
Aug. 23. Campbell-Bannerman's conversation with King Edward VII.
Dec. 4. Balfour's resignation announced.
5. Campbell-Bannerman kisses hands as Prime Minister.
21. The Albert Hall meeting.
27. Alfred Harmsworth created a Peer.

1906.

The Trade Disputes Act nullifies the Taff Vale judgment.
Jan. *The Tribune* (lasted 2 years).

Jan.	8.	Dissolution of Parliament. General Election. Result:—379 Liberals, 157 Unionists, 83 Nationalists, 51 Labour.
	9.	Death of Lord Ritchie of Dundee.
March	12.	Maiden speeches of P. Snowden and F. E. Smith.
April	9.	Mr. Birrell introduces an Education Bill.
May	19.	Women's Suffrage deputation to Campbell-Bannerman.
July.		Chamberlain's illness.
July	23.	Campbell-Bannerman: "La Douma est morte. Vive la Douma!"
Oct.	11.	Mr. Lloyd George at Cardiff on Liberalism and Labour.

1907.

The Times bought by Northcliffe.

Feb.	13.	54 women arrested in Suffragette disturbances.
March	20.	75 women arrested.
May.		Second Hague Peace Conference.
Oct.	29.	Asquith declares that votes for women will do more harm than good.

1908.

The Licensing Bill passes the House of Commons with a majority of 237, but is rejected by the Lords.

April	5.	Resignation of Campbell-Bannerman. Asquith succeeds him as Prime Minister.
	22.	Death of Campbell-Bannerman.
July	31.	H. M. Hyndman in *The Clarion* on "The Coming War against Great Britain."
Oct.	1.	Mr. Lloyd George complains of "flank" attacks by Socialists upon Liberals.

1909.

Bethmann-Hollweg succeeds von Bülow.

Jan.		*The Englishman's Home.*
July	30.	Mr. Lloyd George's Limehouse speech.
Dec.		The Osborne judgment in the House of Lords. Blatchford's articles in *The Daily Mail* on the danger of war.
Dec.	2.	Asquith's Resolution that the House of Lords, by rejecting the Budget, had committed a breach of the Constitution, etc.

1910.

Jan.		General Election. Result:—273 Unionists, 275 Liberals, 82 Nationalists, 40 Labour.
May	6.	DEATH OF KING EDWARD VII.

Nov. 15. Asquith obtains the consent of the King to create Peers, if necessary, in order to pass the Parliament Bill.

Dec. General Election. Result :—272 Unionists, 272 Liberals, 84 Nationalists, 42 Labour.

1911.

The Panther sent to Agadir.
Payment of Members of Parliament voted.
Anglo-French conversations.

Feb. 21. Asquith introduces the Parliament Bill.

May 15. Parliament Bill read a third time in House of Commons.

Aug. 11. French and German negotiations following Agadir.

18. Parliament Bill is passed.

1912.

Grey agrees to consultations as to co-operation of British and French Fleets.

Feb. 8. Haldane arrives at Berlin.

April 11. Asquith introduces the Home Rule Bill.

1913.

March 25. The " Cat and Mouse " Bill.

April 3. Mrs. Pankhurst sentenced to 3 years' penal servitude.

May 6. Asquith speaks against Women's Suffrage in the House of Commons.

1914.

Naval Estimates settled at 52½ millions.

March 24. The Curragh incident.

June 18. Triple Alliance of Railwaymen, Miners and Transport Workers.

June 23. House of Lords proposals to amend Home Rule Bill.

June 28. Assassination of the Archduke Franz Ferdinand of Austria and the Archduchess at Serajevo.

July 2. Death of Chamberlain.

20. Home Rule Amending Bill dropped. Conference announced to meet at Buckingham Palace.

23. Conference closes.

24. Austria's ultimatum to Servia.

27. Irish Debate.

29. Austria declares war on Servia.

30. Home Rule Amending Bill indefinitely postponed.

31. The Stock Exchange closes *sine die.*

Aug. 1. Germany declares war on Russia,

3. and on France.

4. ENGLAND DECLARES WAR ON GERMANY.

INDEX

Abraham, William, ("Mabon"), 61, 280.
Acton, Lord, on Democracy, 3; on Gladstone's ecclesiastism, 32; a Home Ruler, 39, 40; Liberalism, 57; influence on Gladstone, 57; on Cabinet of 1880, 91; on Majuba, 218.
Agadir, 317.
Agricultural Labourer, The, 133 *seq.*; votes Liberal in 1885, 141.
Agricultural Labourers' Union, founded, 135; growth and supporters, 136; end of, 140.
Alcester, Lord, on weakness of Navy, 111.
Alexandria, bombarded, 218.
Algeciras Conference, 239, 317.
Alverstone, Lord, *see* Webster, Sir Richard.
Anderson, George, 61; votes for return of Civil Lists, 98.
Andrassy, 315.
Anglo-Japanese Treaty, 317.
Angus, Sir William, 90.
Answers, 73.
Arch, Joseph, his Programme (1885), 68; supported by Nonconformists, 106; for Disestablishment, 114; character, 135; founds Agricultural Labourers' Union, 135; M.P., 136; on extravagance of Squires, 153; "feudalism," 156; Poaching Prevention Act, 156; rural tyranny, 157; farmers, 158; Squires, 159; President Birmingham Radical Union (1883), 279; visits Gladstone, *ib.*; parodies hymns, 281.
Argyll, Duke of, 71, 76; resigns office, 91, 185; 183, 184.
Aristotle, definition of Aristocracy, 297.
Arnold, Matthew, on M.P.s and Reform, 17; hopes of Derby and Disraeli, 18; on Home Rule, 42; Gladstone as statesman and scholar, 51; complimented by Disraeli, 98; on Dissent, 105-6; middle-class amusements, 126; Disraeli's interest in families, 148; State action, 283; Franco-German War, 314.
Arnold-Foster, H. O., acts with Stead, 111; 241.
Ashbourne, Lord, *see* Gibson, Mr.
Asquith, H. H., *see* Oxford and Asquith, Lord.
Atbara, 220.
Athenæum, The, on Women's Rights, 261.
Austin, John, definition of Democracy, 1.
Austrian Emperor, alarmed at Reform Bill, 143.
Aveling, Edward, 285.

Baillie Cochrane, Mr., 202.
Balfour, A. J., (Earl Balfour), on function of Caucus, 87; M.P. for Hertford, 139; not against Reform, 140; on Great Britain a Democracy, 140; Whigs, 196; a Party split, 210; defeated at Manchester, 241; Member for City, 242; on 1906 Parliament, *ib.*
Balfour, Gerald, (Earl Balfour), 241.
Ball, John, 289.
Balliol men, 244.
"Bare Degradation," 11.
Barnes, G. N., 277, on Dilke, 283.
Barnett, Canon, 281.
Barttelot, Sir W., 169.
Battle of Dorking, The, 308.
Beaconsfield, Lord, *see* Disraeli, B.
Bedford, Duke of, his wealth, 181.
Bell, Richard, 277.
Bennett, Sir John, 136.
Bentinck, Cavendish, 160, 208.
Bentinck, George, 160.
Bentinck, Lord George, 149.
Bentinck, Lord Henry, 149.
Berlin Act, 316.
Berlin, Treaty of, 39.
Besant, Mrs., 286, 298.
"Big Loaf and Little Loaf," 241.
Birkenhead, Lord, *see* Smith, F. E.

