The winter 2012 issue of this Journal depicts on its front page the standard, rather intense photographic treatment of David Lloyd George. Like most photographs, it gives no indication of the Lloyd George seen in other images, such as cartoons, paintings, mugs and ceramics. Biographies and general histories contain a number of differing versions of what Lloyd George did, his motivation, the impact of his actions and the personality through which he delivered those actions. There are largely favourable biographies by Thomson and Owen, stridently critical versions by Lloyd George’s son Richard and by McCormick, and more balanced views by Rowland and Hattersley. Alan Mumford reviews images of Lloyd George.
SUCH “OUTSIDER” VIEWS are complemented and occasionally contradicted by Lloyd George’s own direct contribution, both from reports of his speeches and through his articles and books. The books were, of course, substantially concerned with presenting his own image of his role during the First World War and in creating the peace treaties, and they conflict in places with the memoirs and biographies of other people, particularly generals, that cover the war.1 Frances Stevenson (his secretary and mistress) recorded in 1934 that ‘some of his friends think that he would do better sometimes to admit that he has occasionally made mistakes, and been in the wrong but he seems incapable of doing this’.2 He did not keep a diary during this parliamentary career; and his letters to Dame Margaret and Frances, unsurprisingly, sustain his self-image.3 A lot of Stevenson’s material probably reflects what Lloyd George wanted recorded as his views; his other main secretary, A. J. Sylvester, reveals less attractive aspects of his boss.4

However, the image that has been most frequently seized upon in books is that of J. M. Keynes: How can I convey to the reader, who does not know him, any just impression of this extraordinary figure of our time, this syren [sic], this goat-footed bard, this half-human visitor to our age from the hag-ridden magic and enchanted woods of Celtic antiquity. One catches in his company that flavour of final purposelessness, inner irresponsibility, existence outside or away from our Saxon good and evil mixed with cunning remorselessness, love of power.6

This caricature in words was written at the height of Keynes’ anger with Lloyd George, during the 1919 peace-treaty negotiations. When he eventually published it, in 1933, he confessed that it was an unfair portrait, having worked in harmony with Lloyd George on unemployment in the 1920s. Lloyd George, however, retaliated in his War Memoirs: ‘He is an entertaining economist whose bright but shallow dissertations on finance and political economy when not taken seriously always provide a source of innocent merriment to his readers.’7 Yet another image of Lloyd George is presented through drawn caricature or cartoons (the word used throughout the rest of this article). The most frequently used illustration is that by David Low, and he is a totally different figure in this image from the one seen in most photographs: a twinkling figure engaging the viewer in a sense of fun, enjoyment, participation. However, just as with the written word, the various cartoonists depicted a wide variety of images of Lloyd George, as will be shown in this article.

The context for cartoons – electorate and press
The significance of cartoons is best understood within the context of the people who viewed them. For Lloyd George, the main changes in the political environment was the increase in the electorate – from 6.7 million in 1900, to 7.7 million (all male) in 1910, to 21.3 million including many women in 1918, then to 28.8 million in 1930.8 Two parallel changes were the continuing increase in adult literacy and corresponding proliferation of newspapers (there was no radio until the 1920s and, of course, no TV). Lloyd George’s response to these changes found expression in his relationship with the press – which he said ‘must be squared or must be squashed’.9 Thus he can be viewed as the first modern prime minister in the way he developed that relationship, for example, holding in 1922 the first press conference ever given by a prime minister.10 (Unlike Churchill, radio was not a major contributor to his image).

Lloyd George’s predecessors had shuddered with distaste at the thought of trying to influence newspapers; he, on the contrary, was obsessed with the cultivation of his image. Beaverbrook wrote, ‘Mr Lloyd George likes praise but not from a delight of flattery. He likes a good Press as a shopkeeper likes a good customer.’11 Salisbury’s comment about the Daily Mail – ‘a paper written by office boys for office boys’12 perhaps recognised the revolution in newspaper style and circulation which formed so significant a feature of Lloyd George’s relations with the press, and through which cartoon images of Lloyd George became more relevant.

LG (Low, New Statesman, 16 March 1926) From 1919 to 1922 Low had drawn critical cartoons of Lloyd George, but this cartoon (part of a series on important people) brings out his attractive side. It also indicates LG’s large head and short legs.

