



Liberal Democrat History Group

Newsletter Six

March 1995

A Liberal Democrat History Group
Conference Fringe Meeting

Old Heroes for a New Party

Following the success of last spring Conference's fringe meeting of the same title, we are repeating the theme with three new speakers:

Alan Beith MP
Sir William Goodhart
Cllr Tony Greaves

Each will talk about a philosopher, writer or politician of the past who has something of relevance to contribute to the Party's principles and policies today. The aim is to connect the political beliefs and values which modern day Liberal Democrats hold with a historical tradition, or school of thought, or individual writings.

8.15pm Friday 10 March
Prince Regent Room,
Royal Hotel, Scarborough

I have come across men of letters who have written history without taking part in public affairs, and politicians who have concerned themselves with producing events without thinking about them. I have observed that the first are always inclined to find general causes whereas the second, living in the midst of disconnected daily facts, are prone to imagine that everything is attributable to particular incidents, and that the wires they pull are the same as those that move the world. It is to be presumed that both are equally deceived.

ALEXIS DE TOCQUEVILLE

The Liberal Democrat History Group aims to promote the discussion of historical topics, particularly those relating to the histories of the Liberal Party and the SDP.

We aim to fulfil this objective by organising discussion meetings, by spreading knowledge of historical reference sources, by assisting in the publication of studies of the Liberal Democrats and its predecessor parties, and by publishing this Newsletter. The Newsletter is free to all members, and includes up to date news of our activities.

Membership of the History Group costs £5.00 (£3.00 unwaged rate); cheques should be made payable to 'Liberal Democrat History Group' and sent to Patrick Mitchell, 6 Palfrey Place, London SW8 1PA.

Contributions to the Newsletter - letters, articles, and, especially, book reviews - are invited. If they are intended for publication, please type them and, if at all possible, send them on disc (any programme, but only 3.5" discs, please). The deadline for the next issue is 11 May 1995; contributions should be sent to Duncan Brack, Flat 9, 6 Hopton Road, Streatham, London SW16 2EQ.

The History Group is run by an informal committee, which meets once every three months. Any member of the Group is very welcome to attend a committee meeting and contribute thoughts and suggestions. The next two take place at 6.30pm on Thursday 11 May, and then at 6.30pm on Thursday 27 July, in the Meetings Room in Party HQ (4 Cowley Street, London SW1).

In this edition of the Newsletter:

Book Reviews:

Palmerston: The Early Years 1783-1841

The Most English Minister

Asquith

Mazzini

L.T.Hobhouse: Liberalism and Other Writings

Opinion:

What is Liberal Democracy?

The Importance of History

History Group news:

New column: Research in Progress

Mediawatch and Thesiswatch

“The Representative Man”

Book Reviews
by Tony Little

Kenneth Bourne:

Palmerston: The Early Years 1783-1841
(Allen Lane, 1982)

Donald Southgate: *The Most English Minister*
(Macmillan, 1966)

The great boon for nineteenth century historians is the availability of materials. The spread of literacy, the efficient post, and the growth of the civil service left a mass of paper. Despite the second world war, the ravages of time and the destruction of obviously embarrassing documents much has survived, even material never intended for publication. But this plentiful supply is also the historian's greatest curse. The availability of written evidence sometimes makes one forget that most politics, even then, involved meetings and conversations, the bulk of which were never recorded. In addition, the sheer bulk of correspondence, diaries, memos and memoirs referring to long lived statesmen require an army of researchers or a lifetime to master.

Palmerston is a prime example. He accepted his first ministerial post in 1807, before securing election to parliament, and died as prime minister 58 years later. Throughout that period he was out of office for less than 10 years and was only off the front bench for three years. Such a career inevitably left a mass of documentation dense enough to defeat the most assiduous historian and sufficient to support a range of controversies. Bourne's book covers the first, most neglected part of the career; Southgate's rather older tome the whole life but with most weight given to the period after 1846. So, until Bourne's work is complete, this pair offers the best detailed modern examination of the early Victorian era's dominant statesman. Although Bourne's is the first modern biography to claim full access to the Palmerston papers, for the period the two books share, it is surprising how much they overlap and how much their judgements coincide.

Palmerston was a slow starter. The first twenty years of his career, longer than most politicians ever achieve, was spent in middle ranking office, frequently passed over for promotion. But this time was not wasted. He was given the space in which to become at ease in the Commons, for he was not a natural orator. He gained experience and demonstrated skill at managing a frequently obtuse and obstructive bureaucracy. He had the time for an extensive and expensive social life.

