

Tony Little introduces one of the speeches not included in *Great Liberal Speeches* because of shortage of space.

'Let us open to them the door of the House of Commons'

Thomas Babington Macaulay on Jewish Disabilities (House of Commons, 17 April 1833)

Thomas Babington Macaulay was born on October 25, 1800, the son of the Evangelical philanthropist Zachary Macaulay, a leading opponent of the slave trade. A precocious child, he began writing poetry and history before he was ten. At Trinity College, Cambridge, he developed his skills as a debater. His essay on the English poet John Milton, published in the *Edinburgh Review* in 1825, was the foundation of his fame. Although called to the bar he preferred politics and entered the House, ironically given his support for parliamentary reform, as the member for Lord Lansdowne's pocket borough of Calne.

The speech that made Macaulay's parliamentary reputation occurred early in his career, on 2 March 1831, and is included in *Great Liberal Speeches* under the title 'Reform that you may preserve'; it paved the way for the Great Reform Act of 1832. But Macaulay was a classic Whig reformer, and also fought against religious intolerance, the subject of the speech we reproduce here.

In the nineteenth century the critical battle against discrimination was fought not on the ground of race or sexual orientation but of religion. Although a small minority of the population in Britain, Roman Catholics were the overwhelming majority in Ireland, which had been part of the United Kingdom since 1800 and was subject to British legal discrimination. By winning a seat in parliament that he could not occupy, Daniel O'Connell forced the

issue to the forefront. In the face of a threat of revolution in Ireland, Catholic Emancipation was conceded, but this still left the Church of England in a privileged position against which the dissenting churches were to campaign for most of the century.

It also left Jewish people unable to obtain high office. Macaulay spoke against the civil disadvantaging of Jews – 'Jewish disabilities' – several times, and wrote one of his more impassioned essays on the subject. As is very clear from the speech featured here, the case for full citizenship for Jews is the same as for tolerance for any other minority group. He was fighting the same bigotry which opposed Catholic Emancipation and he powerfully argues the case for the inclusion of all groups in civil society. Although resolutions were passed in the Commons from the 1830s, it was Disraeli, as part of Lord Derby's government, who delivered Jewish emancipation in 1858. The Liberal Lionel de Rothschild, who had been winning elections for the City of London since 1847 but had felt unable to take the oath of office as a matter of conscience, was finally able to occupy his seat.

After holding various government posts, Macaulay lost his own seat in 1847, partly as a result of his views on religious tolerance. His attack on the concept of leaving education to philanthropists (the subject of the second speech of his included in *Great Liberal Speeches*) and his defence of funding Anglican schools both antagonised nonconformists, and for



Thomas Babington Macaulay (1800–59)

his Edinburgh constituents, this compounded the offence of his support for the funding of the Catholic College at Maynooth in Ireland.

The first two volumes of the *History of England from the Accession of King James II* were finished in 1848 and at once achieved success. In 1852 Macaulay returned to Parliament, but because of a weak heart he refused office. He was created Baron Macaulay of Rothley in 1857, a very early literary peerage, and died on 28 December 1859. He is buried in Westminster Abbey. Macaulay is best known, now, for his *History*, which is the epitome of the Whig view of history as progress but it is best read as great Victorian literature, for Macaulay's opinionated, rhetorical, driving narrative style.

On 17th April 1833, the House of Commons resolved itself into a committee to consider the civil disabilities of the Jews. Mr Warburton took the chair. Mr Robert Grant moved the following resolution:

'That it is the opinion of this committee that it is expedient to remove all civil disabilities at present existing with respect of His Majesty's subjects professing the Jewish religion, with the like exceptions as are provided with respect to His Majesty's subjects professing the Roman Catholic religion.'

The resolution was passed in the Commons but rejected by the House of Lords. Jews were eventually allowed to enter the Commons in 1858.