How can I convey to the reader, who does not know him, any just impression of this extraordinary figure of our time, this syren [sic], this goat-footed bard, this half-human visitor to our age from the hag-ridden magic and enchanted woods of Celtic antiquity. One catches in his company that flavour of final purposelessness, inner irresponsibility, existence outside or away from our Saxon good and evil mixed with cunning remorselessness, love of power.
The coincidence of vastly increased adult literacy and the innovative ideas of Alfred Harmsworth (later Lord Northcliffe) created a larger readership. At the start of Lloyd George’s parliamentary career in 1890, *The Times* sold 40,000 copies, and the top-selling London morning papers sold perhaps 300,000. Of the Sunday papers, *Reynolds* sold 320,000 — but the *News of the World* only 30,000. Only ten years later, in 1900, the Daily Express was selling more than 700,000 copies. By the time the First World War broke out in 1914, the Daily Express (not yet under Beaverbrook’s control) was selling 400,000; the Mail, 800,000; the *News of the World*, 2,000,000; and *The Times* went up to 165,000 as the result of a massive price reduction. By the end of Lloyd George’s premiership, the *Daily Mail*, the *Daily Express*, the *Daily Herald*, and the *Manchester Guardian* — with a circulation of 40,000 for best sellers — were selling nearly up to the 1,000,000 of the *Daily Mail*, compared with the *Liberal Daily News* at 300,000. The *Daily Herald*, supporting Labour, increased from 40,000 before 1914 to 200,000 in 1921. Conservative-supporting newspapers outsold the Liberal papers (Daily News, *Daily Chronicle*, *Westminster Gazette* and *Manchester Guardian*) by two to one over the period 1900 to 1922.

There was also a large readership for a substantial number of provincial papers — the Manchester Guardian, for example, was influential outside Manchester. In 1910, national and provincial papers both sold 3.5 million copies daily. The readership — and so the number of people who saw cartoons of Lloyd George — was three or four times this.

We can compare this readership with the number who saw political prints in the early nineteenth century, which was perhaps 40,000 for best sellers.

Unlike Asquith, as in so many other respects, Lloyd George frequently met editors and particularly those of Liberal papers. The most important relationship was with C. P. Scott of the Manchester Guardian — who supported, encouraged, but then finally became critical of Lloyd George — from 1900 to the mid-1920s. The relationship with Scott is particularly interesting because it was most frequently Lloyd George who called C. P. Scott to come and see him, often over working breakfast meetings. The relationship was symbiotic — Scott hoping to influence Lloyd George while Lloyd George tried to influence the content of Scott’s editorials, saying: ‘Come and see me sometimes and correct my faults or help my better self.’

In contrast, he was involved in the removal of Donald, editor of the *Liberal Daily Chronicle*, when he diverged from LG’s policies. There is little evidence of contact with the editor of the Daily Mail at one extreme or the *Times* at the other.

He frequently (at least 700 meetings) saw Riddell, who was the main director of Reynolds’ News and the *News of the World*. Riddell bought a house for him at Walton Heath in 1912, frequently played golf with him and recorded their conversations in two published diaries. This seems, however, to have been a relationship as close to that of friendship as Lloyd George was ever prepared to engage in, as much as an attempt to influence what went into those two papers.

In contrast, his dealings with Northcliffe, owner of the Daily Mail and later of The Times, were strictly political and full of mutual distrust. In 1916, Northcliffe, through his newspapers, said that Asquith had to go, though without necessarily supporting Lloyd George as a replacement. Northcliffe subsequently crowed to his brother, ‘who killed cock Robin’ and believed he had had a major input. LG brought him into government to try and keep him quiet — unsuccessfully: from 1918 he was consistently an enemy of Lloyd George. On 16 April 1919 Lloyd George made a venomous attack on an unnamed newspaper proprietor (Northcliffe). He delivered a sarcastic description of what he claimed to be this man’s ‘diseased vanity’ (tapping his head). In the same speech he spoke of The Times as being seen by people in France as the three-penny edition of the Daily Mail.

Newspapers, including The Times and the Daily Mail, provided extensive coverage of the speech — but few cartoons. LG wrote his own speech; unlike Baldwin’s famous attack on press proprietors in 1931, in which the crucial phrase was written by Kipling.