The period from 1820 until 1859 was one of great fluidity in British politics. Although the Commons never entirely solidified into a two party system, after 1859 it functioned more clearly on party rather than factional lines. Palmerston reflected the ambiguity of the period and would have been happier with the description Liberal Conservative rather than

the honorary Whig he became after 1830 through his association with Lady Cowper, his mistress and Melbourne's sister. His Liberalism caused his resignation from the Tory government in 1827. His conservative inclinations made him resistant to constitutional reform from the time of the Great Reform Bill until his death.

“Liberalism all over the world”

Pam's great abiding interest was in foreign affairs. He was Foreign Secretary from 1830-1841 and again from 1846-1851. When he was Prime Minister after 1855 and again from 1859-1865 he still effectively controlled foreign policy. It was here that his Liberalism made itself most clearly felt. His first great parliamentary speech, against the Wellington government, was in favour of Greek nationalism and secured him his place in the Whig government of 1830. He welcomed the 1830 continental revolutions. He appeared the firm supporter of the 1848 nationalist uprisings. He helped achieve the unification of Italy in 1859 - a key factor in bringing the forces of the Liberal Party into a cohesive whole. Palmerston played the leading role in the creation of Belgium, down to the treaty which formed the *casus belli* of the Great War in 1914. Throughout his career, Pam was a leading crusader against slavery.

The key to understanding Palmerston is to recognise his sympathy for his time. He was popular with the electorate, he was one of the early manipulators of the press to secure that popularity and to use it in forwarding his policies, but this was subsidiary. He was a British nationalist who always sought to advance that interest at a time when the navy ruled the seas and Britain was the dominant world economic power. But even this was not the critical factor. Palmerston instinctively embodied the views of the country at the time in the way that Churchill did in the second world war.

Palmerston was not an imperialist in the subsequently accepted meaning of the term. He disdained the conquest of other nations: *“Let us try to improve all these countries by the general influence of our commerce, but let us all abstain from a crusade of conquest which would call down upon us the condemnation of all other civilised nations...”* was how Palmerston stated the position formally. His more informal instruction to Cowley sums it up even better - *“We do not want Egypt any more than any rational man with an estate in the north of England and a residence in the south would have wished to possess the inns on the north road. All he would want would have been that the inns should be well kept, always accessible and furnishing him, when he came with mutton chops and post horses.”*

Palmerston saw the crucial significance of the French Revolution and of the settlement of the Napoleonic wars in 1815. Throughout, his foreign policy aimed to preserve the balance of power in Europe. He sought to prevent the other great powers coalescing to achieve dominance, or, by allying Britain to potential aggressors, to moderate their demands. He also recognised that this balance of power could not be maintained by the reactionary techniques of a Russia or an Austria. Constitutional, but not democratic, governments were more effective in providing for the needs of their own peoples and less inclined to the glory of war than autocracies.

While glorifying Britain's adaptable constitution he never sought to impose it on others.

His reputation for aggrandisement rests not on the colonies added to Britain's realm but on his aggressive foreign policy techniques. Occasionally this went OTT, as when Pam used military force against the Greeks to achieve satisfaction for the dubious claims of Don Pacifico, but overwhelmingly his threats of force prevented rather than caused wars. He only threatened where it was thought he could deliver but where, as in Poland or Hungary, Britain was unable to intervene militarily Palmerston still thought it worth while to lecture Russia or Austria on the benefits of reform. The only major war of the period to involve Britain, the Crimean, occurred when his Foreign Office rival, Aberdeen, was at the helm, employing techniques closer to Neville Chamberlain's. To be effective Palmerstonian policy depended on subterfuge, a willingness to wield a scathing pen and an apparent willingness to resort to arms. With members of the royal family and his own government colleagues in regular, friendly correspondence with his autocratic continental opponents, it is not surprising that he built a reputation for arrogance and independence nor that he sometimes failed to inform the Queen of his intentions until it was too late for her (or Albert) to interfere.

"We cannot go on legislating for ever"

Palmerston only played a limited part in domestic policy. Even as a junior minister, his war office responsibilities had primarily a foreign orientation. Traditionally he is seen as an obstacle in the path of Liberal reform. He tried to moderate the 1832 Reform Bill. His opposition to Gladstonian financial reforms, when PM, remind one of Mrs T's relations with Nigel Lawson or Geoffrey Howe at the end of her career, and in his final term of office he effectively postponed consideration of a further reform act. He recognised that there would be strange doings "when Gladstone has my place" and perhaps this is one of his reasons for clinging to office until he died. Throughout his premierships his policies were sufficiently conservative for the Tories generally to support him in office.