Mr Warburton, I recollect and my honourable friend the Member for the University of Oxford will recollect,

that, when this subject was discussed three years ago, it was remarked, by one whom we both loved and whom we both regret, that the strength of the case of the Jews was a serious inconvenience to their advocate, for that it was hardly possible to make a speech for them without wearying the audience by repeating truths which were universally admitted. If Sir James Mackintosh felt this difficulty when the question was first brought forward in this House, I may well despair of being able now to offer any arguments which have a pretence to novelty.

My honourable friend, the Member for the University of Oxford, began his speech by declaring he had no intention of calling in question the principles of religious liberty. He utterly disclaims persecution, that is to say, persecution as defined by himself. It would, in his opinion, be persecution to hang a Jew, or to flay him, or draw his teeth, or to imprison him, or to fine him; for every man who conducts himself peaceably has a right to his life and his limbs, to his personal liberty and his property. But it is not persecution, says my honourable friend, to exclude any individual or any class from office; for nobody has a right to office: in every country official appointments must be subject to such regulations as the supreme authority may choose to make; nor can any such regulations be reasonably complained of by any member of society as unjust. He who obtains any office, obtains it not as a matter of right, but as a matter of favour. He who does not obtain an office is not wronged; he is only in that situation in which the vast majority of every country must necessarily be. There are in the United Kingdom five and twenty million Christians without places; and, if they do not complain, why should five and twenty thousand Jews complain of being in the same case? In this way my honourable friend has convinced himself that, as it would be most absurd in him and me to say that we are wronged because we are not Secretaries of State, so it is most absurd in the Jews to say that they are wronged because they are, as a people, excluded from public employment.

'Those conclusions are so monstrous'

Now, surely, my honourable friend cannot have considered to what conclusions his reasoning leads. Those conclusions are so monstrous that he would, I am certain, shrink from them. Does he really mean that it would not be wrong in the legislature to enact that no man should be a judge unless he weighed twelve stone, or that no man should sit in parliament unless he were six feet high? We are about to bring in a bill for the government of India. Suppose that we were to insert in that bill a clause providing that no graduate of the University of Oxford should be Governor General or Governor of any Presidency, would not my honourable friend cry out against such a clause as most unjust to the learned body he represents? And would he think himself sufficiently answered by being told, in his own words, that appointment to office is a mere matter of favour, and that to exclude an individual or a class from office is no injury? Surely on consideration, he must admit that official appointments ought not to be subject to regulations purely arbitrary, to regulations for which no reason can be given but mere caprice, and that those who would exclude any class from public employment are bound to show some special reason for the exclusion.

My honourable friend has appealed to us as Christians. Let me then ask him how he understands the great commandment which comprises the law and the prophets. Can we be said to do unto others as we would that they should do unto us if we wantonly inflict on them even the smallest pain? As Christians, surely we are bound to consider first, whether by excluding the Jews from all public trust, we give them pain; and secondly, whether it be necessary to give them that pain in order to avert some greater evil. That by excluding them from public trust we inflict pain on them my honourable friend will not dispute. As a Christian, therefore, he is bound to relieve them from that pain, unless he can show what I am sure he has not yet shown, that it is necessary to the general good that they should continue to suffer.

'The intolerance which he thinks a duty'

But where, he says, are you to stop, if once you admit into the House of Commons people who deny the authority of the Gospels? Will you let in a Mussulman? Will you let in a Parsee? Will you let in a Hindoo, who worships a lump of stone with seven heads? I will answer my honourable friend's question by another. Where does he mean to stop? Is he ready to roast unbelievers at slow fires? If not, let him tell us why – and I will engage to prove his reason is just as decisive against the intolerance which he thinks a duty as against the intolerance which he thinks a crime. Once admit that we are bound to inflict pain on a man because he is not of our religion, and where are you to stop? Why stop at the point fixed by my honourable friend rather than at the point fixed by the honourable Member for Oldham (Mr Cobbett), who would make the Jews incapable of holding land? And why stop at the point fixed by the honourable Member for Oldham rather than at a point which would have been fixed by a Spanish Inquisitor of the sixteenth century? When once you enter on a course of persecution, I defy you to find any reason for making a halt till you have reached the extreme point. When my honourable friend tells us that he will allow the Jews to possess property to any amount, but that he will not allow them to possess the smallest political power, he uses contradictory language. Property is power. The honourable Member for Oldham sees very clearly that it is impossible to deprive a man of political power if you suffer him to be the proprietor of half a county, and therefore very consistently proposes to confiscate the landed estates of the Jews.