The other major involvement with a press owner was with Max

**Stop Thief**

(J. J. Proctor, *The People*, 9 May 1909)

*Caption: Taffy was a Welshman; Taffy was a thief; Chief of hen-roost robbers; May his run be brief.*

In 1908 Lloyd George said ‘I have no nest eggs. I am looking for someone else’s hen roost to rob next year’. The famous People’s Budget of 1909 proposed new taxes. The caption makes use of a then familiar gibe about Welshmen. The dog is presumably a reference to A. J. Balfour’s description of the House of Lords as the watchdog of the constitution.

*Images of Lloyd George*
Aitken, who became Lord Beaverbrook at the time of the creation of the new government in December 1916. Beaverbrook wrote some brilliantly readable but not fully accurate accounts of his involvement in this change of government and the later fall of Lloyd George, and his (exaggerated) contributions to these events. (The ‘honours scandal’ of 1922, which contributed to Lloyd George’s downfall, was initiated by the Duke of Northumberland, who protested about the number of honours for people in the press.)

In 1901 Lloyd George brought about changed ownership of the Daily News, which thereafter supported moderate pro-Boers instead of Liberal Imperialists. Much greater was his financial involvement in the purchase of the Daily Chronicle in 1918; not only did he direct its political views, but it added to the Lloyd George political fund when he sold shares in it in 1926. Perhaps the most extraordinary involvement, had it come off, would have been with The Times upon the death of Northcliffe in 1922. Lloyd George sought to get the financial backing to take over the paper and even discussed with Frances Stevenson the idea that he should become editor and give up his major political involvement. This was on top of having set up his own coalition Liberal magazine, published between October 1920 and November 1923 with a print run of 30,000.

These attempts to create newspaper support must be seen in the context of a press environment in which the majority of newspapers were Conservative-supporting and presented him as at best devious and at worst a liar (see, for example, the Marconi debates in 1913 and General Maurice in 1918). In such a newspaper context, more often unfavourable than complimentary, what was the contribution of cartoonists and how did they make it?

**The significance of political cartoons**

Political cartoons describe and evaluate, often with pungency. In the days before TV they created a visual image more powerful than photographs. Low’s cartoon of Lloyd George is more likely to stay in the mind than the verbal caricature by Keynes. The award of a knighthood to John Tenniel in 1893 signified recognition of the fact that political cartoons had a more than trivial influence on public opinion. In the first significant instance of political cartoons having a more than trivial place in public interest. Beerohm, Partridge and Low were later similarly honoured; the award to Francis Carruthers Gould (FCG), however, was explicitly for his support for the Liberal Party. All of these cartoonists were significant enough to appear in the Dictionary of National Biography, as do Poy and E. T. Reed (but not, strangely, Strube).

The political impact of newspapers is now thought by experts in this field to be most often to confirm views that the readers have already developed. And this goes, too, for cartoonists, since they generally produce cartoons that fit the political views of their paper. When Illingworth took over from Staniforth on the Western Mail, his political views differed from those of the paper. But ‘Nobody suggested ideas when I started on the Western Mail. I knew very well what the politics of the paper were, and I knew which side my bread was buttered. The cartoonist must have a pragmatic approach.’

**Style of cartoonists**

Throughout the period of Lloyd George’s career, cartoons were more often intended to produce a smile or even a laugh than many of today’s cartoons. However, there were significant developments in the style of cartoons: a decline in references to the classics; more use of up-to-date symbols and metaphors. From the first significant cartoon of Lloyd George in 1894 in the Western Mail, and through to 1912, the general content was consistently moderate by today’s standards – JMS, FCG and the Punch cartoonists in that sense remaining in the tradition of most of their predecessors. Criticisms of individuals and policies there were, but often more through the title and text accompanying the cartoon than by any portrayal of the participants in physically exaggerated form.

