

# RADICAL REFORM GROUP

The Radical Reform Group has until recently been relatively neglected by historians of the Liberal Party. **Graham Lippiatt** gives an overview of the group's formation and history, examines the material published by the group itself and reviews the published literature which covers it.

**T**HE RADICAL Reform Group (RRG) was a social liberal pressure group of the 1950s and 1960s. It was founded in 1952<sup>1</sup> by Desmond Banks<sup>2</sup> and Peter Grafton.<sup>3</sup> Concerned that, under the leadership of Clement Davies, the Liberal Party was falling unduly under the sway of classical, free-market liberals and was drifting to the right, they feared the domination of the party by economic liberals such as Oliver Smedley<sup>4</sup> and Arthur Seldon,<sup>5</sup> who both later helped establish the Institute of Economic Affairs, the think tank that was to become an engine of Thatcherism. One prominent Radical Reformer recalled that he joined because of worries that the party was so small and weak in the early 1950s that it was in danger of being taken over by people like Smedley and S. W. Alexander<sup>6</sup> who would be seen as cranks who wanted to turn the party into an economic sect.<sup>7</sup>

The RRG saw their task as promoting 'social reform without socialism' and sought ways in which the institutions and policies of the welfare state and the managed economy could be improved and strengthened.<sup>8</sup> Looking back, one reformer set out the task of the RRG as '... mov[ing] the party as a whole to adopt a programme, especially in industrial and economic affairs, which could become the platform for a new, radical force in politics.'<sup>9</sup> This emphasis on creating something new in British politics was because the RRG recognised that there was something wrong with a political and electoral system which produced great opposing, disciplined party blocs. In the preamble to its constitution, the RRG stated that 'no existing party, acting as such, is, in view of sectional background or historical obsolescence, producing, on

its own, policies which will both give effect to the principles [of liberty and social justice] and gain wide acceptance from all shades of political opinion.'<sup>10</sup> The RRG's intention was to create an effective third force in British politics and looked for ways of forging links with like-minded individuals in other parties. Banks also gave as a justification for the formation of the RRG the need to strengthen the Liberal Party as an alternative for disillusioned electors against the growth of extremist groups. 'If there were no Liberal Party,' he declared in a speech in Cornwall in March 1956, 'we might well be witnessing today the growth of some dangerous movement akin to that of Monsieur Poujade'<sup>11</sup> in France.<sup>12</sup>

In the spring of 1954, the RRG decided to disaffiliate from the Liberal Party in an effort to attract members from the social democratic wing of the Labour Party. It hoped to exploit divisions in the Labour Party between the supporters of Aneurin Bevan<sup>13</sup> and those of Hugh Gaitskell.<sup>14</sup> Most RRG members remained card-carrying members of the Liberal Party but one former Chairman, E. F. Allison, defected to Labour<sup>15</sup> and one of its vice-presidents, the former MP for Dundee, Dingle Foot, (who also later joined Labour, in 1956) openly supported Labour candidates in seats not contested by Liberals in the 1955 general election. The Labour splits did not prove permanent however, and the RRG strategy was not a success. Membership declined and the media were not interested. At the Annual General Meeting of the group in the National Liberal Club on 29 October 1955, members voted narrowly to revert to being an organisation wholly within the Liberal Party.<sup>16</sup> This homecoming was welcomed by a leader in

the *News Chronicle* entitled 'Left or Limbo?'. It called the earlier decision to divorce from the party a mistake, criticising the RRG for having been dormant too long and looked forward to its renewed activities on the left of centre, where it said 'all good Liberals should be'.<sup>17</sup>

Thereafter the RRG continued its role as an internal social liberal ginger group, supportive of Jo Grimond's electoral strategy of realignment. The marginalisation or defection of leading economic liberals and the return of the RRG helped to set the progressive tone of Liberal politics during the years of Grimond's leadership, when the party tended to choose the social liberal and Keynesian economic approach.