Yet while Palmerston was conservative he was not a Tory. His policy objectives were to preserve aristocratic power by efficient administration while tolerating sufficient reform to head off unrest. He was never an autocratic reactionary trying to defend the indefensible or seeking to put the clock back. It is this outlook which unifies Palmerston's foreign and domestic policies.

Palmerston's resistance to change is also easy to overestimate. Even when in Tory governments he supported Catholic emancipation and his role in the 1832 reform was as an intermediary trying to secure an agreement with Tory moderates and prevent a deadlock with the Lords. In the 1840s he supported factory legislation and had close links with Shaftesbury. When Home Secretary in the Aberdeen coalition, he promoted the Truck Act of 1853 and supported public health reforms to prevent intra-mural burial in churches and to improve London's sewerage. As premier he kept Gladstone at the Treasury despite his acknowledged hostility, his fiscal reforms and his resistance to Pam's defence expenditure.

Both these books are long and detailed. They assume some knowledge of foreign affairs and occasionally make leaps in argument that would leave a beginner groping for a handhold on the reasoning. While Bourne seeks to give a detailed exposition of the early career, the minutiae sometimes smother the larger view. His access to the private papers allow a clearer understanding of the sometimes scandalous social life and the difficulties Palmerston faced in balancing his finances despite his extensive estates. Southgate has drawn on his wide experience of the era and presents his judgements in a comfortable and balanced style. By no means a hero worshipper he comes down broadly in favour of Palmerston's style. A reader with time for only one of these works should prefer Southgate.

After the second Russian revolution, the balance of power in Europe Palmerston sought so strenuously to preserve may again be the most important consideration in foreign policy. Let us hope that our age brings forth a more worthy successor to Pam than the Tories can provide.

A Liberal in Power

Book Review
by Malcolm Baines

Roy Jenkins: *Asquith*
(Collins, 1964, reprinted 1978, 1986)

Asquith and his biographer, Roy Jenkins, have often been compared, although more for their reputations as *bon viveurs* than for their comparative success as statesmen. What is conveyed very powerfully in this biography is Asquith's extraordinary administrative and political effectiveness as Prime Minister. Jenkins briefly considers whether Asquith was our greatest twentieth century peacetime PM and concludes that although Attlee, Baldwin and Macmillan all have claims on that title, none actually compares with him in terms of authority over his colleagues, the impression of permanence of command over the nation, or comfortableness in holding the post of PM. Whether in the light of Thatcher's 11 years at No.10 Jenkins would now revise that judgment must, however, await a future edition.

For Liberals, attention has always focused not only on the achievements of the 1906-1914 government, but also on Asquith's part in the subsequent decline of the Liberals to minority party status. Jenkins deals with Asquith's fall in great detail, effectively explaining it as Lloyd George's ability to build a coalition with Bonar Law, the Tory leader whom Asquith had always distrusted and underrated. However, Asquith's final years after his 1916 resignation as PM are only cursorily covered. The issue of the voting records of individual Liberal MPs following the Maurice debate in the Commons on Lloyd George's veracity regarding the number of UK troops in France being used to determine the denial of the coupon to Liberals supporting Asquith which led to the party's disastrous result in the 1918 election is covered, but there is little about

his role in the rivalry with Lloyd George in the early 1920s. Jenkins does, however, rightly conclude that the major blame for the bitterness which has reverberated among Liberals since rests with Asquith's lieutenants, McKenna, Runciman and Vivian Phillips, rather than with the former PM himself.

One of the most interesting points of the biography is that which deals with Asquith's social activities as Prime Minister. His relaxed cycle of country house visits, frequent letters to women correspondents and disinterest in the media contrasts vividly with the frenetic activity of late twentieth century ministers.