But even the honourable Member for Oldham does not go far enough. He has not proposed to confiscate the personal property of the Jews. Yet it is perfectly certain that any Jew who has a million may easily make himself very important in the state. By such steps we pass from official power to landed property, and from landed property to personal property, and from personal property to liberty and from liberty to life. In truth,

those persecutors who use the rack and stake have much to say for themselves. They are convinced that their end is good; and it must be admitted that they employ means which are not unlikely to attain their end. Religious dissent has repeatedly been put down by sanguinary persecution. In that way the Albigenses were put down. In that way Protestantism was suppressed in Spain and Italy, so that it has never since reared its head. But I defy anybody to produce an instance in which disabilities such as we are now considering have produced any other effect than that of making the sufferers angry and obstinate.

My honourable friend should either persecute to some purpose or not persecute at all. He dislikes the word persecution. He will not admit that the Jews are persecuted. And yet I am confident that he would rather be sent to the King's Bench Prison for three months or be fined a hundred pounds than be subject to the disabilities under which the Jews lie. How can he then say that to impose such disabilities is not persecution, and that to fine and imprison is persecution? All his reasoning consists in drawing arbitrary lines. What he does not wish to inflict he calls persecution. What he does wish to inflict he will not call persecution. What he takes from the Jews he calls political power. What he is too good-natured to take from the Jews he will not call political power. The Jew must not sit in Parliament, but he may be the proprietor of all the ten-pound houses in a borough. He may have more fifty-pound tenants than any peer in the kingdom. He may give the voters treats to please their palates, and hire bands of gypsies to break their heads, as if he were a Christian and a marquess. All the rest of this system is of a piece.

The Jew may be a juryman, but not a judge. He may decide issues of fact, but not issues of law. He may give a hundred thousand pounds' damages, but he may not in the most trivial case grant a new trial. He may rule the money market; he may influence the exchanges; he may be summoned to congresses of emperors and kings. Great potentates, instead of negotiating a loan with him by tying him in a chair and pulling out his grinders, may treat with him as with a great potentate, and may postpone the

declaring of war or the signing of a treaty till they have conferred with him. All this is as it should be; but he must not be a Privy Councillor. He must not be called the Right Honourable, for that is political power. And who is it we are trying to cheat in this way? Even Omniscience. Yes, sir; we have been gravely told that the Jews are under the divine displeasure, and that, if we give them political power, God will visit us in judgement.

Do we think that God cannot distinguish between substance and form? Does not He know that, while we withhold from the Jews the semblance and name of political power, we suffer them to possess the substance? The plain truth is that my honourable friend is drawn in one direction by his opinions and in a directly opposite direction by his excellent heart. He halts between the two opinions. He tries to make a compromise between principles which admit of no compromise. He goes a certain way in intolerance. Then he stops, without being able to give a reason for stopping. But I know the reason. It is his humanity. Those who formerly dragged the Jew at a horse's tail, and singed his beard with blazing furze bushes, were much worse men than my honourable friend; but they were more consistent than he.