FCG deployed what Low later called ‘tabs of identity’ portraying Chamberlain with his ever-present orchid and monocle, with a mild emphasis on his sharp nose. However there was no tab, no great exaggeration in his version of Lloyd George. FCG appears in cartoon histories frequently, although he worked for a small-circulation (though politically influential) newspaper, because he was the first, and because he republished his cartoons in a series of books. He made two comments which are of particular significance in relation to Lloyd George. He said that he aimed to use ‘vinegar not vitriol’. And in relating his cartoons to his...
political beliefs (he was awarded a knighthood at the suggestion of the Liberal Prime Minister Rosebery) he commented, ‘I have never, since I devoted my pencil and my pen to the service of the party, seen any part of my duty to attack my own side. When my Conservative friends have asked me “why don’t you sometimes caricature your own people”, I have replied “that’s your work not mine”’.20

Will Dyson, whose cartoons began to appear as the full front page of the Daily Herald in 1912, broke with this tradition. He criticised policies and individuals both through dramatic aggressive attacks on policies and sweeping physical exaggeration. He was a socialist drawing for a paper sympathetic to socialism and concerned to develop support for the working classes, regularly drawing a bloated capitalist figure. Lloyd George was one of the individual politicians he attacked, both pre-war, for example in relation to the National Insurance Act, and post-war during the 1918 general election. His cartoons are of great significance to cartoon historians but they only appeared in a paper with a small circulation (40,000) in Dyson and Lloyd George’s heyday, although Lloyd George reappeared when Dyson rejoined the Daily Herald with a much larger circulation (over a million) in 1931. However no other cartoonist followed his style.

Another major change came with the arrival of Low in The Star in 1919, with a much more emphatic line in drawing. Low in his autobiography said:

I always had the greatest difficulty in making Ll.G sinister in a cartoon. Every time I drew him, however critical the comment, I had to be careful or he would spring off the drawing board as a loveable cherubic little chap. I found the only effective way of putting him definitely in the wrong in a cartoon was

The Responsible Party (JMS, Western Mail, 14 November 1904)

Caption: Robber (Mr Lloyd-George): If yer don’t ‘and over the blooming swag at once an’ without no trouble, I shall ‘old yer responsible for all the devastation an’ damage as’ll take place.

Lloyd George’s political career had started with a victory over the established church in Wales. In 1904 he was battling to reduce the control that the church had on schools.

A Counter Attack (FCG, Westminster Gazette, 3 July 1913)

Caption: The Tory Party: Deary me! What a dreadful, savage, dangerous creature! And we were only beating him with a broomstick! (The Tory criticism of Mr Lloyd-George’s speech at the National Liberal Club on Tuesday is on the lines of ‘Cet animal est méchant; quand on l’attaque, il se défend’.

Lloyd George had a continuing belief that the taxation of land would provide him with the additional revenue he needed. His attack on landowners stimulated Conservative attacks on him.
by misplacing his quality in sardonic incongruity – by surrounding the comedian with tragedy.21

I have difficulty identifying this in Low’s cartoons of him. Certainly much more damaging to Lloyd George was Low’s wonderful invention – in 1920 when he worked for The Star – of the coalition as a two-headed ass.22 Interestingly Low depicts this figure in a relatively abstract form, without applying the faces of Lloyd George and either Bonar Law or Austen Chamberlain. Lloyd George was still a significant figure when Low moved to the London Evening Standard in 1927, by which time Lloyd George’s change to more radical policies chimed with what seemed to be Low’s own political beliefs. Like Dyson, Low was sometimes accused of being a socialist but, unlike Dyson, was in reality only mildly radical and mildly left wing, though strongly anti-establishment.

Low’s companion in the Beaverbrook stable, Strube, differed in drawing for the larger-circulation Daily Express and Sunday Express, and in his political views – mildly conservative.23 His cartoons were certainly very different from those of Low. Baldwin described Strube as a gentle genius: ‘I don’t mind his attacks because he never hits below the belt. Now Low is a genius but he is evil and malicious. I cannot bear Low.’24 Low in fact criticised Strube for being too kind to politicians; certainly Strube’s cartoons of Lloyd George created mild amusement rather than shock. However he also created ‘tabs of identity’ for Lloyd George. In a speech in 1913 Lloyd George had claimed inaccurately to pheasants eating mangel wurzels.25

Lloyd George, Rufus Isaacs and the Master of Eliebank were accused of profiting from inappropriate purchase of shares in the American Marconi company. A select committee of the House of Commons produced three reports: the Liberal majority exonerated (whitewashed) the three; a minority led by the Conservative Robert Cecil condemned them; and the third was selectively critical.