**The RRG saw their task as promoting 'social reform without socialism' and sought ways in which the institutions and policies of the welfare state and the managed economy could be improved and strengthened.**

## **Material published by the Radical Reform Group**

In all, the RRG published three pamphlets setting out the purpose and strategy of the group and detailing the policies that the Liberal Party and the country ought to adopt.<sup>18</sup> The group also published a regular newsletter which contained commentary on the political developments of the day, Liberal election prospects, essays on policy questions, and internal announcements and notices. This author has not been able to establish exactly when the first newsletter was published but the last one appears to have been the issue of September 1964.<sup>19</sup> Between November 1956 and September 1964, twenty-three newsletters were circulated to RRG members.<sup>20</sup>

The earliest of the RRG pamphlets was a three-page document, *Radical Approach: A Statement of Aims by the Radical Reform Group*, published in 1953. In the introduction, the authors set out an essentially Liberal belief in the supreme value of the human

personality and the need to create the conditions of liberty in which each personality can develop to the full. They observe, however, that liberty is a changing concept and declare that the task in the twentieth century is to win economic liberty at the same time as preserving and extending political liberty. What was wanted was a 'synthesis of freedom and social justice'. To achieve these aims the state has a clear role to play in specific fields. The first is the welfare state, in which 'no one through unemployment, sickness or old age shall be destitute; in which people with families to care for shall be helped to provide for them by those whose burdens are lighter; and in which the opportunity of a good start in life shall be available to all.' The pamphlet recommends the payment of a family allowance for the first child, an increase in old age pensions and the principle of a free health service. The next field for government action is full employment, which the pamphlet asserts is to be maintained broadly 'along the lines of Lord Beveridge's proposals for what he called the socialisation of demand'. Next the pamphlet sets out its authors' belief in free trade, although with Britain taking the lead in the creation of an international rather than a unilateralist system. In agriculture, the maintenance of planned production through a continuance of the policy of guaranteed prices and assured markets for farmers is advocated. In industry, it recommends co-ownership, profit-sharing and anti-monopoly as the watchwords. In summary, the authors argue that they seek wholesale social reform, but not socialism as understood in Britain, through the policy of nationalisation of the means of production, distribution and exchange.

*Radical Aims: A statement of policy by the Radical Reform Group*, which was published in 1953 or 1954, recalls the reaction to Labour's post-war socialism and how that led in the Liberal Party to the 'increasing influence of a school of "laissez-faire" apostles who but a few years ago were regarded as a lunatic fringe' seeking to revert to the philosophy of Herbert Spencer.<sup>21</sup> There follows an essay raising particular human

problems and again according a central place to the concept of liberty and the liberal tradition as a framework for thought and action. That framework, it is asserted, must 'ensure to all men an economic status comparable to the status demanded by the plea for liberty. As of right, wealth and income must be more equally shared ...'. The document makes some advanced recommendations in relation to the Third World. Albeit in language which today would be unacceptable, the authors recognise the 'appalling aspect of our present economic system [in] our treatment of backward peoples' (sic). They acknowledge the damage to 'native peoples and native ways of life' (sic) and state that 'our attitude to backward areas must be consistent with our highest beliefs; if men need freedom and the economic conditions to give it life, the need of all men is equally real'. Finally, in an early example of environmental consciousness, the pamphlet acknowledges that humanity needs to be more responsible with and demonstrate humility towards the world's material resources. It deplores the profligacy with which the free economy has treated natural resources such as coal, oil, forests and ores, tacitly recognising that these resources are finite and must be developed with more than the profit motive as the sole criterion.