Birrell, Augustine, on Schnadhorst, 87; on Dissent, 105; Irish Disestablishment, 113; Libéral Publication Department, 122; in Cabinet, 239.
Bismarck, dislike of Gladstone, 32; conversation with Dilke, 82, 314; 191; acquisition of New Guinea, 224, 309; 306; on Belgian guarantee, 315; arbiter of Europe, *ib.*; Colonial policy, 316.
Bitter Cry of Outcast London, The, 287.
Blatchford, Robert, 285, 286, on German peril, 319.
"Bloody Sunday," 239.
Blunt, Wilfrid, on Morley, 224; hate of British Empire, 226; on Dr. Jameson, 226; assassination of Wyllie, 227; de-Anglicized, 227; on Germany, 318.
Boer War, approved by Nation, 220.
Bonar Law, H., 241.
Bondfield, Miss, ridicules Women's Suffrage, 264.
Booth, Charles, 286.
Booth, General, 288.
Bourne, Cardl., interview with Campbell-Bannerman, 123, 143.
Bowen, E. E., 143.
Bowles, T. Gibson, 241.
Brabazon, Colonel, his political Programme, 161; 177, 228.
Bradlaugh, Charles, at Primrose Hill demonstration, 14; Home Ruler, 39; Republican, 64; Northampton Programme, 66; refuses to take Oath, 78-80; Malthusianism, 78; supports Disestablishment, 114; and Agricultural Labourer, 136; on treatment of private soldier, 222; against Bishops in Lords, 266; an Individualist, 286, 298; on payment of Members, 295.
Brand, Mr., a Whig, 186.
Brassey, Lord, scheme of Imperial Defence, 225.
Breadalbane, Lord, 49.
Brett, Hon. Reginald, (Lord Esher), on "Nonconformist Conscience," 120.
Brigg, Mr., denounced by Snowden, 279.
Bright, John, on giving vote to the poor, 2; Household Suffrage, 11; Palmerston, 13; inspired Hodgkinson's Amendment, 21; Anti-Republican, 64, 71; supports Bradlaugh, 79; on English Christianity, 80; his Liberal Association, 86; grievance against Landed Gentry, 145; on value of Land, 147; 160; enters Cabinet, 182; at Osborne, 199; on Colonies and India, 215; resignation, 218.
Broadhurst, Labour M.P., 61; support of Caucus, 88; praised by Gladstone, 276.
Brodrick, St. John, (Lord Midleton), 241.
Bronkhorstspruit, 218.
Brontë, Charlotte, 259.
Brooks's Club, Whigs meet at, 183; a rift, 186; a scene of struggle, 188.
Bruce, Mr., (Lord Aberdare), 71.
Buccleuch, Duke of, 36, 132.
Budget of 1909, 253; rejected by Lords, 266; Land Value Duties, 269.
Bulgarian Atrocities, 37-8.
Bülow, von, 316-7, 325.
Bureaucracy, growth of, 7.
Burials Act, 125, 129.
Burke, on Democracy, 13; 86, 132; on House of Lords, 273.
Burke's *Landed Gentry*, 179.
Burnaby, General, denounces Bradlaugh, 160.
Burns, John, 207; in Cabinet, 239; 240; on manœuvres, 250; attitude of Labour to, 258; "out of date" with Labour, 273; independent M.P., 277; resigns at beginning of Great War, 310.
Burt, Thos., on Tory Democracy, 5, 206; 61, 276.
Butler, Samuel, on dangers of Liberalism, 3.

Cairns, Lord, on Majuba, 218.
Cambon, M., on an English "Revolution," 173; signs Entente, 308.
Cambridge, Duke of, retirement, 236; obstructs Army Reform, 312; 328.
Campbell, Rev. R. J., at City Temple, 126.

Campbell-Bannerman, Sir H., difficulties of Home Rule, 41; democratic optimism, 58; on Liberal "rebels," 97; trusted by Nonconformists, 112, 121; their support in House of Commons, 123; interviewed by Cardinal Bourne, *ib.*; "loathed" Imperialism, 224; Prime Minister, 235; character, *ib.*; War Secretary, 236; other offices, *ib.*; becomes Home Ruler, 237; not a Fabian, 238; Albert Hall Meeting, 240; master of his Cabinet, 242; on Balliol men, 244; poverty of the Nation, 246, 287, 293; co-operation with Labour, 280; anti-militarism, 309; *vive la Douma*, 310.
Candahar, evacuated, 218.
Caprivi, von, 136.
Cardwell, Lord, 71, 309, 312, 324.
Carlyle, Thomas, on "government by a multitude," 3; universal Democracy inevitable, 12; on Reform agitation 1866, 17; admirer of Germany, 314.
Carnarvon, Lord, attitude to Home Rule, 40.
Carson, Lord, popularity in N. Ireland, 54.
Case of Rebellious Susan, The, 260.
Caucus, The, organizes popular feeling, 85-91; meaning of 85; early Caucuses, 86; Schnadhorst, 87; municipal influence, *ib.*; success in 1880, 88; attacked by Lord R. Churchill, *ib.*; Presidents of N.L.F., 90; Mr. Winston Churchill on the Machine," 90. *See* also Chamberlain, J., and Schnadhorst.
Cavendish, Lord F., assassinated, 40.
Cecil, Sir Evelyn, 139.
Cecil, Lord Robert, *see* Salisbury, Lord.
Chamberlain, Joseph, on Gladstone's ecclesasticism, 32; against Home Rule, 41; Birmingham Caucus faithful, 42; his Liberalism, 58; a Republican, 62; John Bright celebrations, 63; Programme (1873-1882), 67; campaign, 1885, 67; Ransom," *ib.*; "Unauthorized Programme 68; Programme (1892), 70; Chairman Education League, 72; in Cabinet, 76; alliance with Dilke, 80; the Highbury circle, *ib.*; "Natural Rights," 80; popularity at Birmingham, 81; ruthlessness, *ib.*; at Chatsworth, 81; on the Caucus, 88; disclaims Hartington's leadership, 91; "The First Blast," 96; Bulgarian atrocities, 109; for Disestablishment, 114; Welsh Disestablishment, 116; Education Act, 1870, 116; on rural labourer, 134; Redistribution, 139; large estates, 148; Game Laws, 156; ruin of farmers, 166; Granville, 185; Radicals and Whigs, 187; in conflict with Whigs, 196; on Primrose League, 209; promotes reforms, 1886-92 and after 1895, 213; an early Imperialist, 224; 228; on Fair Trade, 229; Imperial Federation, *ib.*; Imperial Reform, 230; Tariff Reform, *ib.*; in favour (1885) of Labour M.P.s, 276; and Payment of Members, *ib.*; criticism (1900) of Labour M.P.s, 278; on poverty, 287; occupation of Port Arthur, 307; Conscription, 309. *See* also Gladstone, W. E.
Chant, Mrs. Ormiston, 291.
Chaplin, Charles, his *obiter dictum*, 157.
Chaplin, Henry, (Viscount Chaplin), style of living, victim of agricultural depression, 154-6; ridiculed by "Toby M.P.," 160; Disraeli's praise, 160; the harvest of 1879, 163; refuses Local Government Board, 168; on County Councils, 169; dislike of motor cars, 177; Lord Curzon on, 177; defeated at Sleaford, 291; against Women's Suffrage, 262.
Charles the Second, King, on non-royal persons, 7.
Chartists, 66, 261.
Chefket Pasha, 39.
Chichester, Lord, 71.
Childers, H. C. E., 71.
"Chinese Slavery," 122, 241.
Church, Dean, 38
Church Rates, 113.

Churchill, Lord Randolph, on Gladstone's "Progresses," 46; the Fourth Party, 77; on the Caucus, 84; revives Tory organization, 86; on N.U. Conservative Associations, *ib.*; Schnadhorst, 87; attacks Birmingham Caucus, 88; against Entail, 99; defends Church of England, 114; opposes Reform Bill, 138, 146; on agricultural depression, 165; Tories and Land, 167; wroth with Sclater-Booth, *ib.*; on Whigs and Radicals, 186; on Whigs, 196, 7; Tory Democracy, 205; strikes at Gladstone, 207; Rendel on, 208; popularity, 209; Leader House of Commons and Chancellor, 209; the Queen's praise, *ib.*; Dartford speech, *ib.*; promises to Chamberlain, 212; resignation, *ib.*; decline, 213; Lord Oxford on, 214; Conservatives' debt to, *ib.*; on Union, 200; not an Imperialist, 225; on Transvaal independence, 225; Majuba, 226; sympathy with Arabs, *ib.*; against retention of Soudan, *ib.*; in favour of Labour M.P.s, 276; a Municipal Socialist, 290; for Payment of Members, 295; on Conscription, 310; England's weakness, 317.