However, Asquith did not come from a wealthy background and although seen as "the last of the Romans" was very much a self made man. Born in Yorkshire, he was brought up in London from an early age. Following a classical education at Balliol with a competent, but not outstanding career as a barrister, he was elected for East Fife and then appointed Home Secretary in Gladstone's last government and Rosebery's brief administration. Jenkins focuses on his period as Prime Minister as the most effective testimony to Asquith's greatness. Confronted by horrendous problems - the suffragettes' campaign of violence, industrial unrest, Ulster and the House of Lords (all identified by Dangerfield in *The Strange Death of Liberal England*) - it is Asquith's effective and fundamentally Liberal use of power which makes him of interest to contemporary Liberal Democrats. Although traditionally Asquith has been linked with the Liberal right due to his support for the Boer War, Jenkins correctly places him in the Liberal mainstream. He contrasts Asquith's pre-eminence over both the last 100% Liberal Cabinet and the 1915-16 period (when, despite an ostensible coalition, the Tory ministers were confined to junior posts), with Lloyd George's key dependence on the loyalty of the Conservative Party during the 1916-22 period.

To conclude, *Asquith*, despite its age, is a masterful and well written biography of one of the greatest Liberal figures of the century. Most significantly, Jenkins displays a Liberal politician who was essentially a man of government, who was always faithful to liberal and humane ideals and to fastidious standards of political behaviour. As such it both entertains and sheds instructive light on what it is like to be a Liberal in power.

What is Liberal Democracy? The Importance of History

by James Lund

In what way does the Liberal inheritance of the Liberal Democrats prevent the party from developing its inescapably political identity in a way that will win wider, more sustained electoral support? The answer is, I think, that that inheritance is not a democratic one, and yet it remains a powerful influence on the presuppositions and style of the party in actuality, contradicting what impression its current, professed policies make.

The inheritance is a powerful one. The Liberal party came into existence and first forged its identity in the second half of the nineteenth century when the greatness of Great Britain had only just begun to come into question, and then only in the economic sphere. The former smoking room and dining room of the splendidly refurbished National Liberal Club, founded in 1884, with their full length portraits of, *inter alia*, Gladstone in early middle age and Lloyd George recall the days when the Liberal party itself was a great political power, a coalition of the landed Whig aristocracy and members of the middle classes, drawn from the worlds of finance, commerce, industry and professions. The terms of that coalition were the continuance of oligarchical government in the name of the crown in return for free trade, reform of major institutions to render them more efficient and open to meritocratic competition, an enlargement of the franchise, and, latterly, important but very limited measures of social reform.

This was not a democratic party. Although in 1885 Joseph Chamberlain might say that "*government of the people by the people ... has at last been effectively secured by the two measures which together constitute the great achievement of Mr Gladstone's administration*", this opinion is very questionable. It took the Reform Bills of 1918 and 1925 to establish adult suffrage for both men and women. Before the Act of 1918, with its variety of franchises for adult men and married women over 30, between 40 and 45 per cent of the Edwardian adult male population was excluded from the electorate. The exclusion levels were particularly high in the industrial towns and great cities, so that the 1918 Act almost doubled the adult male enfranchisement in the latter areas. By that time the party was split and in decline, never having faced a democratic electorate as a major party with power. There has also been some question as to how far the New Liberalism, which gave rise to social reform from 1906 to 1914, was ever fully accepted in principle by the party as a whole.

All this was a long time ago, it may very rightly be said, and Liberal Democrat policy today appears to give the lie to the claim that the party holds back from democracy in its actual approach to politics as distinct from its formal professions of what it will do if elected.

Yet my doubts on this score are fuelled by a pamphlet which has appeared recently, namely Geoffrey Thomas' *Liberal Democracy: the Radical Tradition*, which claims to set out the philosophy of the party, and in doing so draws principally on Kant, who died in 1804, and John Stuart Mill, who died in 1873. More recent figures, notably T. H. Green, who died in 1882, also figure, as do John Rawls and Dorothy Emmett among living philosophers; but the tradition presented by Thomas, who remarks in passing that we should not regard it "*as something self-contained, an independent kingdom of the past*" draws heavily on late eighteenth century and mid-nineteenth century philosophy.

Such a presentation suggests to me that there is an important element in the party that is too much grounded still in the tradition of the days of the old Liberal party in its greatness. Certainly in the radical tradition as Geoffrey Thomas presents it, there is a major philosophical inadequacy of great political importance. What is fundamental in any political philosophy that professes to be a philosophy of democratically conducted

politics, and not a philosophy of monarchical, clerical or oligarchical government, is the question of what is proposed in respect of what we are to think of ourselves as human beings, who can share a mode of being which manifestly comprehends the inhuman as well as the human, both in the actual relations we have with one another and in what we think reflectively about ourselves.