Many of these approaches and policies found their way into the Liberal Party general election manifesto for 1955.<sup>22</sup> Particular convergence was found in the approaches to colonial development, industrial democracy and anti-monopoly, support for the welfare society, and provision for the old and the vulnerable. However, there was one notable clash with the RRG programme. Whereas *Radical Approach* had urged the need for guaranteed prices and assured markets for British farmers, the manifesto pointed out that Britain was spending £300 million annually subsidising agriculture, which it described as a short-sighted policy. Additionally, the manifesto was strong on traditional Liberal approaches to devolution and electoral reform as well as advocating European unity and robust

**In the aftermath of the 1959 general election, with a third successive Labour defeat, there seemed a real opportunity for progressive forces to realign around the Liberal Party and break from a Labour Party hidebound by its historic connections to the trade unions and Clause IV socialism.**

support for the United Nations and multilateral disarmament. These were not issues which the RRG discounted. The constitutional agenda underpinned much of the RRG critique of British politics set out in the group's unpublished constitution and the need for a radical alternative. And foreign policy questions came to feature more prominently in the later publication, *Radical Challenge* (1960). In the early days of the RRG, however, the domestic agenda was its primary focus.

The final RRG publication, *Radical Challenge* was a longer work, running to ten pages. *Radical Challenge* was a child of its political times. In 1956, Jo Grimond had become leader of the Liberal Party. In 1958 the party won the Torrington by-election, the first Liberal gain in a by-election since 1929. The economic and political landscape seemed to be moving, with the slow decline of heavy industry and with more of Britain's population becoming affluent and aspiring to middle-class lifestyles. Post-Suez a new, less traditional, outlook on foreign and Commonwealth affairs appeared to be developing, more in tune with liberal thought. In the aftermath of the 1959 general election, with a third successive Labour defeat, there seemed a real opportunity for progressive forces to realign around the Liberal Party and break from a Labour Party hidebound by its historic connections to the trade unions and Clause IV socialism. This thinking echoed the early aspirations of the RRG to create a fresh and radical, yet non-socialist, force in British politics.

So the introduction to *Radical Challenge* stressed the threatened eclipse of Labour and acknowledged those in the Labour Party (specifically naming Tony Crosland<sup>23</sup> and Roy Jenkins) who recognised the need for an overhaul to abandon nationalisation and class-consciousness. The purpose of the pamphlet was 'to give a clear lead to progressive-minded men and women', to offer a prospectus of radical goals as a rallying point around which such progressives could realign.

The first section, 'Beyond Independence', calls for continuing self-determination and

independence for colonial peoples and an end to minority rule in places like Algeria and South Africa. It proposed a more interdependent approach, foreseeing that colonial successor-states would struggle to be economically viable and dependent upon aid. It looked forward to international assistance for developing nations on the model of the Marshall Plan. The next section, entitled 'Unarmed Combat', deals with the Cold War, calling for detente and disarmament, particularly of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction. It calls for an independent, international authority to control and inspect national arsenals. Once the arms race is over, the pamphlet looks forward to a world where the duel between the liberal democracies and the Communist bloc transfers from the military to the socio-economic plane.

In 'A New Deal for Industry', the pamphlet reiterates the policies of industrial democracy and employee shareholding, praising the German model of 'co-determination' whereby large firms operate joint employer-worker boards. In the section dealing with 'The Role of Government', the state is urged to intervene in aspects of the economy which have traditionally been regarded as the sphere of private enterprise but not to engage in nationalisation or to prolong artificially the death throes of a sinking industry. Rather, it is the government's role to identify and encourage new industries which create new goods or services for which there is a market, to assist with retraining and to give the lead to private industry by establishing publicly owned and financed concerns in these areas and by providing basic facilities such as cheap communications. This section goes on to champion the breaking up of existing monopolies, the prevention of new ones and the encouragement of small-scale enterprises in industry and agriculture through government-funded low-interest loans.

The section on 'Trade Union Reform' criticised the failure of the unions to adapt to changing industrial conditions, and their clinging on to outdated practices and becoming increasingly

bureaucratic and centralised. An advance towards unions representing all the workers in a given industry, to avoid demarcation disputes, is proposed, as is local negotiation of wage rates to keep down inflation. Unrealistically, however, these reforms were supposed to spring spontaneously from within the union movement. This was because it was felt that their value would be vitiated were they to bear the hallmarks of vindictive or repressive legislation. There was also a call for the correction of abuses in union finances and elections.

