THE DEVELOPMENT OF
AS A PHILOSOPHY

Writing the Introduction to a collection of speeches by Lloyd George on *The New Liberalism* in 1909, A. G. Gardiner, Editor of the *Daily News* and member of the Rainbow Circle,[1] argued that, 'We may say that between 1886 and 1906 the Liberal Party in this country was dead. It was torn by civil war and miserable personal feuds. With the exception of the Budget of 1894 there was no single evidence that the vital spirit of Liberalism still lingered in the corpse.'[2] **Dr Alison Holmes** examines the philosophy that underpinned the Liberals' revival.

PUNCH, OR THE LONDON CHARIVARI.—April 11, 1906.

EQUALITY—WITH A DIFFERENCE.

LABOUR. "EXCUSE ME, MUM, BUT I DON'T LIKE THE 'ANG O' YOUR SCALES. I THINK YOU'LL FIND *THIS* PAIR WORKS BETTER—*FOR ME!*"

THE NEW LIBERALISM
Y OF TRANSITION

G ARDINER WAS obvi-
ously dramatising
his case for effect
– given that, at the
time of his writing,
far from being dead, Liberals
were in power and running one
of the most progressive govern-
ments in British history. Hyper-
bole notwithstanding, Gardiner
makes a crucial point because,
without the transformation of
Liberalism that began at the end
of the nineteenth century, the
party would surely have been at
least absorbed, if not buried, by
its political opponents.

This article will look at this
period of transition, and the
external factors and intellectual
ideas that influenced the devel-
opment of the New Liberalism.
This will be done by placing it
within the prevailing climate of
change and highlighting the two
questions that led to the shift in
political debate in general and
Liberalism in particular. Specifi-
cally, it will look at the impact
of global economic forces on
the drivers of social change as
well as the two most influential
debates in terms of the approach
of the New Liberalism: the col-
lapse of economic individualism
as the underpinning of the role
of the state in society, and the
influence of Darwin's work on
the conception of human nature
and the community.

Two distinctions are cru-
cial at the outset. The first is
the difference between social
change and social reform. John
Roach, in particular, makes
the point that: 'Social changes
result when political economic
forces impinge upon the lives
of individuals and communi-
ties … a distinction should be
drawn between social change
and social reform. The former
is primarily instinctive and non-
rational. The latter is quite defi-
nitely planned and organised by
individuals working according
to a programme. Social change
goes on constantly, but social
reforms take place because social
reformers will them to do so.'[3]

The second distinction is
between philosophy and ide-
ology. In line with Michael
Freeden, an 'ideology' is taken
to be 'action-oriented, geared to
the comprehension of a specific
political system and, with that
as a springboard, to its assess-
ment, critique, and possible
transformation'.[4] In contrast, the
term 'philosophy' is used in a
much more general sense as an
approach to questions regarding
the 'good society' and its com-
ponent parts.

The outcome of this period
of social change was a broad
progressive consensus around a
new philosophy that remained
focused on the individual and

Punch, 11
April 1906:
**Equality – with
a difference**

Labour: 'Excuse
me, mum, but I
don't like the 'ang
o' your scales. I
think you'll find
this pair works
better for me!'

freedom but that had adapted
the place of the individual to
include the wider community.
New Liberalism as the ideol-
ogy of the Liberal Party per se
is not discussed here, but it is
suggested that the party came
to include an action-oriented
programme of social reform,
particularly after 1906, as a result
of the development of the New
Liberalism as a philosophy of
transition. Arguably, this new
approach enabled the Liberal
Party to retain its independent
and distinct voice, though it
was not enough to enable it to
retain its lead over the Labour
Party. It could even be suggested
that these philosophical devel-
opments led to what became
known as the 'great divorce' in
progressive politics as it rein-
forced Liberalism's faith in the
individual even as it embraced
the community and expanded
the role of the state.

Winston Churchill, in his
biography of his father writ-
ten at the time, called this
period 'the end of an epoch
… Authority everywhere was
broken. Slaves were free. Con-
science was free. Trade was free.
But hunger and squalor and
cold were also free and people
demanded something more
than liberty … And how to fill
the void was the riddle that split
the Liberal Party.'[5]

Old Liberalism at the cusp of the century

The unavoidable problem for politicians was that the older form of a limited, property-based economic system, with its strong Protestant and Anglo-Saxon context, could not be entirely reconciled with the recently expanded electorate and a free and open conception of citizenship – even by the Liberals who had fought to create the new democratic society. Each party needed a philosophical narrative and electoral ideology to cope with this change. Gardiner sets out the challenge to Liberalism.