'Not for differing from us in opinion'

It has been said that it would be monstrous to see a Jewish judge try a man for blasphemy. In my opinion it is monstrous to see any judge try a man for blasphemy under the present law. But if the law on that subject were in a sound state, I do not see why a conscientious Jew might not try a blasphemer. Every man, I think, ought to be at liberty to discuss the evidences of religion, but no man ought to be at liberty to force on the unwilling ears and eyes of others sounds and sights which must cause annoyance and irritation. The distinction is clear. I think it is wrong to punish a man for selling Paine's *Age of Reason* in a back shop to those who choose to buy or for delivering a Deistical lecture in a private room to those who choose to

listen. But if a man exhibits at a window in the Strand a hideous caricature of that which is an object of awe and adoration to nine hundred and ninety nine out of every thousand of the people who pass up and down that great thoroughfare; if a man, in a place of public resort, applies opprobrious epithets to names held in reverence by all Christians; such a man ought, in my opinion, to be severely punished, not for differing from us in opinion, but for committing a nuisance which gives us pain and disgust. He is no more entitled to outrage our feelings by obtruding his impiety on us, and to say that he is exercising his right of discussion, than to establish a yard for butchering horses close to our houses and to say he is exercising his right of property, or to run naked up and down the public streets and to say that he is exercising his right of locomotion. He has a right of discussion, no doubt, as he has a right of property and a right of locomotion. But he must use all his rights so as not to infringe the rights of others.

These, Sir, are the principles on which I would frame the law of blasphemy; and if the law were so framed, I am at a loss to understand why a Jew might not enforce it as well as a Christian. I am not a Roman Catholic, but if I were a judge at Malta, I should have no scruple about punishing a bigoted Protestant who should burn the Pope in effigy before the eyes of thousands of Roman Catholics. I am not a Mussulman; but if I were a judge in India, I should have no scruple about punishing a Christian who should pollute a mosque. Why, then, should I doubt that a Jew, raised by his ability, learning, and integrity to the judicial bench, would deal properly with any person who in a Christian country should insult the Christian religion?

'Are we to exclude all millenarians from office?'

But, says my honourable friend, it has been prophesied that the Jews are to be wanderers on the face of the earth, and that they are not to mix on terms of equality with the peoples of the coun-

tries in which they sojourn. Now, Sir, I am confident that I can demonstrate that this is not the sense of any prophecy which is part of Holy Writ. For it is an undoubted fact that, in the United States of America, Jewish citizens do possess all the privileges possessed by Christian citizens. Therefore, if the prophecies mean that the Jews never shall, during their wanderings, be admitted by other nations to equal participation of political rights, the prophecies are false. But the prophecies are certainly not false. Therefore their meaning cannot be that which is attributed to them by my honourable friend.

Another objection which has been made to this motion is that the Jews look forward to the coming of a great deliverer, to their return to Palestine, to the rebuilding of their temple, to the revival of their ancient worship, and that therefore they will always consider England, not their country, but merely their place of exile. But, surely, Sir, it would be the grossest ignorance of human nature to imagine that the anticipation of an event which is to happen at some time altogether indefinite, of an event which has been vainly expected during many centuries, of an event which even those who confidently expect that it will happen do not confidently expect that that they or their children or their grandchildren will see, can ever occupy the minds of men to such a degree as to make them regardless of what is near and present and certain. Indeed Christians, as well as Jews, believe that the existing order of things will come to an end. Many Christians believe that Jesus will visibly reign on earth during a thousand years. Expositors of prophecy have gone so far as to fix the year when the millennial period is to commence. The prevailing opinion is, I think in favour of the year 1866; but, according to some commentators, the time is close at hand. Are we to exclude all millenarians from parliament and office, on the ground that they are impatiently looking forward to the miraculous monarchy which is to supersede the present dynasty and the present constitution of England, and that therefore they cannot be heartily loyal to King William?