Churchill, Winston, on "the Machine," 90; 161; on Majuba, 218; military ardour, 228; struck by Suffragettes, 263; naval expenditure, 321.

Clarendon, Lord, 183.

Clark, Sir A., on Gladstone's physique, 29.

Cleon, on Democracy and Empire, 5; 23, 300.

Clifford, Rev. Dr., on Gladstone, 45; supports Progressives, 107; interest in education, 108; "pro-Boer," 108; for Japan v. Russia, for Korea v. Japan, *ib.*; Passive Resistance, 116; presides at Memorial Hall, 118; admires Lloyd George, 121; dissatisfied with Liberals, 124; campaign against Lords, 268, 280.

Clynes, J. R., 278.

Cobden, Richard, on traders buying land, 147; assurance to farmers, 164; an Internationalist, 324.

Cobden, Miss Jane, 262.

Cockburn, Lord Chief Justice, on chastity's safeguard, 78.

Coke, on duty of M.P., 304.

Collier, Sir Robert, 183.

Collings, Jesse, 92, 136, 210.

Communism, Bernard Shaw explains, 299.

Compensation for Disturbances Bill, 185

Compound Householder, The, Tories approve of his exclusion, 19; very numerous, 20; abolished, 21 *seq.*; restored, 25.

Connaught, Duke of, 62; Wolseley's confidence in, 328.

Cons, Miss, 262.

Consort, Prince, on Gladstone as Oxonian, 31.

"Constitution Charlie," 5.

C. D. Acts, repeal of, 110; 161.

Conway, Kate, 285.

Cook, Miners' Representative, 282.

Cook, E. T., on *The P.M.G.*; 110.

Corn Production Act, 166.

County Councils, 168-71; Ritchie's Bill, 169; expense of, 171. *See* also London County Council.

Courtney, Leonard, 61, 80.

Cowper, Earl, 92; resignation, 185-8.

Cowper-Temple Clause, The, 72.

Cox, Harold, 269.

Cramb, Professor, 227-8.

Cranborne, Lord, *see* Salisbury, Lord.

Cremer, a "pro-Boer," 95.

Crewe, Lord, 252.

Crimes Bill, 40.

Croker, J. W., 145, 6.

Cross, Sir R. A., (Viscount Cross), Disraeli's praise of, 203.

Cunninghame Graham, R. B., 227.

Curran, Pete, 285.

Curzon, Lord, on H. Chaplin, 177.

Czar, The, interviewed by Stead, 110; Peace Rescript, 325.

Daily Express, The, 99.

Daily Mail, The, 74; Imperialistic, 76; 99; Blatchford's articles in, 319.

Dalkeith, Lord, 36, 132.

Darlington, Lord, his pocket-boroughs, 145.

Dawson, M.P., outburst in House of Commons, 161.
Death Duties, 171-3.
De Grey, Lord, 71, 183.
Democracy, Austin's definition, 1; views of eminent men on, 2-3; Democracy and Empire, 5; Oscar Bailey's view of, 245; Aristotle's definition, 297; Lord Salisbury on, *ib.*
Denbigh, Lord, 327.
Derby, Lord, 18.
Devonshire, Duke of, *see* Hartington, Lord.
Dickinson, W. H., 240.
Dictators, many now in power, 7.
Dilke, Sir C., on Gladstone and Granville, 34; on Russian cruelties, 39; republicanism, 61; recantation, 62; Queen Victoria and housing, 63; Chelsea Programme, 66; for Women's Suffrage, 67, 262; speeches in 1891, 69; Radical Club, 70; alliance with Chamberlain, 80; versed in foreign affairs, 82; Gambetta and Bismarck, *ib*; on Gladstone, Bright and Hartington, *ib.*; in Divorce Court, 83; rejected by Chelsea, 84; M.P. Forest of Dean, *ib.*; death, *ib.*; the Chelsea Caucus, 86; denounced by Nonconformists, 118; left out of Ministry, 118; attacked by Stead, *ib.*; supports Agricultural Labourers, 136, 170; on cession of Heligoland, 224; our military weakness, *ib*; on Campbell-Bannerman, 237; praises 1906 Parliament, 244; on Asquith, 248; relations with Labour, 281; report on housing, 287; on Municipal Socialism, 290; our unpreparedness, 312-13; on Franco-German War, 315; German peril, 318; quotes a French officer, 323.
Dilke, Lady, founds Women's T.U. League, 263.
Dillwyn, Llewellyn, 61.
Dimsdale, Baron, 169.
Disestablishment of Church of England, Miall moves for a Committee on, 113; support of Radicals, Labouchere's proposals, 114; Chamberlain's intentions, *ib.*; ceases to be practical politics, 115; not in Liberal Programme of 1892, *ib.*
Disraeli, Benjamin, the vote of privilege, 11; on General Peel, *ib.*; Democracy, 12, 13; exalts ratepaying Householder, 20, accepts Hodgkinson's Amendment, 22; on Toryism, 24; no Demagogue, 25, 47; Bulgarian atrocities, 38; Gladstone's vindictiveness, 54; Cowper-Temple's Clause, 72; advises Queen after his fall, 78; on Dilke, 82; on the Caucus, 86; Party organization, *ib.*; Gladstone's tribute to, 96; flatters M. Arnold, 98; on aggressive Nonconformists, 107; Rural Householders, 130; love of magnificence, 148; nobility and gentry, 149; acquires Hughenden, *ib.*; praise of Chaplin, 160; on traditionary influence, 162; bad harvests, *ib.*; buys land, 163; on Peel, 181; the Social Problem, 202; Social Reform Legislation, 203; attracted by aristocrats, 204; interviewed by Hyndman, *ib.*; an Imperialist, 216; Suez Canal shares, *ib.*; Royal Titles Act, 217; on a Tariff, 228; as to Women's Votes, 261; on Mill, 270; on resources of Empire, 311.
Donald, Sir Robert, *the P.M.G.*, 110.
Dorking, The Battle of, 308.
Drew, Mrs, *see* Gladstone, Miss Mary
Dryden, on Dissenters, 104.
Dukes, Lloyd George's attacks on, 254-5.
Dunkellin, Lord, Amendment to Reform Bill, 17.
Durham, Lord, 182.

East Lothian, agricultural prosperity, 147.
Ecroyd, Farrer, Fair Trade movement, 141.
Education Act 1870, 72; gives opportunity to New Journalism 73-6; angry Nonconformists, 116; women voters for School Boards, 261.
Education Act 1902, Nonconformist opposition, 116; Passive Resistance, 117; 240.

Edward the Seventh, King, Gladstone wanted to employ, 34; lunch with Chamberlain, 62-3; attacked by Bradlaugh, 64; illness, 65; tea with Joseph Arch, 133; 172; "a strong Conservative," 217; meets Campbell-Bannerman, 237; his Liberal sympathies, *ib.*; on Campbell-Bannerman, 270; visit to France, 308; on Bismarck, 316; on Haldane's hat, 321.
Edwardians, The, 172.
Egypt, Gladstone's policy, 218.
El Obeid, massacre of Hicks's army, 218, 9.
Elcho, Lord, (Earl Wemyss), 140.
Electors, number of, 1.
Elijah's Mantle, 206, 208.
Elliott, Sir George, 203.
Emery, R. G., 296.
Endymion, 181.
Ernle, Lord, *A View of the Countryside*, 179.
Essex, Lady, 177.
Evening News, The, acquired by Harmsworth, 74; advocates Imperialism, 76.