The Modern Artful Dodger (Matt, Daily Dispatch, October 1913)

Caption: In bringing this famous Dickens picture up to date our artist has adhered rather too closely to precedent by showing the modern Dodger with his hands in his own pockets.

Lloyd George’s speech in Limehouse, London, on 30 July 1910 in defence of his budget was regarded by his opponents, both Conservative and Liberal, as an unacceptably violent attack on the aristocracy. This was still a reference point in October 1913 when Lloyd George referred inaccurately to pheasants eating mangel wurzels.
decades continued to draw Lloyd George with pheasants and mangel wurzels also present, as Lloyd George’s son was delighted to point out in his nasty biography of his father. Earlier he showed Marconi wearing a cloak and long hair as ‘identifiers’. Strube used Lloyd George’s cloak and long hair as ‘identifiers’. In later years Strube’s mild humour rather than cartoons and were an example of Lloyd George’s son was delighted to point out in his nasty biography of his father. Earlier he showed Marconi shares peeping out of a pocket or under an inverted tumbler … Even if he were tucked away in an odd corner he was still the sparkle of the cartoon.34

The pheasants lasted longest in the cartoons and were an example of Strube’s mild humour rather than savage criticism. In later years Strube used Lloyd George’s cloak and long hair as ‘identifiers’. In terms of the number of readers who saw his cartoons in the Evening News and Daily Mail, Poy was Strube’s main rival. Northcliffe described him as the ‘first gentleman of Fleet Street’, which perhaps sums up the nature of his cartoons.

The publication of cartoons
The decision by papers on whether to use political cartoons changed during Lloyd George’s lifetime (and has changed twice since). Political cartoons gradually started to appear regularly in newspapers after first the Pall Mall Gazette (circulation around 10,000) from 1888, and then the Westminster Gazette (circulation 20,000 in early twentieth century), decided to publish FCG. Both were London evening papers. Only in the first decade of the twentieth century did a majority of the popular papers start to regularly include them – with the exception of the Daily Mail, which held off until 1918. The most important decision was by the London Evening News, which brought Poy from the Manchester Evening News: his cartoons were often reproduced the next day in the Daily Mail.

Newspapers had been much later in using cartoons than magazines, and it was the establishment of Punch in 1841, in particular, which gave impetus to the latter. Punch had a circulation of about 40,000 in 1870 and had reached 120,000 by 1910. Its rivals such as Judy and Fun had largely ceased to be important by the time Lloyd George achieved prominence. Another magazine, Vanity Fair (circulation 2,500), survived and published a cartoon of Lloyd George in its last year, 1913. Magazines such as London Opinion, John Bull, Passing Show, and Bystander regularly carried cartoons, as did the short-lived Lloyd George Liberal magazine – though the long-lived Liberal magazine rarely did. None of the ‘heavy’ political journals used cartoons, the one temporary exception being the New Statesman, which printed a supplement in 1926 of cartoons drawn for it by Low, including one of Lloyd George. (Circulation, however, was then around 10,000).

The national ‘heavy’ newspapers – The Times, the Daily Telegraph – published some cartoons during the First World War. The Observer did not use cartoons until the 1960s. The Sunday Times and provincial papers sometimes had cartoons by their own cartoonists but often repeated those from London papers.

The involvement of newspaper owners
There is very little information available about the decision to carry cartoons, and then which cartoonists to use and which line should be taken. Beaverbrook, as owner of the Daily Express, Sunday Express and London Evening Standard, was involved in all aspects of his papers while constantly denying it. His personal role in relation to cartoons was most evident in the case of David Low, who he pursued for several years to try and attract him from the London Evening Star to his own Evening Standard, finally achieving this in 1927. He already had Strube for his most popular paper, the Daily Express. The Evening Standard (circulation 334,000 in 1920) aimed at a slightly higher market than its evening rivals and was thought to be read by ‘important people’.