Mr Thomas' account of the radical tradition of liberal democracy is grounded in what he has to say first and foremost concerning the principle of respect for persons. He identifies persons primarily with acts of choice which give actual expressions for "wants and preferences, wishes, tastes, beliefs and so forth", which define our personal interests. Respect for persons requires, Thomas maintains, acceptance, valuation and expectation of such choices in others and a disposition not to interfere with them and indeed to assist in their fulfilment.

What this quite fails to make clear is the way in which Kant conceived human beings philosophically. He did so in terms of a twofold mode of being, a pure mind related to a purely material body: that is, in terms of two systematic abstractions from the actuality of our experience of one another as living organisms, capable through our transactions with one another of developing, or *failing to develop*, active, expressive and reflective powers. Democratic purpose in political life requires that we and the governments we elect think in such human terms and not in terms of the systematic abstraction of the mainstream philosophical tradition in the modern age, represented by Kant, who would allow nothing ethical to human affections. 'Citizens' one moment, the 'workforce' the next.

(to be concluded)

Radicalism and the Risorgimento

Book Review
by Terry Cowley

Denis Mack Smith: *Mazzini*
(Yale University Press, 1994)

After Garibaldi, Mazzini is one of my favourite radicals of the 19th century in Europe; and this book confirms his importance as a revolutionary and political figure. Denis Mack Smith's thorough, clear, well researched biography provides us with a scholarly work that will retain an importance for many years to come. This work is essential not only for the historian, but for the general political engagé.

Some of the intriguing facts about our hero include his love of black cigars; that he lived in Fulham; read the works of Goethe, Byron, Shelley, and practically everybody else most avidly. He also just loved books.

This biography examines in some depth his relationships with Garibaldi and Cavour. In the history of Italy where corruptions and cynicism have been bywords in politics, it is

refreshing always to discover and rediscover a man like Mazzini, with such integrity, honesty, and a mind that was able to think far beyond expediency. He also had a great capacity for friendship, and counted among his English friends such personages as the Carlyles, John Morley, Dickens, Swinburne and Gladstone. In this study Cavour's general pseudo-Machiavellism becomes shabby as does his spite and envy. Also the spite and nastiness of so-called Moderates and Liberals who after reunification branded Mazzini as a terrorist, and banned him from living in Italy till only a few months before his death.

The irony was that Mazzini was - in the true sense - a moderate, a Liberal reformer, a social conciliator and a progressive thinker - with honesty, unlike many of his political contemporaries who were moderate in name, but conservative in deed, untrusting, and afraid of the Italian people. Garibaldi's shabby treatment of Mazzini is appalling and almost paranoiac in its obsessiveness, and certainly dents the halo of the secular saint of the Risorgimento. An excellent book - buy it, read it, digest it and see how many of its truths and observations apply to the political rag-bag known as the Liberal Democrats.

This book review first appeared in the magazine Liberator and is reprinted with their kind permission.

Reformulating Liberalism

Book Review
by Stewart Rayment

L.T.Hobhouse (edited by James Meadowcroft):
Liberalism and Other Writings
(Cambridge, 1994)

Collini, following De Ruggiero (reprint please) calls Hobhouse's Liberalism "timeless", "a classic", "the best twentieth century statement of Liberal ideas" and "one of the constitutive works of the canon". Quite so. Thus we are indebted to Cambridge University Press for making this work available again. Yet De Ruggiero was writing in 1927 of a book penned in 1911, and Collini in 1979. Does Hobhouse's Liberalism really hold for the end of the Twentieth Century, still more the Twenty First?

It is not sufficient for a magazine like *Liberator* which would see itself in the intellectual tradition of Hobhouse to answer "Yes". Most of Hobhouse's other writing, with the possible exception of *The Metaphysical Theory of the State* (a handy one for laying into those Marxists), is largely forgotten. However the claims made for Liberalism at the start of this review stand. First, following John Stuart Mill, Hobhouse wrote in an everyday language; his thoughts are accessible to all.

Second, and this is a factor in his books generally, Hobhouse wrote from a philosophical standpoint. His journalism, much of the writing of his colleagues, J.A.Hobson, the Hammonds, down to Keynes, Beveridge, Grimond and Michael

Meadowcroft, is all good Liberal stuff but is the product of its time. It is inevitable that a political thinker, especially one who sees their mission as the betterment of humanity and working in an empirical discipline such as liberalism will refer to real events and people. Against what must have been a temptation to rage about The People's Budget and the Parliament Act, Hobhouse in the main refers to broad events. Where these prevail, particularly in the last chapter, or to expand on the contribution of a seminal figure such as Gladstone, for example, Meadowcroft has provided footnotes. Thus, the late Twentieth Century reader is not lost in a minutiae of incidents that have lost their deeper significance.