The next section, 'The Wards of Society', calls for a strengthening of the welfare state in relation to the elderly and especially an increase in old age pensions. It attacks the arbitrary imposition of an age of retirement at sixty or sixty-five years. It identifies the unfairness of a system which discriminates against women who wish to return to work after their children are grown up. It is particularly scathing about the state of mental hospitals (sic), where essentially sane people have been incarcerated for years without redress and where patients are institutionalised. It questions whether the contributory principle should be retained in the financing of pensions and unemployment benefit or whether a new and comprehensive tax should supersede all existing methods of paying for social services.

The section 'Education: The Open Door' attacks the eleven-plus examination as predestining every child to social superiority or inferiority on the basis of a single assessment at too early an age. It calls for comprehensive education but on a human scale and accepts the continuation of public schools in a free society, while looking forward to a day when they will fade away.

The final section is called 'The Defence of Standards' and anticipates more contemporary arguments about the decline in the quality of life at the same time as the growth of affluence. It worries about over-commercialisation and the primacy of the 'values of the box-office and the sales-graph'. The section welcomes greater cultural and aesthetic opportunities but it calls for measures to alert

people to the dangers and equip them for distinguishing the excellent as opposed to the shoddy. It identifies adult education and the control of advertising as two possible approaches. It calls for good town and country planning to avoid creeping 'subtopia' and calls for less emphasis on road building and more to resuscitate the railway network. There is a last plea for the arts to flourish but to avoid the over-concentration of facilities in London.

### The Radical Reform Group in published literature

Until an upsurge of interest in Liberal Party politics brought on by the formation of the SDP and possibility of Liberal influence on government, the standard works covering the history of the Liberal Party in the 1950s and 1960s were those by Roy Douglas<sup>24</sup> and Chris Cook,<sup>25</sup> neither of which mentions the RRG at all. It does get a passing reference in David Dutton's survey of Liberal history published in 2004.<sup>26</sup> However Dutton refers to the group as a direct successor to Radical Action; yet, while they may have been some overlap in membership, there is no evidence that the RRG sprang from the ashes of the earlier organisation.<sup>27</sup> Jorgen Scott Rasmussen's study of the Liberal Party, published in the UK in 1965, does not deal with internal pressure groups.<sup>28</sup> There is no mention of the RRG in the memoirs of prominent Liberals of the time, although it was Jeremy Thorpe who was most closely associated with the group and we await the publication of papers dealing with Thorpe's career. There have been entries in two History Group publications, *Dictionary of Liberal Biography* and *Dictionary of Liberal Thought* which add to the literature, the first a biography of Desmond Banks<sup>29</sup>, the second an analysis of the history and thought of the RRG.<sup>30</sup>

The earliest detailed reference to the RRG in published literature is to be found in Alan Watkins' book, *The Liberal Dilemma*,<sup>31</sup> published in 1966. Set within the chapter entitled 'The Darkest Days', this gives a good flavour of the times in which the RRG was born and the social liberal rationale behind its

**The purpose of the pamphlet was 'to give a clear lead to progressive-minded men and women', to offer a prospectus of radical goals as a rallying point around which such progressives could realign.**

formation. He sets the departure from and reversion to the Liberal Party in a wider political context. Watkins queries the effectiveness of the group in providing a comprehensive umbrella for all those in the party who broadly agreed with its approach, citing one source attacking the RRG as misunderstanding the traditional synthesis of political, social and economic liberalism from which party policy is derived. Watkins also questions whether the Radical Reformers were just opposed to the doctrinaire free-traders or whether they wanted to replace the old guard with a new, young leadership drawn from their own ranks. Watkins does, however, conclude that it is possible to see the RRG as the precursor to the revolution that Jo Grimond put into effect.