In one important point, Sir, my

honourable friend, the Member for the University of Oxford, must acknowledge that the Jewish religion is of all erroneous religions the least mischievous. There is not the slightest chance that the Jewish religion will spread. The Jew does not wish to make proselytes. He may be said to reject them. He thinks it almost culpable in one who does not belong to his race to presume to belong to his religion. It is therefore not strange that a conversion from Christianity to Judaism should be a rarer occurrence than a total eclipse of the sun. There was one distinguished convert in the last century, Lord George Gordon; and the history of his conversion deserves to be remembered. For if ever there was a proselyte of whom a proselytising sect would have been proud, it was Lord George, not only because he was a man of high birth and rank; not only because he had been a member of the legislature, but also because he had been distinguished by the intolerance, nay, the ferocity, of his zeal for his own form of Christianity. But was he allured into the synagogue? Was he even welcomed to it? No, Sir, he was coldly and reluctantly permitted to share the reproach and suffering of the chosen people; but he was sternly shut out from their privileges. He underwent the painful rite which their law enjoins. But when, on his deathbed, he begged to be buried among them according to their ceremonial, he was told that his request could not be granted.

I understand that cry of 'Hear'. It reminds me that one of the arguments against this motion is that the Jews are an unsocial people, that they draw close to each other, and stand aloof from strangers. Really, Sir, it is amusing to compare the manner in which the question of Catholic emancipation was argued formerly by some gentlemen with the manner in which the question of Jewish emancipation is argued by the same gentlemen. When the question was about Catholic emancipation, the cry was, 'See how restless, how versatile, how encroaching, how insinuating, is the spirit of the Church of Rome. See how her priests compass earth and sea to make one

proselyte. How indefatigably they toil, how attentively they study the weak and strong points of every character, how skilfully they employ literature, arts, sciences, as engines for the propagation of their faith. You find them in every region and under every disguise, collating manuscripts in the Bodleian, fixing telescopes in the observatory of Pekin, teaching the use of the plough and the spinning wheel to the savages of Paraguay. Will you give power to the members of a Church so busy, so aggressive, so insatiable? Well, now the question is about people who never try to seduce any stranger to join them, and who do not wish any body to be of their faith who is not also of their blood. And now you exclaim, 'Will you give power to the members of a sect which remains sullenly apart from other sects, which does not invite, nay, which hardly even admits neophytes?'

The truth is, that bigotry will never want a pretence. Whatever the sect be which it is proposed to tolerate, the peculiarities of that sect will, for the time, be pronounced by intolerant men to be the most odious and dangerous that can be conceived. As to the Jews, that they are unsocial as respects religion is true; and so much the better: for surely, as Christians, we cannot wish that they should bestir themselves to pervert us from our own faith. But that the Jews would be unsocial members of the civil community, if the civil community did its duty by them, has never been proved. My honourable friend who made the motion we are discussing has produced a great body of evidence to show that they have been grossly misrepresented; and that evidence has not been refuted by my honourable friend the Member for the University of Oxford. But what if it were true that the Jews are unsocial? What if it were true that they do not regard England as their country? Would not the treatment that they have undergone explain and excuse their antipathy to the society in which they live?

While the bloody code of Elizabeth was enforced against English Roman Catholics, what was the patriotism of Roman Catholics? Oliver Cromwell said that in his time they were Espaniolised. At a later period it might

have been said that they were Gallicised. It was the same with the Calvinists. What more deadly enemies had France in the days of Louis the Fourteenth than the persecuted Huguenots? But would any rational man infer from these facts that either the Roman Catholic as such, or the Calvinist as such, is incapable of loving the land of his birth? If England were now invaded by Roman Catholics, how many English Roman Catholics would go over to the invader? If France were now attacked by a Protestant enemy, how many French Protestants would lend him help? Why not try what effect would be produced on the Jews by that tolerant policy which has made the English Roman Catholic a good Englishman, and the French Calvinist a good Frenchman.