> It was the task of the old Liberalism to free the individual from the restrictions and disabilities of a conception of the State based on property and aristocratic privilege … This was a sound view so long as the State represented the interests of a privileged caste. But with the establishment of a democratic State the task of Liberalism changed.[6]

A classic description of this transition is found in the work of L. T. Hobhouse. As well as an important New Liberal thinker, Hobhouse is also a good example of the open nature of the debate and the influence those operating outside the political arena were able to bring through the media:

> The earlier Liberalism had to deal with authoritarian government in church and State. It had to vindicate the elements of personal, civil, and economic freedom; and in so doing it took its stand on the rights of man, and, in proportion as it was forced to be constructive, on the supposed harmony of the natural order. Government claimed supernatural sanction and divine ordinance. Liberal theory replied … that the rights of man rested on the law of Nature, and those of

government on human institution. The oldest 'institution' … was the individual, and the primordial society the natural grouping of human beings under the influence of family affection, and for the sake of mutual aid …[7]

In practical terms, traditional understandings as to one's role and responsibilities were no longer clear, while lines of demarcation such as class, status and profession were no longer a sure guide as to political position. The resulting uncertainty is evocatively described by Jose Harris as 'a society in which rootlessness was endemic and in which people felt themselves to be living in many different layers of historic time'.[8]

Today, it would not be surprising to suggest that electoral survival requires a political party to have both the vision to lead and the ability to reflect the interests and concerns of the electorate. New Liberalism is fascinating because it was developed at a time we now recognise as the first era of globalisation and at the point of creation of a mass democracy. Political parties were not only dealing with the natural evolution of party positioning but with the beginnings of a recognisably modern democracy. This, in turn, altered the relationship between the individual and the State and demanded not only a new philosophical approach, but new policies and a new practice of politics. Forward-looking Liberals recognised both the moral need to reflect the concerns of the working class as well as the electoral danger of the growing socialist movement.

Because of this unstable environment, it is not possible to understand the New Liberalism in terms of social reform by looking at the Liberal Party in isolation – not least as the party's official ideology tended to lag behind the philosophy of its campaigners. Thus, a great deal of the thinking in terms of both

the approach and the progressive policies of the party from 1906 were developed outside that arena. There are three identifiable starting points or 'episodes' around the New Liberalism, each representing a different approach.

Episodic change and a philosophy of transition

1886 and political disarray. Gardiner's observation of the 'death' of Liberalism in 1886 was also Michael Freeden's choice of starting point in his study of the New Liberalism. It is useful in that it marks the beginning of the party's national disarray which precipitated change. W. E. Gladstone wavered in his support for social reform; Joseph Chamberlain, a committed social reformer, had resigned at least in part because of his frustration with the party's hesitation over his Radical Programme. Unemployment was at an all-time high and the Trafalgar Riots were an ominous sign of working-class disquiet.

1896 and social reformers. However, given the increase in social reform initiatives, 1896 could be suggested as an equally good starting point. The Liberal Party was visibly changing between 1880 and 1890,[9] as the progressive work of the Liberals in government from 1892–95 demonstrates. This may even have inspired Thomas Mackey, an historian of the Poor Law, to suggest that: 'The "State of the Poor" has now established itself as a permanent controversy, and, before long, it may be thrust into the forefront of practical politics.'[10]

J. A. Hobson, another key New Liberal thinker, also points to this date and the formation of the journal *The Progressive Review* (an extension of the discussion group, the Rainbow Circle) as the beginning of what he already called 'the New Liberalism'. The stated intention of this group of reformers was, he said, to unify the 'multiplicity of progressive movements', to come to grips

> **New Liberalism is fascinating because it was developed at a time we now recognise as the first era of globalisation and at the point of creation of a mass democracy.**

with 'that huge unformed monster', the social question, and to implement 'a specific policy of reconstruction' based on a new conception of 'economic freedom … the conscious organisation of society' and 'an enlarged and enlightened conception of the functions of the State'.[11]