Fabianism, 244-5, 292. *See* also Socialists.
Factory Acts, 202.
Faggot voters, 53, 131, 2, 7.
Fancy Franchises, 11, 18.
Fashoda, 308.
Fawcett, Henry, 60; a Republican, 62; 80.
Fellowes, Ailwyn, 241.
Female Suffrage, *see* Votes for Women.
Ferry, Jules, 307.
"Filling up the Cup," policy of, 267.
Fifty Pounder, The, 8.
Fitz Maurice, Lord E., classified as Radical, 61; also as Whig, 186.
Fitzwilliam, Earl, his pocket-boroughs, 145.
Fitzwilliam, 6th Earl, votes with Tories, 184.
Forester, speech in House of Commons, 160.
Forster, W. E., on Household Suffrage, 11; Irish Secretary, 40; 76; resents Bradford Caucus, 86; resignation, 91.
Fortescue, Lord, 71.
Fourth Party, The, attack on Bradlaugh, 79.
Fox, C. J., member of Brooks's, 188; 227.
Fox-hunting, cost of, 172.
France, danger from, 307-8.
Franco-Russian Alliance, 308.
Fraser, Bishop, 115; on farm-labourers, 134.
Freeman, E. A., 38, candidate for Parliament, 60.
Froude, J. A., Bulgarian Atrocities meeting, 38; on Franco-German War, 314.
Furness, Sir Christopher, 279.

Game Laws, 156, Chamberlain and Arch on, *ib.*
Garvin, J. L., on Schnadhorst, 87.
Gaskell, C. M., on impoverishment of the Squire, 165.
Gathorne-Hardy, (Lord Cranbrook), 22, 311.
General Strike, The, 294, 5; 300.
George the Fifth, King, 200; advised to create Peers if necessary, 269, 300.
German Emperor alarmed at Reform Bill, 143. *See* also Wilhelm I.
Germany, Crown Princess (afterwards Empress) of, on weakness of England, 306.
Germany, Crown Prince of (afterwards Emperor Frederick I.), 312.
Gibbon Edward,, on rich and poor, 289.
Gibson (Lord Ashbourne), on lack of interest in Reform, 136; opposes Bill, 138; insists on Redistribution, *ib.*
Gladstone, Herbert (Viscount Gladstone), *After Thirty Years*, 27; speech on Ireland, 40; praises Conservative legislation, 203.
Gladstone, Miss Mary, *Diaries and Letters*, 27; on "the Churchums," 31; changed opinion of Parnell, 93; on the 1880 Cabinet, 100; a quotation from Lucretius, 100; Dilke's devoutness, 118; 186, 199.
Gladstone, W. E., for the masses, 2; praises "Progress," 3; disagrees with Tennyson, 3; on Democracy's extravagance, *ib.*; on Reform in 1859, 10; declaration in 1864, 10; reform necessary, 10; the Bill of 1866, 14; denounces

Gladstone, W. E.—*cont.*
Grosvenor and Stanley, 16; resigns on Dunkellin's Amendment, 17; champions Compound Householder, 20; anger at Disraeli's success, 25; Disraeli "the grand corruptor," 26; length of career, 28; physique, 29; visits Harrow, *ib.*; master of precedents, 29; on Balfour, 29; decline of powers, 30; love of office, 31; Oxonian and theologian, *ib.*; "a great Christian statesman," *ib.*; disliked by Bismarck, 32; respect for Thorne, *ib.*; relations with Queen, 33, 4; for a splendid Court, 35; liked aristocratic Whigs, 35; belief in aristocratic principle, 36; an Economist, *ib.*; Bulgaria and Eastern Question, 37-9; Home Rule, 39-43; "a very simple man," 43, Mrs. O'Shea, 44; popular hero, 44 *seq.*; as Social Reformer, 45; reclaims street-walkers, 45; incorruptible, *ib.*; Pilgrimages of Passion, 46; detested by the Classes, 47; vindictiveness, 48, 54; attacks the Classes, 48; censure of Hartington, 49; last speech, 50, 267; accepts Newcastle Programme, 51; a modern estimate, 52; activity in retirement, 53, 74-6; the "G. O. M.," 54; Jowett on *Juventus Mundi*, 55; his Liberalism, 56, 7; an Emancipator, 59; the Newcastle Programme, 69; interest in Education, 71; on the 1880 Election, 77; defends Bradlaugh, 79; on Chamberlain, 81; on Dilke, 82; fourth Ministry, 93; tribute to Disraeli's leadership, 96; hedges on Disestablishment, 114; views on Welsh Disestablishment, 115; Nonconformist support for Home Rule, 118; introduces 1884 Reform Bill, 137; on faggot-voters, *ib*; faith in Democracy, 138; on agricultural depression, 164; "guinea-pigs," 166; Local Government Bill, 169; never a Whig, 182; temporary retirement, 183; "head of the Radicals," 185; on Liberal Dukes, 188; a Liberal Britain, 201; Tory Democracy, 207; Suez Canal shares, 216; Egyptian policy, 218; on Colonial self-government, 233; "Imperium et Libertas," *ib.*; on cost of Democracy, 255; rule as to Cabinet, 248, 271; in favour of Labour M.P.s, 277; entertains Arch, 279; Payment of Members, 296; on benefits of Franchise, 297; an Individualist, 298; faces war with Russia, 307; anti-militarism, 308; resignation, 309; Madame Novikoff, 310; concessions to Germany, 316; optimism, 324.
Gladstone League, The, 209.
Glasier, Bruce, 285.
Glynne, Sir Stephen, 31.
Gordon, General, 91, 218, 9, 225.
Gorst, Sir John, 86, 193, 241.
Goschen, W. E. (Viscount Goschen), 71; opposes Reform Bill, 139; on Suez Canal shares, 217; 309.
Granville, Lord, 71, 76; disliked by Queen, 77; 183, 4; Chamberlain's opinion of, 185; 188; both Whig and Radical, 190; a sportsman, 191; on Colonies and India, 216; Suez Canal shares, 216; El Obeid, 219; French aggressions, 307; German aggressions, 316.
Graves, M.P. for Liverpool, 20.
"Great Unpaid," "The," 157.
Green, J. R., 38; Home Ruler, 39; supports working-man candidate, 276.
Grey, Earl, 16.
Grey, Sir E. (Viscount Grey of Fallodon), as Home Ruler, 39; approves Boer War, 220; Foreign Minister, 240.
Grey, General, Secretary to Queen Victoria, 20.
Grierson, General, 314.
Grosvenor, Lord (Duke of Westminster), motion on Reform Bill, 1866, 16; 35, 199.
Grosvenor, Lord Richard (Lord Stalbridge), 35, 187, 196.
Grote, George, 60.
Guinness, Rogers, Rev. Dr., a Nonconformist leader, 107.
Gully, W. C. (Speaker), 279.