Low and Beaverbrook both claimed that he was never censored by Beaverbrook or anyone else at the Standard. In fact, at least forty of his cartoons were not used, usually after an editor or other executive had consulted with Beaverbrook;
however, none of these relate to Lloyd George.26 (Since Strube offered his editor a choice of five or six cartoons, the situation did not arise for him.) Beaverbrook had a continuing interest in cartoons about himself. Apparently he sought copies of all cartoons which included him in however minor a role,27 and he particularly liked Low’s version of him. Northcliffe is recorded as intervening once—in the form of an instruction to the night editor of the Daily Mail to publish fewer Tom Webster cartoons.28 The only other proprietor about whose interest we have knowledge is Rothermere, who had complained to Beaverbrook about the Low cartoons in which he appeared. Low was told (successfully) to tone down his cartoons.29

Cartoonists were often less responsive to speeches than would be the case nowadays. This was sometimes true for historically important Lloyd George speeches, for example there were no cartoons about his description of the House of Lords as Balfour’s poodle in 1908. There were only two cartoons about Agadir in 1911, and even his great Queen’s Hall speech about the need for war in 1914 resulted in only one cartoon.

Lloyd George had always been subject to criticism from cartoonists, for example, about his 1910 budget, the House of Lords, or the National Insurance Act (where he was depicted as the devil). They generally made use of the more radical elements of his speeches, although there were also complimentary cartoons about his success in resolving strikes. The attitude of cartoonists changed with the First World War, as he was recognised as the man who had been successful in the Ministry of Munitions. Most cartoonists welcomed his later appointments, first as Secretary for War, then as prime minister. With the exception of Dyson, most favoured him during the 1918 general election. Critical cartoons re-emerged over questions such as waste in government expenditure, some aspects of his struggles over payment of war costs by Germany from 1919 and, eventually, the honours scandal. Critical and favourable cartoons appeared following the peace treaty with Ireland in 1921.

It was easy to portray Lloyd George’s actions: it was less easy to show Lloyd George’s personality. Whether you took the extraordinary depiction of him by Keynes, or the less elegant denunciations of him as a devious and intriguing Machiavellian politician, concerned only with power, these were more difficult to convey within the conventions then used by cartoonists. Though nowadays cartoonists would have no problem in portraying Lloyd George with lies spewing out of him.

Cartoonists enjoyed portraying Lloyd George in a variety of roles, which is most easily observable in the Punch collection of cartoons on him.30 We see Lloyd George as an acrobat, snake charmer, Cockney, shepherd, and character from Dickens, amongst others. Other guises deliberately set out to present a view of Lloyd George’s personality and nature—as the Artful Dodger, as Long John Silver with his political fund, or as Napoleon the man of destiny.

Cartoons of Lloyd George often highlighted his Welshness, most usually through putting him in a supposedly Welsh dress, for example as Dame Wales, a figure created by JMS in 1893. Sometimes, however, he was drawn as a goat. The most straightforward explanation for this is that a goat was a well-recognised symbol of Welshness, and nearly all of these cartoons were drawn before Keynes’ description of him as ‘goat footed’ in 1933. It may also simply have occurred to cartoonists that he was nimble footed as he moved from one situation to another. In political circles the description of him by one of his civil servants, Sir George Murray, as ‘my Welsh goat … he feeds happily enough out of my hand at present’31 may have circulated in political circles, but may not have been known to cartoonists. A further interpretation is suggested by John Campbell’s use of a cartoon of Lloyd George as a goat in his book...
The Goat in the Wilderness, which raises the possibility that the cartoonist was deliberately referencing the passage from Leviticus about the scapegoat. Finally, there remains the question of Lloyd George’s sexual activities, which have led to an assertion that he was a goat in that sense. But were cartoonists aware of that aspect of Lloyd George’s life and did they mean that sort of double reference? This would not be an issue nowadays, since references to sexual activities by politicians are more frequently made, for example in relation to George Osborne and his supposed association with a dominatrix.

The physical characteristics of Lloyd George which cartoonists increasingly drew upon were his long white hair, which he grew from the 1920s, his cloak, and occasionally his pince nez. Physical exaggeration is not usually part of the picture. Northcliffe once remarked, ‘it’s his big head on a little body that I don’t like.’ However only two cartoonists seem to have seen the same thing: Low (see earlier), and Spy in Vanity Fair in 1913, although this was a characteristically dull cartoon otherwise. (Photographs indicate that Northcliffe’s description was accurate).