Yet despite a unity of philosophical message, there were significant political setbacks. The resignation of Gladstone and the loss of the election in 1895 deepened party schisms later exacerbated by the Boer War, on which public opinion was divided. Unfortunately for the reform debate, those against the war were also in favour of social legislation, making it an unpopular political topic. C. F. G. Masterman in particular identified the khaki election of 1900 as a new low in terms of progressive thought. The election and the accompanying sense of defeat for reform inspired *The Heart of the Empire* (1901), written by a number of progressive activists. Masterman, having just fought and lost (though he later became an important progressive force in the 1906 government) despaired of the public mood and the political parties' unwillingness to take on social reform:

> There was the age of Socialism, when middle class enthusiasts abandoned their comfortable surroundings to preach to the workers … the gospel of the New Era … There was the age of Slumming, when stimulated by the cloying pathos of the popular novelist, the wealth and the good of the West descended halo-crowned into hovel and cellar … There was the Age of Settlements, when the universities … founded citadels in the dark quarters … There was the Age of Philanthropy … All these have risen and flourished and passed away, and the problem still remains in all its sordid unimaginable vastness as insoluble as ever.[12]

Bentley Gilbert, in his introduction to a 1973 reprint, suggests that, in 1900, 'social reform seemed to be not only dead but damned'.[13]

1900 and beyond. A more optimistic starting point might therefore be after the election and into the new century, as the New Liberalism began to gain support. Events conspired to reunify liberal opinion and the opportunity arose to put new liberal ideas into action. The poor condition of the recruits for the Boer War had made plain the 'condition of England' due to grinding poverty, and Chamberlain's campaign in favour of tariff reform stiffened Liberal resolve and renewed its sense of purpose. The Liberal landslide of 1906 also brought to power a new generation of enthusiasts, both political and social, who had considerable influence on the party leadership. Many of the now-classic New Liberal texts were published early in the new century and arguably consolidated the thinking of the previous decade.

All of these three episodes are crucial to the story of the New Liberalism, but given that these 'advanced liberals' were such a disparate group, the real story of its development lies in the interaction between ideas and experience at every level of society and the impact of global pressure on every institution. Elie Halévy reflects this when he argues that the period from 1886, 'does not belong to the British nineteenth century as I understand it'. It is, 'at most, the epilogue' to the nineteenth century though, at the same time, a 'prologue' to the next.[14]

The New Liberalism is best understood as a philosophy of transition. It demarcates the end of traditional Liberalism (while retaining some of its key characteristics) and describes the process by which it became a distinctly new political ideology. New Liberalism did not exist before this period but nor

The New Liberalism is best understood as a philosophy of transition. It demarcates the end of traditional Liberalism.

did it last; it can be likened to a philosophical 'holding space', as politics caught up with the economic and social realities of the time. New forms of public debate shaped its character and prepared the way for the landslide of 1906 while activists and social thinkers moved from special-interest campaigns, discussion groups and think-tanks into positions of influence and into the practical politics of a party in government.

External drivers of social change

The 'social problem', the 'social question' and 'social reconstruction' were all terms used to describe the problems resulting from the industrialisation and urbanisation of the country's population. Economically, the collapse of agricultural prices at home and the industrialisation of Britain's main foreign competitors combined to create periods of severe depression. The expansion of both education and the franchise had unleashed social and political forces while immigration, foreign wars, free trade and the Empire dominated the external agenda. Innovations in communications and transport ensured that both information and disquiet spread quickly. There were three specific drivers of social change.

The first was the rapid development of new technologies. Technology initiates social change and while it is outside the control of the actors involved, it presents challenges and opportunities to society that require political response. The second was the increasing economic pressures of unemployment, agricultural failure, urban overcrowding and poverty, while new manufacturing industries suffered at the hands of foreign competitors. And the third driver was the emergence of new ideas, particularly in the biological sciences, that altered the perception of human nature and the community.

Before going into further depth there are two important points to note. The first is that technological development acts both as a catalyst and a driver; the development of technology brings economic benefits in its own right but also has a significant impact on social life and the fabric of society, for example in forms of employment and information. The speed of this development is often overlooked but the telephone and the transatlantic cable, the phonograph, radio and moving pictures as well as the internal combustion engine all emerged within a twenty year period (1876–96). The compression of time and space made possible by technology created its own social and political dynamic.