There are anachronisms in Hobhouse's style and thinking. Although opposed to Social Darwinism, the extent to which it pervaded the thinking of the earlier part of this century shows. He follows Cobden in opposition to Empire and would have been delighted by much of the turn of events in that sphere. That few post-colonial states are pillars of Liberalism would hardly have surprised him, proof of the folly of the imperial adventure. However, out of the context of its time, it would be easy to mistake Hobhouse's writing on this subject as patronising. With his time and recalling his contribution to the Women's Movement it should be remembered that he speaks of species 'man' rather than gender.

So the work is still readable, but why should it be read? There aren't many such studies of liberalism since, less so still available. Bobbio writes from an academic Marxist position (Euro communist?), Manning and others of that ilk are academic and not directed at the common man. Hobhouse weans us with a historical base that, in terms of British

experience is at once recognisable and overlaps with the national myth. From there he takes us into the more purely philosophical antecedents of liberalism, as tested in action, and from this draws us to liberalism as a resolution of the conflict between the individual and society. Hobhouse thus establishes a basis for the collective resolution of problems through government. To 'the theory of natural rights of the individual' is added 'a theory of the mutual harmony of individual and social needs'.

Much of Hobhouse's agenda for the collective resolution of problems has come to pass. Misformed in socialist hands and savaged by the neo-liberalism of Margaret Thatcher, Hobhouse's argument retains its validity. There was an element of elitism in Hobhouse's liberalism; he was attracted to the idea of Liberal minds and Labour muscle as a way forward for society. Echoes of this debate are still with us. Hobhouse lived long enough to be disappointed by the first fruits, and would have been profoundly disappointed with what Labour actually achieved, I suspect. What Hobhouse really sought, I suspect, was the union of the best minds in altruistic thought with the needful masses. He saw clearly the short-comings of Marxism (before the Marxist state became a reality) and also what he termed 'official socialism'. It is the shallow 'official socialism' that prevails in the Labour Party, dogs even their best reforms. Labour more than any other is responsible for the polarisation of British politics into rigid party lines, and, I'm sorry Mr. Ashdown, will do it again, it is an aspect of their (as most other) socialism.

What would Hobhouse see as the future of Liberalism today? I think he would still seek the realisation of liberty through harmony. If much of the material advance he advocated has been achieved, its spiritual basis is as much lacking. Hobhouse remains as strong a starting point as any for the attempt to put those matters right.

This book review first appeared in the magazine Liberator and is reprinted with their kind permission.

Research in Progress

This is a new column designed to assist the progress of research projects currently being undertaken, at graduate, postgraduate or similar level. If you think you can help any of the individuals listed below with their thesis - or if you know anyone who can - please get in touch with them to pass on details of sources, contacts, or any other helpful information.

The Young Liberals 1970-79: their philosophy and political strategy. MA thesis. Ruth Fox, 9 Chapel Terrace, Headingley, Leeds LS6 3JA.

The grass roots organisation of the Liberal Party 1945-64; the role of local activists in the late 1950s revival of the Liberal Party. Ph.D thesis. Mark Egan, University College, Oxford OX1 4BH.

The Liberal Party in Southampton 1890-1945 (particularly 1890-1918). Sources needed for Ph.D thesis on the development of labour politics in Southampton. Graham Heaney, 132 Hayling Avenue, Copnor, Portsmouth, PO3 6ED.

If you know of any other research project in progress for inclusion in this column, please send details to Duncan Brack at the address on the front page.

Membership Services

The History Group is pleased to make the following listings available to its members.

Mediawatch: a bibliography of major articles on the Liberal Democrats appearing in the broadsheet papers and major magazines and academic journals (all those listed in the British Humanities Index, published by Bowker-Saur). Starting in 1988, this now extends to September 1994.

Thesiswatch: all higher degree theses listed in the Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research under the titles 'Liberal Party' or 'liberalism' (none yet under SDP or Liberal Democrats!)

Any History Group member is entitled to receive a copy of either of these free of charge; send an A4 SSAE to Duncan Brack at the address on the front page.