'Such has in every age been the reasoning of bigots'

Another charge has been brought against the Jews, not by my honourable friend the Member for the University of Oxford – he has too much learning and too much good feeling to make such a charge – but by the honourable Member for Oldham, who has, I am sorry to say, quitted his place. The honourable Member for Oldham tells us that the Jews are naturally a mean race, a sordid race, a money-getting race; that they are averse to all honourable callings; that they neither sow nor reap; that they have neither flocks nor herds; that usury is the only pursuit for which they are fit; that they are destitute of all elevated and amiable sentiments. Such, sir, has in every age been the reasoning of bigots. They never fail to plead in justification of persecution the vices which persecution has engendered. England has been to the Jews less than half a country; and we revile them because they do not feel for England more than half patriotism. We treat them as slaves, and wonder that they do not regard us as brethren. We drive them to mean occupations, and then reproach them for not embracing honourable professions. We long forbade them to possess land; and we complain that they chiefly occupy themselves in trade. We shut them out from all the

paths of ambition; and then we despise them for taking refuge in avarice.

During many ages we have, in all our dealings with them, abused our immense superiority of force; and then we are disgusted because they have recourse to that cunning which is the natural and universal defence of the weak against the violence of the strong. But were they always a mere money-changing, money-getting, money-hoarding race? Nobody knows better than my honourable friend the Member for the University of Oxford that there is nothing in their national character which unfits them for the highest duties of citizens. He knows that, in the infancy of civilization, when our island was as savage as New Guinea, when letters and arts were still unknown to Athens, when scarcely a thatched hut stood on what was afterwards the site of Rome, this contemned people had their fenced cities and cedar palaces, their splendid Temple, their fleets of merchant ships, their schools of sacred learning, their great statesmen and soldiers, their natural philosophers, their historians and their poets.

'Let not us fight the battle of truth with the weapons of error'

What nation ever contended more manfully against overwhelming odds for its independence and religion? What nation ever, in its last agonies, gave such signal proofs of what may be accomplished by a brave despair? And if, in the course of many centuries, the oppressed descendants of warriors and sages have degenerated from the qualities of their fathers, if, while excluded from the blessings of law, and bowed down under the yoke of slavery, they have contracted some of the vices of outlaws and of slaves, shall we consider this as a matter of reproach to them? Shall we not rather consider it as a matter of shame and remorse to ourselves? Let us do justice to them. Let us open the door of the House of Commons. Let us open to them every career in which ability and energy can

concluded on page 47

peace when the war turned against Britain in the spring of 1940. It must, of course, be admitted that such a narrative would be difficult to construct, for in the years after the end of his premiership in 1922 Lloyd George's attention was understandably directed away from international affairs and towards the domestic problems of the British economy and the Liberal Party. That said, Lentin shows that Lloyd George was in no sense Hitler's dupe. All the same, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that he misjudged his man. There were aspects of Hitler to which Lloyd George was instinctively drawn, not least because Hitler was enacting in Germany some of the social and economic policies which the Welshman had unsuccessfully urged upon the National Government in Britain.

But to suggest that, had Lloyd George rather than Neville Chamberlain been in power in the late 1930s, some sort of Anglo-German understanding would have been arrived at, presupposes that Britain could, in anything other than the very short term, have lived in harmony with a Nazi Germany rampant and unrestrained in continental Europe.

There is plenty here to stimulate the reader, though at the end of the day he may still decide that Lloyd George will forever escape the conclusive grasp of historical comprehension. As his long-term secretary, A. J. Sylvester, once put it, 'his character is the most complex I have ever known'.

David Dutton is Reader in History at the University of Liverpool.

'Let us open to them the door of the House of Commons'

continued from page 21

be displayed. Till we have done this, let us not presume to say that there is no genius among the countrymen of Isaiah, no heroism among the descendants of the Maccabees.