Cartoons in books
Lloyd George is, of course, featured in the collections of cartoons by FCG, Poy, Dyson, Strube and Low. Aside from their individual characteristics, they provide an opportunity for a degree of chronological examination of the changes in depiction of Lloyd George. The collection of Punch cartoons referred to earlier took him up to 1921 (and followed the precedent of individual collections by Punch on Disraeli and Judy on Gladstone).

General histories covering Lloyd George’s political life sometimes include cartoons; the Low New Statesman cartoon is probably the favourite. Punch cartoons are also frequently used, perhaps because Punch volumes are easier to research than newspapers. This is slightly misleading, because Punch artists tended towards observation rather than sharp criticism. Given the relatively small circulation of Punch, they were in fact less important in creating Lloyd George’s contemporary image. Since he was interested in cartoons it is very surprising that Beaverbrook includes none in his three volumes about Lloyd George (although he did include them in his small book Politicians and the Press). Not all biographies include cartoons: Lloyd George’s great-grandson Robert leads the way with nineteen, followed by Richard Toye’s volume on the same subject who gives us seven. The most recent biography by Roy Hattersley sadly includes only the Spy cartoon. A most interesting absence of cartoons is to be found in Frank Owen’s biography, the first to be based on the collection of papers sold to Beaverbrook by Frances Stevenson. The absence is interesting not just in itself, but because Owen had been sent details of original cartoons and scrapbooks held in those papers. Lloyd George did not include cartoons in his six volumes on the war and the peace treaties.

**Collections of cartoons**
Institutions such as the Lloyd George Museum, the National Library of Wales and the National Portrait Gallery have small collections of Lloyd George cartoons. The British Cartoon Archive at the University of Kent also has a number of cartoons related to LG.

**Commemorative ceramics**
As well as standard portraits, cartoons were occasionally either copied or developed especially for...
Lloyd George’s reaction to cartoons

Grey and Peel in the early to mid-nineteenth century collected prints of themselves. There is no indication other prime ministers did likewise until Lloyd George, who certainly did. However, there is no reference in the biographies of him that this author has read to Lloyd George’s attitude or response to cartoonists. For example there is nothing in Frances Stephenson’s diaries. However information from the Lloyd George papers, and from cartoonists tells us that he collected cartoons featuring himself. (It is not known whether he paid for them).

J. M. Staniforth of the Western Mail received compliments from Lloyd George, and even more significantly an engraved cigarette case. Staniforth’s cartoons were advertised in 1918 as being available for sale ‘at 2 guineas each’. The obituary for Staniforth in the Western Mail says ‘The Prime Minister often asked for the original drawings. Many of these are hung on the walls of 10 Downing Street or at Mr Lloyd George’s private residence.’ Lloyd George wrote in the same paper that Staniforth’s cartoons ‘were always free from malice and any suggestion of coarseness.’ Lloyd George regarded ‘The responsible party’ as one of Staniforth’s greatest successes and ‘it is always kept in Mr Lloyd George’s own house’.

It is rather puzzling as to why this should be Lloyd George’s favourite. The 4th Earl Lloyd George has thirty-four original cartoons which were probably held by Lloyd George at Churt. Unsurprisingly the original cartoons he held were not strongly critical.

Lloyd George, apart from collecting cartoons, sent compliments to a number of cartoonists, such as Staniforth, Low and Strube. An interesting demonstration of his views was that he persuaded Rae-makers, the Belgian cartoonist, to go to the USA to enlist American help in the war. Low in his autobiography says that Lloyd George ‘had a little collection of originals of what he thought were my best efforts.’ One included in this article was ‘You’re Next’, showing him as the only surviving leader from the 1919 Peace Treaty.

In 1933 Lloyd George was asked how he managed to keep so cheerful with all the anxieties and work which he encountered when he was prime minister.
The first thing I did, even before I got out of bed was to take up the Daily Express, a paper with whose policy I often firmly disagreed, and look at Strube’s cartoon. That put me in good humour for the rest of the day. Strube taught me how to laugh at myself and that, believe me, is a virtue which many eminent men would do well to acquire."

We have no evidence that Lloyd George’s interaction with editors and owners affected how cartoonists portrayed him. The fact that he obtained cartoons and commented on them favourably is not matched by any recorded response by those cartoonists. We do not know whether they were more inclined to present a softer view of him.