The next most detailed mention comes in Vernon Bogdanor's *Liberal Party Politics*, published in 1983, with references in chapters by William Wallace on 'Survival and Revival' and by Andrew Gamble on 'Liberals and the Economy'. Wallace associates the return of the RRG to the Liberal Party and the leadership of Jo Grimond as related elements in the revival of Liberal electoral fortunes which he dates from the winter of 1955–56 and which are strongly boosted by anti-Conservative feeling over Suez. These factors, says Wallace, help the Liberal Party begin 'to rediscover a sense of purpose and a place in the political spectrum'.<sup>32</sup> Gamble, in a single reference, concentrates on the opposition of the RRG to the economic liberals and concludes by linking the RRG to Grimond's views on the future of politics.

Some useful references to the RRG are also to be found in Garry Tregidga's regional study, *The Liberal Party in South-West Britain since 1918*.<sup>33</sup> Tregidga charts a Liberal revival in the south-west and places it within a wider context, in which the RRG played its part and with whom local figures, like Dingle Foot<sup>34</sup> and Jeremy Thorpe, were associated. Tregidga points out that the RRG, founded by young parliamentary candidates, was attracting support from the Liberal revival in the universities and that Thorpe in particular was spreading the RRG gospel at the

regional universities in Exeter and Bristol.<sup>35</sup>

The most recent contribution to the literature on the RRG is Mark Egan's book, *Coming into Focus*,<sup>36</sup> published in 2009 but based on his Oxford doctoral thesis awarded in 2000. The book contains a section devoted to the RRG as part of the chapter about the Young Liberals (YL). It lists the RRG as a YL ginger group, along with Radical Action and New Orbits, although it concedes that the RRG was not led by YLs, just that a number of prominent young Liberals were active in the group. Egan's main contention is that the RRG was not an engine of new thinking but a ginger group for what was essentially already party policy in the face of the lacklustre leadership on policy development by Clement Davies and the threat of laissez-faire liberals like Oliver Smedley. Such was the 'rudderless nature of the party', writes Egan, 'that a separate ginger group had to be established in order for the mainstream Liberal view to be presented to the [Liberal] Assembly'.<sup>37</sup> Egan rightly points out that, once Grimond became leader of the party, the need for the RRG declined. Both in terms of strategy, i.e. realignment of the left, and in robust policy development based on the social liberal tradition and economic interventionism, the party revived and found its political place under Grimond. As Egan notes, many of the Radical Reformers like Banks, Moore and, of course, Jeremy Thorpe went on to hold important positions in the party and to influence policy formulation. However Egan states that Grimond was not connected with the RRG (albeit he kept in touch with members of the group). In fact Grimond was President of the RRG in the late 1950s. However, in a letter to Peter Grafton dated 2 March 1960, he declined the invitation to continue in the role on the grounds that 'it may give an odd impression if I am an Officer of a group within the party'.<sup>38</sup> He went on to say that 'much as I value the work being done by the group, I think this may be all the more necessary if you propose to have any really serious discussions about the sort of area of agreement of the Left'.

One of the proposals at the 1960 AGM was for there to be 'one main effective party of the left'.<sup>39</sup> Grimond seemed to think that any work done on policy strands that could lay the foundations of the realignment of the left could be inhibited if he, as leader of the party, carried on as chief officer of the RRG.

It remains moot as to how far the RRG influenced Grimond or whether he simply shared common views with the group, but his connection with the RRG and its key personnel was close from almost the start of his leadership and continued through the period when his association with the strategy of realignment of the left was at its height. The RRG also had close ties with Grimond's successor as party leader, Jeremy Thorpe. In the exchange of letters in which Thorpe accepted the invitation to continue as a vice-president of the RRG for the year 1965–66, his association with the group was described as so long as to be virtually historical.<sup>40</sup> After Thorpe had won the leadership contest in 1967, he wrote to Peter Grafton saying that his victory was 'an RRG victory' and warned that he needed and expected the group's continued support.<sup>41</sup>