The second point is that, taken together, these changes effectively provided both motive and means for the first national media debate over social policy. Experts and activists could make their findings known quickly and feed into the higher discussions on philosophical approach as well as engage with the popular political agenda. Meanwhile, politicians could be informed and influenced in their policy decisions by public opinion. The space and form of this kind of national discussion was as new as it was crucial to both the democratisation of politics and the debates that influenced New Liberalism.

Fundamental questions

Two debates were particularly important, as they not only shaped the domestic political debate but altered the direction of Liberalism. The first was the implications of the economic downturn on what had been a consensus on free trade and a laissez-faire approach to the relationship between the state and society. The second was the impact of evolutionary theory, epitomised by Charles Darwin's work. This affected the basic understanding of the nature of

Economically, the perception of 'progress' and 'peace' were consciously linked through free trade.

the individual in their communities. Biology provided a new organic model of society. The settled view of human nature and the role of the individual as well as the state's role and responsibilities in terms of the welfare of its citizens was being challenged at the most fundamental levels, and both the thinkers and political leaders of the Liberal Party engaged with these debates.

Economic crisis and the death of laissez-faire

Economically, the perception of 'progress' and 'peace' were consciously linked through free trade. The financial reforms initiated by Sir Robert Peel reached their apex in 1860. The ideas associated with what was known as the Manchester School had become the underlying assumptions of society, in terms of the role of the state in relation to both economic and political remedies. These ideas also served as the key to the individualistic model of human nature that included freedom from interference by the state – not only an economic model but a moral code shared by much of English Nonconformity:

> The philosophical basis of laissez-faire was the assumption that the maximum of benefits was to be attained by the individual through the exercise of free, unfettered competition … It was further assumed that the pursuit by all men of what was to their own advantage must necessarily result in the maximum of benefit to the community as a whole …[15]

From the outset, the free trade ethos appealed to the working class, not least as it was posed in terms of cheaper food – the 'big loaf' vs. the 'little loaf'. It was further argued that free trade and commerce promoted peace among states, and this combination of peace and progress was so ingrained that even as socialists

questioned economic individualism in favour of a more collectivist approach, they did not question free trade. Yet, as the recurring depressions towards the end of the nineteenth century left thousands with no means of support and no infrastructure to fall back on, it seemed clear that the policy of 'let it alone' was unsustainable.

Social science and the study of poverty

As the debate on the efficacy of free trade gained in significance, social investigators were looking at the social impact of these cyclical downturns. Victorian notions of morality, character and self-help did not sit well with the growing evidence that one could work hard but remain poor. Their examinations suggested that poverty was more complicated than previously thought. To better understand this phenomenon, Edwin Chadwick and others began to examine the working poor, gathering statistical information and proposing political remedies. Economists such as the American, Henry George, with his theories of land reform, sought to apply traditional rent theory to modern urban conditions and was lionised in Britain. His publication, *Progress and Poverty: An Inquiry into the Cause of Industrial Depressions and of Increase of Want with Increase of Wealth: The Remedy* 'sold in hundreds of thousands of copies'.[16]

The Bitter Cry of London, a report on slum housing by Andrew Mearns in 1883, led to a Royal Commission, while concern over sweated labour[17] produced a House of Lords Select Committee report in 1888.[18] In 1889 Charles Booth set out to disprove H. M. Hyndman's figure of 25 per cent living below subsistence levels as a 'wild overestimate'.[19] He discovered instead that the figure was too modest. His report, *Life and Labour of the People of*

East London, was followed two years later by his study of the rest of London, a groundbreaking piece of work analysing the sources and structure of poverty. These were supplemented by Seebohm Rowntree's 1901 study of York, *Poverty – A Study of Town Life*, inspired by Booth and his own father's work in the 1860s.

This process became an almost constant flow of information between those activists on the ground and politicians and civil servants in government, clearly reflected in the topics of government reports as well as their use of eyewitness accounts. A whole cadre of reformers, investigative journalists and academics were also quick to use the media to create social awareness as well as support for their reform campaigns. Organisations such as the Fabian Society, the Extension Movement and the Settlement Movement,[20] as well as a wide range of religious and political organisations, drew attention to the plight of the poor with specific policy recommendations. Social investigators, journalists and observers even began what was known as 'slumming', or 'going dirty', which involved spending time in casual labourers' hostels or living in poor neighbourhoods to observe conditions at first hand. These pastimes were at their height in 1884 and attracted a range of important people, thus ensuring that their causes received a great deal of coverage.[21] Reform was not limited to one specialisation, profession or even class or political party, but was a fluid process that sought to understand life in poverty.