Returning to the caricature of Lloyd George by J. M. Keynes, we can see that some of it appears in the work of cartoonists: the siren, the goat, the bard and Keynes’ implication that Lloyd George was a magician. What cartoonists could not capture was Keynes’ observation of inner irresponsibility, absence of Saxon good and evil (whatever that was) and cunning remorselessness. Moreover, whatever the contribution of Keynes description to the views of historians and biographers, it was only read from 1933. The views of cartoonists had been influential for three decades before that.

Alan Mumford is the author of David Lloyd George: A Biography in Cartoons. He has previously published collections of cartoons on the Conservative and Labour parties and two on general elections, the most recent being Drawn at the Hustings (2011).

Note: For copyright reasons some cartoons are not available for inclusion in the article.
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Maynard Keynes famously described Lloyd George as “this siren, this goat footed bard, this half human visitor”. Other writers described a man of many parts: the wizard, the bounder, the spellbinder, circus performer and robber of wealth. Cartoonists delighted in showing him in these and other roles.

This fascinating book by Alan Mumford provides first as context a narrative of his career and an analysis of his position as an outsider. Further context is given in a review of the huge increase in circulation of newspapers, amplifying the number of people who saw cartoons and were potentially influenced by them.

The 160 cartoons in the book focus on the main events in Lloyd George’s life: early struggles over education in Wales, The Boer War, the 1909 Peoples Budget and the House of Lords. Marconi, the “man who won the war” and then the man to conquer unemployment.

Readers of the Journal can obtain the book at a 30% discount by ordering online, quoting the Journal at Troubadour Bookshop via www.troubadour.co.uk or Troubadour, 9 Priory Business Park, Wistow Road, Kilworth Beauchamp, Leicestershire, LE8 0RX. Tel: 0116 279 229. Regular Price £20.00 +p&p.
Party Agents
It is always a pity to spoil a good anecdote, but I am impelled to do so in deference to this journal’s reputation as a source of accurate history. The correspondence on this subject was stimulated by David Steel’s story about Jo Grimond being asked about his politics by a Lerwick solicitor, Mr Goodlad, after, not before, that solicitor had agreed to be his election agent (Journal of Liberal History 86, autumn 2013).

I have now come across an earlier reference to Peter Goodlad; he was the Liberal agent in the Shetlands in 1938, not at an election, but as organising a summer vacation campaign tour by the President of the Glasgow University Liberal Club, in support of Lady Glen-Coats, then the constituency’s newly-elected prospective Liberal candidate.

The Liberal student concerned did later twice come close to becoming a Liberal MP himself, in West Aberdeen- shire in 1945 and Dundee West in 1951; much later he became better known as a right-wing journalist. John Junor tells the full story of his youthful campaigning in the Northern Isles and with Lady Glen-Coats on pages 7–11 of his Memoirs (1990). Incidentally, Orkney & Shetland was only twice won by a Conservative, in 1935 and 1945; apart from being local Liberal organiser, Peter Goodlad would have been well aware that Jo was the sitting Tory MP’s challenger.

Michael Steel

John Buchan and the Liberal Party
Two memories came flooding back when reading of Liberalism in John Buchan’s life (‘Liberalism and Liberals in John Buchan’s life and fiction’, by Malcolm Baines, Journal of Liberal History 82, spring 2014). I regret I cannot recall the exact quote nor its location, but I remember coming across the statement attributed to Buchan when he resigned as prospective Tory candidate for his native Peebles and Selkirk (later part of my own constituency). He declared that the Borders was a real hotbed of Liberalism and went off instead to become MP for the universities seat.

My second recall was triggered by your report that the Buchan family became Tories because of Gladstone’s ‘weakness in leaving General Gordon to be killed in Khartoum’. In the 1966 general election when I was fighting to retain the seat I had won in the by-election the previous year, my wife was told on the doorstep by one woman: ‘I quite like your husband as our MP, but I could never vote Liberal’. ‘Why not?’ Judy enquired. ‘Because they did not send help for General Gordon!’ Years later when I saw the plaque in Khartoum on the murder spot I reflected ‘that cost me a vote’.

David Steel

Queries
Two queries following the excellent spring edition of the Journal—