How far do these published sources assist in coming to a conclusion about the strength and membership of the RRG and its influence on the strategy and policies of the Liberal Party in the 1950s and 1960s? As early as 1954, writing in the Liberal Party publication *Ahead*, Timothy Joyce was referring to press speculation that the forthcoming Liberal Party Assembly in Buxton would be a battleground between the Radical Reform Group and a free trade group over the issues of agricultural protection and industrial co-ownership. Perhaps reflecting the fact that he was writing in an official organ, Joyce tried to downplay this conflict saying that the average constituency association knew little about these 'splits and splutterings' and cared little for either group. He estimated both factions had only a few dozen followers each.<sup>42</sup> This seems to be borne out by the numbers attending the AGM of the RRG of 1955, at which it decided to come back into the Liberal Party, as the vote

**It remains moot as to how far the RRG influenced Grimond or whether he simply shared common views with the group, but his connection with the RRG and its key personnel was close from almost the start of his leadership and continued through the period when his association with the strategy of realignment of the left was at its height.**

in favour of that resolution was passed by sixteen votes to fifteen.<sup>43</sup> However, the attendance sheet for the AGM of 9 February 1957 lists fifty-three members present and the membership list of the RRG for the year 1965 contains 184 names.<sup>44</sup> It is uncertain how many could be described as active, and the list includes honorary and former honorary members and officers, such as Jo Grimond and the radio personality and cricket commentator John Arlott.<sup>45</sup> Clearly, though, even at a time when the activities of the RRG were no longer expanding, there was still a large pool of supporters of its aims and objectives. The evidence of the publications of the RRG, the references to it in the national and party media, its programme of events, the publication of its newsletter over many years and the references to its influence in the party in some of the published literature all point to the RRG as being a key social liberal pressure group inside the Liberal Party in the 1950s and 1960s, influencing strategy and policy and with connections to the very top of the organisation.

*Graham Lippiatt is a contributing editor of the Journal of Liberal History, Secretary of the Liberal Democrat History Group and author of the entry on the Radical Reform Group in Dictionary of Liberal Thought (Brack & Randall (eds.), Politico's Publishing, 2007).*

**The RRG was a key social liberal pressure group inside the Liberal Party in the 1950s and 1960s, influencing strategy and policy and with connections to the very top of the organisation.**

- 1 Peter Grafton, 'The Radical Reform Group', *Ahead*, October 1953; *The Times*, 24 June 1954, p. 3.
- 2 Desmond Banks, Lord Banks of Kenton (1918–1997).
- 3 Peter Grafton (b. 1916), chartered quantity surveyor; Liberal candidate for Bromley in 1950.
- 4 Oliver Smedley (1911–1989), chartered accountant; Liberal candidate at Saffron Walden in 1950 and 1951.
- 5 Arthur Seldon (1916–2005), economist; active Liberal at the LSE and in the Orpington party.
- 6 S. W. Alexander (1895–1980), journalist; Liberal candidate for Ilford North in 1950 and sometime Chairman of the London Liberal Party.
- 7 Interview with Richard Moore, 14 May 2006.
- 8 Andrew Gamble, 'Liberals and the Economy', in Vernon Bogdanor, *Liberal Party Politics* (Oxford:

- Clarendon Press, 1983), p.201.
- 9 Derick Mirfin, 'The Liberal Party's Radical Reform Group', *Time and Tide*, 12 April 1962.
- 10 Constitution of the Radical Reform Group, unpublished (probably 1952).
- 11 Pierre Poujade (1920–2003) French populist politician, supporter of Vichy France in 1940–42, who articulated the grievances and nationalism of shopkeepers and other small business people.
- 12 Alan Watkins, *The Liberal Dilemma* (London: MacGibbon & Kee, 1966), p. 80.
- 13 Aneurin 'Nye' Bevan (1897–1960), Welsh Labour politician and government minister who introduced the National Health Service. The Labour Party withdrew the whip from Bevan in 1955 over his leadership of a revolt against party policy on the atom bomb.
- 14 Hugh Gaitskell (1906–1963), leader of the Labour Party, 1955–1963.
- 15 *The Times*, 29 April 1955, p. 18.
- 16 Transcript report of the Annual General Meeting of the Radical Reform Group, held on 29 October 1955 at 3 p.m. in the Meston Room of the National Liberal Club – in possession of the author.
- 17 *News Chronicle*, 23 February 1956, leader.
- 18 These are the only publications credited to the RRG in the catalogue of the British Library.
- 19 Interview of 5 June 2007 with Professor Alan Deyermond (1932–2009), sometime editor of the RRG newsletter.
- 20 Copies of newsletters in possession of author from the papers of the late Professor Alan Deyermond.
- 21 Herbert Spencer (1820–1903), classical liberal political theorist who challenged socialism, Fabianism and the New Liberalism.
- 22 British political party post-war manifestos can be accessed on the internet pages of politics resources at <http://www.politicsresources.net/area/uk/man.htm>.
- 23 Anthony Crosland (1918–1977), Labour minister and leading social democratic thinker who influenced the generation that founded the SDP.
- 24 Roy Douglas, *The History of the Liberal Party 1895–1970* (London: Sidgwick & Jackson, 1971); updated in *Liberals: A History of the Liberal and Liberal Democrat Parties* (London: Hambledon Continuum, 2005).
- 25 Chris Cook, *A Short History of the Liberal Party 1900–1976* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1976).
- 26 David Dutton, *A History of the Liberal Party in the Twentieth Century* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), pp. 180 and 189.
- 27 Mark Egan, *Coming Into Focus: The Transformation of the Liberal Party, 1945–64* (Saarbrücken: VDM Verlag Dr Muller, 2009), p. 124.
- 28 Jorgen Scott Rasmussen, *The Liberal Party: A Study of Retrenchment and Revival* (London: Constable, 1965).
- 29 Graham Lippiatt, 'Desmond Banks', in Duncan Brack et al. (eds.), *Dictionary of Liberal Biography* (London: Politico's, 1998), pp. 26–27.
- 30 Graham Lippiatt, 'The Radical Reform Group', in Duncan Brack and Ed Randall (eds.), *Dictionary of Liberal Thought* (London: Politico's, 2007), pp. 329–31.
- 31 Alan Watkins, op. cit., pp. 69ff and p. 80.
- 32 Vernon Bogdanor (ed.), *Liberal Party Politics* (Oxford University Press, 1983), p. 45.
- 33 Garry Tregidga, *The Liberal Party in South-West Britain since 1918: Political Decline, Dormancy and Rebirth* (University of Exeter Press, 2000), pp. 146ff.
- 34 Dingle Foot (1905–1978), Liberal MP for Dundee 1931–45.
- 35 Tregidga, op. cit., pp. 148 and 154–55.
- 36 Mark Egan, *Coming Into Focus: The Transformation of the Liberal Party, 1945–64* (Saarbrücken: VDM Verlag Dr Muller, 2009).
- 37 Egan, op. cit., p. 126.
- 38 Copy of a letter from Jo Grimond to Peter Grafton of 2 March 1960, from papers left to the author by Lord Banks.
- 39 From letter from Peter Grafton to Jo Grimond of 23 February 1960.
- 40 Letters between Jeremy Thorpe and Peter Grafton, 6 and 10 December 1965, in possession of the author.
- 41 Letter from Jeremy Thorpe to Peter Grafton, 27 January 1967, in possession of the author.
- 42 *Ahead* magazine (Liberal Party, 58 Victoria Street, SW1), April 1954, p. 4.
- 43 Transcript report of the Annual General Meeting of the Radical Reform Group, held on 29 October 1955 at 3pm in the Meston Room of the National Liberal Club – in possession of the author.
- 44 Both documents included in papers left to the author by Lord Banks.
- 45 Leslie Thomas John Arlott OBE (1914–1991), Liberal candidate for Epping 1955 and 1959.