Ernest Barker points out that between 1848 and 1880, the 'general tendency is towards individualism'[22] and the ideas of laissez-faire gained acceptance in both their domestic and foreign policy agendas. However, intensifying foreign economic competition and deteriorating social conditions shook the social conscience as well as national confidence. Just as the phrase 'survival of the fittest' became shorthand for Darwin's theory of evolution, so too, the Manchester School became the iconic target of commentators. The crisis provided a catalyst for both the New Liberalism and socialism. As Barker says:

> By 1880 the doctrine of laissez-faire – the preaching of non-intervention as the supreme duty of the State, internally as well as externally – seems to have passed … its doctrine of a foreign policy based on pacific cosmopolitanism, steadily lost ground … After 1880 the bankruptcy of the old Benthamite Liberalism was beginning to be apparent. New ideals were needed for the new classes which had won the franchise.[23]

The demise of the Manchester School was gradual in the face of domestic social issues exacerbated by spreading tariffs abroad. Politicians had been confident that free trade was a permanent feature of international relations but the protectionism introduced by various European countries, including Germany, meant that England began to look at state welfare programmes as well as industrial support.[24] Even those who felt that free trade was right could see a new basis had to be found for economic development and social legitimacy.

As many Liberals evolved, they used the new statistical information to adapt their political narrative. They accepted that laissez-faire economic theory had played its part, but concluded that it was time to move on. As G. M. Trevelyan put it in 1901, 'while individualism is of eternity, laissez-faire was of the day, and that day has gone. The spirit of laissez-faire, once the salvation, is now the bane of England … Evil is busily enlisting the neutral Titans of machinery and organisation for pay under its banners, while Good sits singing the old false song of "An excellent world if you leave it alone".'[25]

Biological sciences and notions of community

If economic crises and the birth of the social sciences provided the factual information and structural questions as to the role of the state, the biological sciences challenged religious views while shaping theoretical questions as to the nature of the individual and the community. Charles Darwin published *Origin of Species* in 1859. His conclusions as to natural selection and the descent of humankind from a limited number of 'types' prompted debate even before it was printed. It was widely reviewed and promoted in the media to the extent that the book sold out on its first day. Church spokespeople and naturalists took sides even before they had read the text, while countless political writers and thinkers identified Darwin as an influence in terms of their thinking on the role of society, human nature and the development of the species.

L. T. Hobhouse, for example, attributed much of his approach to a reaction against the prevailing school of Idealism, as well as the popular interpretation of evolutionary theory. He took exception to T. H. Green's interpretation of Hegelian Idealism and even attacked Green's approach for not closing what he saw as the 'gulf' between the ideal and the actual. This, Hobhouse saw, was a fundamental flaw within Idealism itself. At the same time, he refused to accept the popularised version of Darwin found in Herbert Spencer's famous dictum, 'survival of the fittest.'[26]

The overall impact of Darwin's theories was a fundamental shift in thinking from a mechanistic model to an organic understanding of human nature. This was commonly associated with thinkers such as the Fabians who

The overall impact of Darwin's theories was a fundamental shift in thinking from a mechanistic model to an organic understanding of human nature.

argued in favour of centralised state planning and often sought to alter individual behaviour through social mechanisms. The developing model of human nature was based on a biological or organic sense of the individual as part of the environment, but one that could interact with and influence that context while remaining an autonomous actor. The basic ideological question remained the real nature of the individual and whether people operated as 'one against all' or in mutual societies, and whether the pursuit of equality was paramount over the freedom of the individual.

The New Liberalism

By the end of this period of transition, the New Liberalism had taken a firm hold on the Liberal Party as they applied this philosophy to their political ideology with a view to renewal. The traditional Manchester School of laissez-faire economics no longer seemed sustainable and research clearly showed that the social fabric was fraying. The rising, educated middle classes were looking for political leadership. British socialism had, in many respects, developed out of the core concepts of Liberalism, but it was beginning to occupy ground that had seemed firmly Liberal. Public debate centred on questions around the role of the state in the midst of misery, what sort of provision should be made for the welfare of citizens, and what responsibility citizens should have for their own welfare.