Hague Peace Conferences, 325.
Haig, Earl, admiration for Haldane, 324.
Haldane, R. B. (Lord Haldane), on Democracy and the Great War, 8; "after Gladstone the Deluge," 28; Education Act 1902, 117, 283; approves Boer War, 220; interest in Colonies, 225; on Campbell-Bannerman, 238; at War Office, 240; intimate with Fabians, 244, 283; on Asquith, 248; social proclivities, 250; 252; on Burns, 273; Taff Vale case, 293, 4; new spirit in Democracy, 294, 297; accepts War Office, 321; "a steady patriot," *ib.*, 329; on preparations for war, 321; Conscription impossible, 322; reorganized Auxiliary Forces, 323; Expeditionary Force, *ib.*; Grierson's praise, 324; Haig's gift, *ib.*; Asquith's praise, *ib.*
Halsbury, Lord, on Trade Union Levy, 304.
Hamilton, Lord Frederick, 132.
Hamilton, Lord Claud, against rural vote, 132.
Hamilton, Lord Ernest, 132.
Hamilton, Nisbet, 159.
Hamley, Sir E., on defence of London, 312.
Harcourt, Sir William, on popular government, 2; on Gladstone "played out," 30; Mrs. O'Shea, 43; classed as Radical, 61; 76; quarrels with Morley, 93; "impossible" as Prime Minister, 94; Rosebery's implacable foe, 74; resigns leadership, 95; Bulgarian atrocities, 109; Death Duties, 171; on appointment of Magistrates, 177; suffers by Death Duties, 172; 183, 4; faithful to Gladstone, 188; an Erastian 189; Whig and Radical, 189; admires Hartington, 192; anti-Imperialism, 223; resigns leadership, 236; on Bishop Wilberforce, 250; 280, 5; "all Socialists now," 298; on cost of Army, 312.
Harden, Maximilian, on German war-guilt, 319.
Hardy, Thomas, on Democracy and Art, 3; reply to Stead, 110; his peace hopes, 324; shattered by the War, 330.
Hares and Rabbits Bill, 78, 156.
Harmsworth, Alfred (Lord Northcliffe), founds *Answers*, 73, buys *The Evening News*, 74; founds *The Daily Mail*, 74-5; changes attitude to Budget, 75; thinks war inevitable, 318.
Harris, Wm., creator of Caucus, 87.
Harrison, Frederic, introduction to Chamberlain, 80; on risk of war, 318.
Hart Dyke, Sir William, Free Education Bill, 72; 241.
Hartington, Lord (Duke of Devonshire), on Bulgarian atrocities, 38, 91; Gladstone's censure, 49; 71, 3, 6; Dilke on, 82; quarrels with Gladstone, 91, with Chamberlain, *ib.*, with Granville, *ib.*; on agricultural depression, 166; becomes Leader, 183; his following, 184; on Whigs, 187; wants to retire, 188; rejects Home Rule, *ib.*; abilities and character, 192-5; finds Gladstone unintelligible, 193; as Parliamentarian, 193; Rendel's estimate, 195; 208; as to Suez Canal Shares, 216.
Hatherley, Lord, 71.
Healey, Tim, 200.
Henderson, Arthur, 278; a Liberal agent, 279; Temperance Lecturer, 282.
Heneage, Mr., 186.
Herbert, Auberon, Republican, 64; supports Agricultural Labourers' Union, 136.
Hereford, Lord, *see* James, Sir H.
Hertford, Lord, his pocket-boroughs, 145.
Hicks Pasha, *see* El Obeid.
Hicks-Beach, Sir Michael, reduces rents, 178; 212, 232.
Hodgkinson, M.P. for Newark, Amendment to abolish Compounding, 21.
Hohenlohe, German Chancellor, 316.
Holden, Sir Isaac, 279.
Home Rule, delays democratic advance, 29; a difficulty for Liberals, 96. *See* Gladstone, Chamberlain, Harcourt, Morley.
Hope of Fentonbarns, 148, 159.

Horsman, 71.
Hothfield, Lord, 49.
Houghton, Lord, 185.
Household Suffrage, regarded as dangerous, 11; urban enacted, 24; rural, 140.
Hudson, Sir Robert, 90.
Hughes, Rev. H. P., advice to Methodists, 104; his "chuckers-out," 108; West End Mission, *ib*; against Parnell, 109; Imperialist, *ib*.
Hughes, Tom; M.P. 1865, 98; supports Agricultural Labourer, 136.
Hunt, Rowland, speech in House of Commons, 161.
Huxley, Professor, on East End degradation, 288.
Hyde Park railings, torn down, 17.
Hyndman, interviews Disraeli, 204; 207, 211; founds S.D.F., 283; 289, 298.

Iddesleigh, Lord, *see* Northcote, Sir Stafford.
Imperial Liberal Council, 95.
Imperialism, preached by New Journalism, 76; in Gladstone's last Ministry, 93; divided Liberals, 96; not inconsistent with Democracy, 214; meaning of, 215.
In Darkest England, 288.
Income Tax, 173; increased yield, 246.
Independent Labour Party, all candidates defeated 1895, 277; established 1893, 284; 292,3.
Inge, Dean, 152.
Ingogo, 218.
Internationalism, 326.
Irish University Bill, 116.

James, Sir Henry (Lord Hereford), 83.
Jameson Raid, The, 111.
Jeune, Sir F. (Lord St. Helier), 177.
Johnson, Dr., on War Journalism, 75; 152.
Jones, Kennedy, 74, 5.
Jowett, Benjamin, on Gladstone's simplicity, 43; on his scholarship, 55; 181, 243; on Asquith, 248.

Kaiser, *see* Wilhelm.
Karslake, Sir John, on Disraeli, 24.
Kaufmann, General, 39, 306.
Kier Hardie, M.P., Republican, 65; a "pro-Boer," 95; supports W.S.P.U., 264; independent M.P., 277; leads Socialists, 278; 279; defeated at West Ham, 280; praises Campbell-Bannerman, *ib*.; founder of I.L.P., 284; of a new Party, 293; on Haldane's militarism, 324.
Key, Admiral Sir Cooper, 111.
Kilmainham Treaty, 218.
Kimberley, Lord, 71, 76, 183, 4.
Kings, fates of those who attended King Edward's funeral, 6.
Kingsley, Charles, on German victory, 314.
Kipling, Rudyard, "banjo-bard of Empire," 111; 215; criticism of, 221; England's mission, 221; champion of the private soldier, 222; 297.
Kitchener, Lord; enters Khartoum, 220; assurance to Smuts, 238; War Minister, 326; on things deficient, 327.
Kitson, Sir James, a Free Trade Resolution, 246.
Kruger, Kaiser's telegram, 316.

Labouchere, Henry, on Gladstone's love of power, 31; as Home Ruler, 40; 42, 3; a Radical, 61; on Royal Grants, 65; 1880 Election, 77; supports Bradlaugh, 79; carries Amendment Address 1894, 94; a "pro-Boer," 95; plan for Disestablishment, 114; hope as to Reform Bill, 84, 131; on Whigs, 187, 196; Egyptian expeditions, 219; against Votes for Women, 262; on rise of Labour Party, 277; Dilke and Labour, 281; rise of Labour, 293; payment of Members, 295; an individualist, 298.
Labour Exchanges Act, 255.
Labour Reform League, founded by Radicals, 278.
Labour Representation Committee, 292.
Labour Party, Ponsonby's letter to the Queen, 99; Snowden on, 246; alarm of Lloyd George, 257; Women's Suffrage, 263; for Abolition of Lords, 268; comes into

Labour Party—*cont.*
existence, 277; strength in House of Commons, 1910-31, 278; relations with Liberals, 279, 295; well-established, 300.
Laing's Nek, 218.
Land, as bulwark against Democracy, 146.
Lansbury, George, reply to Free Church deputation, 125; conversion to Socialism, 286.
Lansdowne, Lord, a Whig, 197; signs *Entente*, 308.
Lawson, Sir Wilfrid, in Franchise debate, 4, 61; a "pro-Boer," 95; votes for Civil Lists Return, 98; 236, 313.
Lawson Walton, Sir H., 294.
League of Liberals, The, 95, 239, 40.
Leighton, Sir Baldwyn, 136, 160.
Leys School, 106.
"Lib-Labs," 277, 300.
Liberal-Leaguers, *see* League of Liberals.
Liberalism, of Gladstone, 56, 7; Morley, 57; Acton, *ib.*; Chamberlain, 58; Campbell-Bannerman, *ib.*; Asquith, *ib.*; Lloyd George, 59.
Licensing Bill 1908, rejected by the Lords, 123, 4, 268, 252, 3.
Liddon, Canon, 38.
Liebknecht, joins I.L.P., 285.
Life and Labour of the People of London, 286.
Lloyd George, David, 36; "sound for E.Q.," 39; on Liberalism, 58; a "pro-Boer," 95; his "Christian" Budget, 108; attacks Church, 115; on Passive Resistance, 117; Dr. Clifford's admiration, 121; popularity, 124, 242; praises Nonconformists, *ib.*; attacks Wiltshire landowners, 134; address to farmers, 166; on Super-tax, 173; in Cabinet, 239; Budget, 253; a negotiator, *ib.*; attacks Dukes, 254-5; on a Millenium, 256; interrupted by women, 263; attacks the Lords, 268, angry with Socialists, 280; on destitution, 288; Navy, 320.
Local Government Act 1888, *see* County Councils.
Local Veto, 120, 189.
London County Council, political atmosphere, 170; expenditure, 245; Fabianist, 284, 90; strength of Parties, 1904-1931, 291.
Lonsdale, Lord, his pocket-boroughs, 145.
Lords, House of, reform proposals, 70, 266; strength of Parties in, 267; opposition to Liberal Bills, 268; throws out Budget, *ib.*; passes Veto Bill, 269; 269; Burke on, 273; weakened, 300.
Loreburn, Lord, *see* Reid, Sir Robert.
Lothair, 146, 8, 172, 289.
Louise, Princess, 62.
Lowe, Robert (Viscount Sherbrooke), on promises to Democracy, 2; opposes Reform Bill 1866, 14; predicts dire results, 15; on Disraeli's *volte-face*, 23, 4; *Punch's* praise, 24; on labourers' wage, 134; *Advocatus Diaboli* against Democracy, 137; in House of Lords, *ib.*; 256; on rich and poor, 289; 300.
Lowther, James, 208.
Lucy, Sir Henry ("Toby M.P."), Tory speeches in House of Commons, 160.
Lyttelton, Hon. A., 241.