Sir, in supporting the motion of my honourable friend, I am, I firmly believe, supporting the honour and the interests of the Christian religion. I should think that I insulted that religion if I said that it cannot stand unaided by intolerant laws. Without such laws it was established, and without such laws it may be maintained. It triumphed over the superstitions of the most refined and of the most savage nations, over the graceful mythology of Greece and the bloody idolatry of the northern forests. It prevailed over the power and policy of the Roman Empire. It tamed the barbarians by whom that empire was overthrown. But all these victories were gained not by the help of intolerance, but in spite of the opposition of intolerance. The whole history of Christianity proves that she has little indeed to fear from persecution as a foe, but much to fear from persecution as an ally. May she long continue to bless our country with her benignant influence, strong in her sublime philosophy, strong in her spotless morality, strong in those internal and external evidences to which the most powerful and comprehensive of human intellects have yielded assent, the last solace of those who have outlived every earthly hope, the last restraint of those who are raised above every earthly fear! But let not us, mistaking her character and her interests, fight the battle of truth with the weapons of error, and endeavour to support by oppression that religion which first taught the human race the great lesson of universal charity.

Keeper of the Liberal Flame

continued from page 25

John Davies is the eldest son of Ivor Davies, born in 1941 and educated at the universities of Oxford and Sheffield, recently retired from the Publishers Association where he was Director of the Educational Publishers Council, the Council of Academic and Professional Publishers, the Serial Publishers Executive, the Copyright Licensing Agency and the Publishers Licensing Society

- 1 Edinburgh University Personality Series No. 11 – Ivor R.M. Davies in *The Student*, 1 February 1938, p 161.
- 2 Reported in *The Bulletin* (Aberdeen) July 1937.
- 3 Election addresses: Oxford 1938, Central Aberdeenshire 1945, West Aberdeenshire 1950, Oxford 1955, 1959, 1964.
- 4 Profile of the Rev. Roderick G Davies in *The Christian World*, 16 May 1940, p. 3.
- 5 e.g. lead feature in *Glasgow Weekly Herald*, 5 December 1936: 'The Milk Muddle' by Ivor R.M. Davies, p. 8.
- 6 Ian Bradley – 'Oxford 1938 – the first 'War' vote' – *The Times*, 27 October 1978, p. 16.
- 7 Ivor R M Davies, *Trial By Ballot* (London, 1950), pp. 143–44.
- 8 Quoted by Tom Harrison, co-founder of Mass Observation, in *Picture Post*, 5 November 1938.
- 9 'Recount Drama ends Darwen Contest' in *Northern Daily Telegraph*, 1943.
- 10 'Central Aberdeenshire – Result of Poll' in *Huntly Express* 27 July 1945 p. 3.
- 11 See article by Robert Ingham, 'Donald Johnson – the last Liberal Imperialist', *Journal of Liberal Democrat History* 25, Winter 1999–2000, p. 31.
- 12 Reviewed in *Times Literary Supplement* 23 June 1950 p. 383, *Truth* 18 August 1950 p. 167, *The*

Economist 19 August 1950, *The Press and Journal* 13 May 1950, and elsewhere.

- 13 Ivor Davies: obituary in *The Bookseller* by John Davies, 5 December 1986, p. 2240.
- 14 'Mr Davies adopted for Oxford', *Oxford Mail*, 7 June 1952.
- 15 'City Tory majority slashed', *Oxford Times*, 16 October 1964 p. 28.
- 16 'Mr Ivor Davies to stand for Oxford City Council', *Oxford Mail* 28 February 1953.
- 17 Oxford City Council Liberal election address, Wolvercote Ward 1970.
- 18 *Our Olive* (Oxford 1989) p. 95.
- 19 Bernard Levin, writing as Taper in *The Spectator*, September 1961.
- 20 'Ivor Davies – the Man for Oxford', *Liberal News* General Election Campaign edition 1964, p. 1.
- 21 'A royal reward', *Oxford Mail*, 1 November 1984 p. 7.
- 22 'Man of influence for four decades', *Oxford Mail*, 3 December 1986 p. 2. There was no obituary in *Liberal News*.

Bibliographical Note: At their deaths in the late 1980s, Ivor and Jean Davies left behind them a significant collection of press cuttings, election literature and other documents related to their political activities. These have been drawn upon for this article and, where attributed and relevant, some of them are cited in the footnotes. The content of the article, however, also owes much to eyewitness observation and conversations within the family and with friends of the subject over many years.