Macaulay, Lord, for limit of Vote, 12.
McCarthy, Justin, after Parnell's divorce suit, 119.
McCarthyites, 93.
Macdonald, Alexander, praises Disraeli's legislation, 203; Labour M.P., 276.
MacDonald, Ramsay, on a defect in Democracy, 8; criticized by Labour men, 251; I.L.P. candidate, 277; maiden speech, 278; Secretary to Lough, 279; a Fabian, 283; helps to found I.L.P., 284; 292; denounces Czar, 310.
Macdonald, of *The Times*, 248.
McDougall, John, 291.
McKenna, Reginald, on a "War Scare," 319; expenditure on Navy, 321.
Macnamara, Dr., 240.
"Mafficking," 228.

Maiden Tribute of Modern Babylon, The, 287.
Maine, Sir Henry, prejudices of Democracy, 3; the will of a multitude, 4; Government draughtsmen, 4; on constitutional safeguards, 140.
Majuba, 218.
Malmesbury, Lord, on Compound Householder, 19, 20.
Mann, Thomas, 277, a Temperance Lecturer, 282; joins I.L.P., 285.
Manners, Lord John, 202.
Manning, Cardinal, on Gladstone, 48; support for Agricultural Labourer, 136; on County Council Act, 170; on social degradation, 287.
Marx, Eleanor, 285.
Maxton, James, 285.
Meredith, George, on French Emperor, 314.
"Merrie England," 202.
Methodists, anti-Liberal tradition, 102; former sub-divisions, 140. *See* Nonconformists.
Miall, Edward, 113, 4.
Middle Classes, 69; weakened, 300.
Militia Ballot, 233.
Mill J. S., 60; M.P. 1865, 98; loses seat to W. H. Smith, 98; for Female Suffrage, 259, 261.
Milner, Lord; on *The P.M.G.*; 110; Imperialist, 225.
Milner-Gibson, 71.
Miners' Eight-Hours Day, 256.
Molesworth, 182.
Monarchy, still strong in England, 7; 65, 300.
Morel, E. D., 286.
Morley, John (Viscount Morley), merits of Democracy, 2; on Gladstone's mind, 10; an early Home Ruler, 39; Acton on his irreligion, 53; 60; Programmes, 67; on Gladstone and Chamberlain, 78; attitude to Bradlaugh, 79; dines with Parnell, 92; quarrels with Harcourt, 93; with Asquith, *ib.*; with Rosebery, 94; feminine character, 93; gives up active politics, 95; Bulgarian atrocities, 109; for Disestablishment, 114; Welsh Disestablishment, 115; presides at Reform meeting, 133; on himself, 198; Mrs. Webb's criticism, 200; a "Whig," *ib.*; on Unionist victories, 202; Majuba, 218; Imperialism, 223; his Indian administration, 224; retirement, 236; in Campbell - Bannerman's Cabinet, 239; at Althorp and Marlborough House, 249; 252; 262; for abolition of Lords, 266; 285; resigns on Great War, 310; on a confederacy of States, 326.
Morley, Samuel, influenced against Bradlaugh, 80; 118; support for Agricultural Labourer, 136.
Mouravieff, General, 39.
Mundella, A. J., 61; seconds the Address, 71; supports Agricultural Labourer, 136; converted to Home Rule, 270, 279.

National Insurance, 253.
National Service League, 228.
National Liberal Federation, declares for Home Rule, 42. *See* also Caucus.
"Natural Rights," 80, 100.
New Machiavelli, The, 243-5, 258.
Newcastle Programme, The, 43, 69, 266.
Newdegate, C. N., 159, 160.
Newnes, Sir George, "Father of the New Journalism," 73.
Nonconformists, many sects, 104; puritans, 105; political bent, 107; organized, 113; attitude to Education, 116; to Home Rule, 118; condemn Parnell, 119; and "Chinese Slavery," 122; strong in 1906 Parliament, 123, 243; relations with Labour, 126.
"Nonconformist Conscience," "The," 109, 117.
Norman, Sir H., *The P.M.G.*, 110.
North, Lord, on country gentleman's life, 176.
Northbrook, Lord, 76.
Northcliffe, Lord, *see* Harmsworth, Alfred.
Northcote, Sir Stafford (Lord Iddesleigh), character, 205; Liberal sympathies, *ib.*; Master of Harriers, *ib.*
Novikoff, Madame, 48, 310.

Odger, George, Dilke supports, 276.
Old Age Pensions, 253, 5, 6.
Omdurman, 220.

Osborne, Bernal, on Dunkellin's Amendment, 17; on Hodgkinson's Amendment, 23, 71.
Osborne Judgment, The, 295.
O'Shea, Captain, 43.
O'Shea, Mrs., communications with Gladstone, 44; on Gladstone, 48.
Oxford and Asquith, Lord, on Democracy's extravagance, 3; popular intelligence, 4; Gladstone in 1893, 30; as Home Ruler, 43; definition of Liberailsm, 58; on popular government, 59; New Journalism, 74; maiden speech, 92; "branded as schismatic," 95; abandons Home Rule, *ib.*; counsel for Dilke, 100; a Nonconformist, 106; Welsh Disestablishment, 115; a "Whig," 198, 252; 220; Chancellor of Exchequer, 240; career, 247; rhetoric, *ib.*; in Society, 248; "wait and see," 252; against Votes for Women, 258; conversion thereto, 263; in favour of Second Chamber, 266, with restricted powers, *ib.*; speeches against Lords, 268; on Lloyd George, 272; appointments of women, 273; against Nationalization, 299; on co-operation with Labour, 280, 295; on great armaments, 320; praise of Haldane, 324.

Paget, Sir Richard, 169.
Palmerston, Lord, Gladstone's Reform declaration, 10; changes on his death, 13; 59; his appetite, 177; offends the Queen, 181.
Pankhurst, Dr., Home Ruler, 39; Republican, 64; Programme, 67; for Disestablishment, 114; on Agricultural Labourer, 134; for Adult Suffrage, 261; joins I.L.P., 263; 277, 285.
Pankhurst, Miss Christabel, 259, 263; on German peril, 265.
Pankhurst, Miss Sylvia, against conscription, 265; for abolition of Parliament, *ib.*
Paris, Treaty of, 306.
Parnell, C. S., no democrat, 42; intrigue with Mrs. O'Shea, 43; adverse to Bradlaugh, 79; divorce suit, 92; deserted by colleagues, 119; Gladstone's letter, *ib.*; "howling of hypocrites," *ib.*
"Participation without Predominance," 11; Disraeli on, 12, 24.
Parties, relative strength of, 1868-1910, 270; in 1931, 271.
Passfield, Lord, *see* Webb, Sidney.
"Passive Resistance," 116, 7, 121.
Pattison, Mrs. 76.
Paul, H. W., 40.
Payment of Members, 256; Labouchere on, *ib.*; effect of, 257; 295-7.
Peaceful picketing, 295.
Pease, Sir Alfred, 198.
Peel, Sir Robert, antagonizes Tories, 146; prophesy about price of corn, 147; 159, 181, 210, 212.
Penjdeh, 307.
Percival, Bishop of Hereford, on Tariff Reform, 122; message to Peace Congress, 325.
Perks, Sir Robert, 95.
Phineas Finn, 67, 139, 146, 180.
Phoenix Park Murders, 218.
Picton, 313.
Picture of Dorian Grey, The, 160.
Pigott, confession and suicide, 118.
Plurality of Votes, 18.
Pocket-boroughs, 145.
Poor Law Act, 145.
Pope Alexander, 152.
Potter, Miss B., *see* Webb, Mrs. Sidney.
Potter, T. B., 61.
Prime Minister, The, 58, 139, 151.
Primrose League, The, 208-9.
Prince of Wales, The, *see* Edward the Seventh, King.
Programmes, political, 66-70.
"Progress," praised by Gladstone, 3; great expectations in 1868, 1880 and 1906, 214, 241, 290.
Punch, praise for Lowe, 24; on Gladstone the woodcutter, 46; Dilke the Republican, 62; Chamberlain, 63; Gladstone in 1880, 76; Tory discipline, 97; Lord Claud Hamilton's speech, 133; his Peers, Squires, Farmers, Labourers, 150; country life, 151; vulgar traders, 152; Tory speeches, 160-1; agricultural depression, 163; the impoverished Squire, 165, 172, 178; Hart-

Punch—cont.
ington, 194; Lord Randolph Churchill, 208; the 1906 Election, 241; female suffragists, doctors and poets, 261; 276; a Labour Member, 279; on "Slumming," 287; Progressives, 290; Bismarck, 316; "young Müller," 317.

Quiller-Couch, Sir A., on fate of great houses, 174.

Ramsay, Lord, 184.
"Ransom," doctrine of, 67, 212.
Republicanism, 61-66; extinct in England, 99.
Redistribution, Gladstone wanted to postpone, 138; necessity of, 139.
Redmondites, 93.
Reform, *see* Household Suffrage, Compound Householder.
Reform Act 1832, a Revolution, 1; 130, 145.
Reform Bill 1866, 14 *seq.*
Reform Act 1867, 19 *seq.*; Royal Assent, 24; *see* Compound Householder.
Reform Act 1884, *see* Chapter *Reform in* 1884.
Reid, Sir Robert (Lord Loreburn), a "pro-Boer," 220; Lord Chancellor, 239, 252.
"Relugas" Compact, The, 239.
Rendel, Lord, 115; on Lord R. Churchill, 208; Lloyd George's speeches, 253; a "mongrel" House of Lords, 266.
Review of Reviews, The, 76.
Rhodes, Cecil, friendship with Stead, 111, 112; on England's Mission, 227.
Riaz Pasha, 227.
Richard, Henry, 61.
Richards, Tom, 280.
Richmond, Duke of, on agricultural depression, 163.
Ripon, Lord, justifies naval expenditure, 309.
Ritchie, C. T. (Lord Ritchie of Dundee), his career, 168; introduces County Council's Bill, *ib.*; disliked by Tories, 170.
Roberts, Lord, on German preparations, 318.
Robertson, J. M., on Republicanism, 64.
Roebuck, J. A., 71, 227.
Rogers, Rev. J. G., 243.
Rogers, Professor Thorold, on Methodist organization, 281, 287.
Rose, Sir Philip, Conservative Agent, 86.
Rosebery, Lord, on Tory Democracy, 5, 207; succeeds Gladstone, 94; enmity of Harcourt, *ib.*; resigns leadership, 95, 236; ceases co-operation with Party, 95; on "the Machine," 101; Nonconformists, 112; Passive Resisters, 117; on Death Duties, 172; defends Whigs, 197; on Lord R. Churchill's resignation, 212; approves Boer War, 220; Imperialist, 224; isolated, 243; on 1909 Budget, 253; House of Lords, 267, 274; danger to Liberal Party, 275; L.C.C. and politics, 290; jealousy of England, 306; her unpreparedness, 318.
Rowntree, York poverty enquiry, 288.
Royal Grants, 33, 65.
Royal Titles Act, 216, 7.
Ruskin, John, 36.
Russia, Czar of, alarm at Reform Bill, 143.
Russia, danger from, 306-7.
Russell, Hon. B. (Earl Russell), 282.
Russell, Sir Charles (Lord Russell of Killowen), 83; sums up in Jameson's trial, 111, 128.
Russell, Sir Edward, on Nonconformists and Education, 107.
Russell, G. W. E., 186, 199.
Russell, Lord John, a Reform Bill 1851, 10; Reform apathy 1866, 14; 103, 181, 2.
Rylands, Peter, 61.

St. Aldwyn, Lord, *see* Hicks-Beach, Sir M.
Salisbury, Lord (Lord Robert Cecil, Lord Cranborne), fears of "Progress," 3; on crowd emotion, 4; on Disraeli's *volte face*, 23; on Gladstone as Christian, 31; not a demagogue, 47; *The Daily Mail*, 74; the Liberal majority 1880, 77; "Citizen Salisbury," 98; on Reform Bill 1884, 131; M.P. for Stamford, 139; on

Salisbury, Lord—*cont.*
"pure Squire Conservatism," 146, 212; ridicules Local Government Bills, 168; on duty to serve on County Councils, 170; leader in Lords, 205; attitude to Tory Democracy, 210, 211, 232; on American Civil War, 215; Payment of Members, 256; House of Lords, 267; working-men M.P.s, 276; 297, 9; our small Army, 306; complaints against War Office, 311; fatalism, 312; "pacific Germany," 315; union of Heligoland, 316.
Sandhurst, Lady, 262.
Saturday Review, The, on Women, 259.
Schnadhorst, Mr., Secretary to Caucus, 87.
Scott Holland, Canon, on Chamberlain, 81.
Schouvaloff, Count, 315.
Selborne, Lord, "a High-Church Tory," 71, 6.
Selwyn-Ibbetson, Sir H., 169.
Sexton, James, 285.
Shaftesbury, Lord, as landowner, 134.
Shaw, Lefevre, Mr. 67, 266.
Shaw, Bernard, "a permeative Fabian," 284; on Communism, 299.
Sherbrooke, Lord, *see* Lowe, Robert.
Sibthorp, Colonel, 159.
Simon, Sir John, on Trades Disputes Bill, 294; General Strike, *ib.*; Socialism, 298.
Slums, 287.
Smith, F. E. (Lord Birkenhead), on Reform 1832, 130; on 1906 Parliament, 242; Lloyd George's speeches, 253; maiden speech, 231; on Trades Disputes Bill, 294, 5; Lloyd George, 320; Haldane, 321, 9.
Smith Sydney, on Reform agitation, 1832, 130.
Smith, W. H., Disraeli's praise, 65; defeats Mill, 98; 178.
Smith, W. H. and Co., 287.
Smuts, General, 238.
Smythe, George, Lord Strangford, 202.
Snowden, Lord, 173, maiden speech, 246; a Peer, 250; finds the Lords businesslike, *ib.*; against Women's Suffrage, 263; F. E. Smith's maiden speech, 271; Dukes, 272, 8; an ardent Liberal, 279, 280; Labour a religious movement, 281; Temperance worker, 281; joins I.L.P., 285; resigns therefrom, *ib.*; converted to Socialism, 285, 8; not an Industrial, 292.
S. D. F., 292.
Socialists, 291-9, *see* Fabians.
Somerset, Duke of, 184.
Soudan, evacuation of, 220.
Southey, on literary women, 259.
Spectator, The, urges International Agreement, 325.
Spencer, Earl, 49, 76; Gladstone wanted him to be Prime Minister, 93; 184; Whig and sportsman, 191; Morley, Rendel, and Sir A. West on, 191-2; defends Parnell, 192; naval expenditure, 309.
Spencer, Herbert, 60; against Socialism, 298.
Spencer, Hon. C. R. (Earl Spencer), 139.
Spender, J. A., on paths to Parliament, 296.
Spofforth, Markham, Conservative organizer, 86.
Spurgeon, C. H., on Gladstone, 45; eternal torment, 105; denounces Bradlaugh, 160.
Stalbridge, Lord, *see* Grosvenor, Lord Richard.
Stanhope, Hon. E., 311.
Stanhope, Hon. P., a "pro-Boer," 95.
Stanley, Lord, opposes Reform Bill, 1866, 16.
Stanley, Colonel, War Minister, 311.
Stansfeld, Sir J., 61, 279.
Stead, W. T., Bulgarian atrocities, 38, 109; Home Ruler, 39, 63; Imperialist, 76, 111, 225; *Review of Reviews, ib.*; Editor *Pall Mall Gazette*, 109, 10; "The Maiden Tribute," 111, 287; militarist, *ib.*; for strong Navy, *ib.*; friendship with Rhodes, *ib.*; Jameson Raid, *ib.*; drowned in *Titanic*, Lord Fisher's epitaph, 112; attacks Dilke, 118; writes Gladstone on Parnell, 119; on punishment of adulterers, 129; on Housing, 287; interviews Czar, 325.

Stephen, Sir James, on Democracy and wire-pullers, 3.
Stockmar, Baron, 328.
Strachey, St. Loe, on German menace, 318.
Subjection of Woman, The, 261.
Suez Canal, 216-7.
Super Tax, Sur Tax, 173.
Sutherland, Duke of, 184, 199.
Sykes, Christopher, 160-1.
Sykes, Lady, 177.

Tacitus, *Germania*, 314.
Taff Vale Case, The, 240, 256, 293.
Tariff Reform, divides Conservatives, 121; denounced by Bishop Percival, 122.
Taylor, Peter, republicanism, 61.
Tel el Kebir, 220.
"Ten Minutes' Bill," "The," 18.
Ten Pounder, The, 1.
Tennyson, Lord, *Locksley Hall Sixty Years After*, 3.
Tests, Abolition of, effect on Oxford, 99.
Thomas, J. H., praise of Royal Family, 65.
Tillett, Ben, 277; a Temperance worker, 282; joins I.L.P., 285.
Times, The, on "the Interdependence of Nations," 326.
Tit-Bits, 73.
"Toby M.P.," *see* Lucy, Sir Henry.
Tory Democracy, "an imposture," 5; ridiculed by T. Burt, *ib.*; 205; defined by Lord R. Churchill, 206; by Sir J. Gorst, 206; by Lord Rosebery, 207; by Chamberlain, *ib.*; by Gladstone, *ib.*; Salisbury's attitude to, 210.
Toryism, Disraeli on, 24.
Town-Houses in County Towns, 176.
Trades Disputes Bill, 294.
Trade Unionism, 292, 4, 5. *See* also Taff Vale Case, Osborne Judgment, Labour.
Trades Unions, support Reform Bill, 1866, 14.
Trevelyan, Sir George, 92; advocates extension of Reform in 1874, 130, 1; also in 1879, 130, 1, 6.
Trollope, Anthony, candidate for Beverley, 60.
Trotzky, on Fabians, 302.
Truth, 157.

University Tests Act, 106.

Victoria, Queen, on Gladstone's declaration, 30; "not much of an Episcopalian," 32; credits Gladstone with good intentions, 34; horrified at Bulgarian atrocities, 37; on Gladstone and the Lords. 49; Gladstone and the Classes, 50; Dilke, 62; interest in housing, 63; angry with Chamberlain, *ib.*; visits Birmingham, 64; antagonism to Gladstone, 77; consults Beaconsfield after his fall, *ib.*; objection to Joseph Arch, 135; action on Reform Bill, 139; on Harcourt, 172, 189; Death Duties, 172; at first a Whig, 180; on Granville, 190; praises Lord R Churchill, 209; on Churchill's resignation, 212; becomes Empress, 217; on slaughter of fanatics, 227; on Women's Rights, 261; reply to Rosebery, 267; on housing, 287; laments Beer Duty, 303; on war with Russia 306; lampooned by French Press, 308; on a powerful Germany, 315; on the Kaiser, 317.
Villiers, Hon, C., 182.
Volunteer Force, The, 307.
Votes for Women agitation, 258-65; Asquith opposes, 258; Mills' support, 261; Education Act 1870, *ib.*; Dr. Pankhurst and Dilke support, 261, 2; Local Government Act 1888, *ib.*; Local Government Act 1894, *ib.*; Gladstone and Labouchere, *ib.*; Lloyd George and Winston Churchill, 263; Asquith's conversion, *ib.*; Labour attitude, *ib.*; the W.S.P.U., 264; arson and other outrages, *ib.*; the Sisters Pankhurst disagree, 265; Suffrage granted, 265; sixteen million women voters, *ib.*

Walpole, S., against admitting Compound Householder, 20.
Ward, Mrs. Humphry, her political novels, 244.
Warton, M.P., 160.
Warwick, Lady, entertains King Edward and Stead, 63; on Chamberlain at Chatsworth, 81; Joseph Arch, 136;

Warwick, Lady—*cont.*
Church customs and rural benevolence, 158; converted to Socialism, 286.
Watson, Dr. Spence, 253.
Webb, Sidney (Lord Passfield), *Wanted* a Programme, 69, 284; Education Act 1902, 117, 283; 238; a camouflaged Socialist, 244; 275; courtship, 285; 290.
Webb, Mrs. Sidney, on Bright and Chamberlain, 81, 87; on Granville, 190; John Morley, 200; a Fabian, 244, 285; her conversion to Socialism, 285; on life in the slums, 287.
Webster, Sir Richard (Lord Alverstone), the Tories stand by him, 97.
Wellesbourne Oak, meeting at the, 135-6.
Wellesley, Dean, 33.
Wellington, Duke of, on Dissenters, 103; House of Lords, 145.
Wells, H. G., on Fabians, 245, 270.
Welsh Disestablishment, development of Gladstone's views on, 115; Asquith in charge of Bill 1895, *ib.*; enacted 1914, 116; comes into force after War, *ib.*; 120.
West, Sir Algernon, on Irish ingratitude, 43.
Westminster, Duke of, *see* Grosvenor, Earl.
Wetherell, Sir Charles, 159.
Wheat, decline in price of, 166.
Whigs, tactics on Reform Bill 1866, 16, 17; their religion, 32; dislike of Gladstone, 60; large landowners, 180; attitude to Radicals, 182; dislike of Irish Disestablishment, 183; decline in influence, 183, 197; described by "Toby M.P.," 185, 6; between two fires, 187; mentality, 198; extinction of, *ib.* *See* Chapter on "The End of the Whigs."
Wilhelm I, German Emperor, alarm at Reform Bill, 148; power of Bismarck, 315.
Wilhelm II, German Emperor, telegram to Kruger, 316; at Tangiers, 317; Queen Victoria on, 317; Brandenburgh speech, 317; "Admiral of the Atlantic," *ib.*; 330.
Wilson, Howell, Independent Labour M.P., 277.
Wolff, Sir H. D., 225.
Wolseley, Lord, on our unpreparedness, 311; on Duke of Cambridge, 312; confidence in Duke of Connaught, 328.
Women's Franchise League, 263.
Women's Social and Political Union, 264.
Women's Suffrage, *see* Votes for Women.
Wood, Sir Evelyn, 177.
Wyllie, Sir Curzon, assassinated, 227.
Wyndham, George, on Hartington, 194; on war with Germany, 318.