Given the divisions within the leadership of the Liberal Party, the debate was divergent. 'Advanced liberals' took the traditional, independent model of the individual and placed that free individual squarely within the community. They also looked towards the organic model but rather than argue 'the survival of the fittest', they questioned any model that did

not conceive of the individual as part of society or suggested that the individual only acted in self-interest, or as merely an economic 'rational actor'. They moved towards an approach which, they argued, understood the social environment as separate but still part of the individual. It was a framework that held both rights and responsibilities as core to the idea of the individual's place. 'Liberty and welfare became twin goals, each in a way defining and explaining the other.'[27] Further, rights and responsibilities, and the attendant definition of liberty, were not limited to a single state. In this perspective, liberty encompassed the world.

But the New Liberalism also sought to understand its differences from the rising socialist ideas, and the debate over liberty versus equality illustrates this difference in views. Socialists, and particularly Fabians, set out systems for creating equality based on the older mechanical model of human nature, whereas the New Liberal approach viewed that as not only unhelpful but counterproductive. The advance of equality, New Liberals held, went against the 'true' nature of the free man because true liberty cannot be gained at the expense of others. To that end, they offered a system of rights and responsibilities incumbent upon liberty. So, even as early socialists were developing state mechanisms that held equality to be the main goal, Liberals were shifting from their atomistic view of the individual to place them within the community but with responsibilities.

This debate as to the role of the individual leads directly into ideas − particularly those of Hobhouse − on the role of the state. The state, in this view, should not be coercive as that did not 'benefit man'. If he acted not by his own will but by that of the state, he had not expanded his own morality but only conformed under threat:

Now when a man overcomes a bad impulse by his own sense of right and wrong his will asserts itself, and it is by such assertions of the will that personality is developed … But where he is merely coerced no such development takes place. On the contrary, so far as coercion extends there is a certain moral pauperisation, the exertion of will is rendered unnecessary and is atrophied.[28]

The state, then, looked at from the perspective of the individual, is based not on control but on the 'self-directing power of personality', and liberty, instead of being a luxury or additional benefit of a peaceful society, is a rational necessity.

The state and the New Liberalism

Hobhouse also explored the function of the state from the state's perspective. His argument flowed directly from his notions of the individual and of liberty, in that he did not see the state as responsible for clothing and feeding its people but for creating the circumstances in which each individual could develop their personality in an ideal of harmony:

> Similarly we may say now that the function of the State is to secure conditions upon which its citizens are able to win by their own efforts all that is necessary to a full civic efficiency. It is not for the State to feed, house, or clothe them. It is for the State to take care that the economic conditions are such that the normal man … can by useful labour feed, house, and clothe himself and his family. The 'right to work' and the right to a 'living wage' are just as valid as the rights of person or property. That is to say, they are integral conditions of a good social order.[29]

It should be noted that he reserved for the state those roles

By the end of this period of transition, the New Liberalism had taken a firm hold on the Liberal Party.

and functions that required a centralised overview, such as defence or child labour. This was not unusual, even within old Liberalism.[30] In this way, he could accommodate his ideas on social welfare and social reform with liberty for the individual.

Conclusion

The Liberals did not die in 1886, but they were compelled by global economics as well as the social and biological sciences, to adapt both their overall philosophy and their tactical political ideology. As a party of power they found themselves at the heart of the challenges presented by the drivers of social change and the debates surrounding economic individualism and the nature of communities in terms of social reform.

New forms of communication and of campaigning made them keenly aware of the competition. They knew that they needed a political narrative that would not abandon their heritage but would enable them to carry the best of their philosophy into the future. Their progress was not straightforward, as is evidenced by the three overlapping episodes during this period of global change, but resulted in both a philosophy of the New Liberalism and an ideology that was carried into the 1906 government.

As Freeden puts it, 'Liberal social reform was the meeting ground, if not the fusion of a science and an ethics … this extended that scope of the study of society as well as assimilating liberal thought in the most important scientific trends of the time … liberals now appreciated that man as a social being was the basic concept of political thought'.[31]

Alison Holmes is a post-doctoral fellow at the Rothermere American Institute at Oxford University. She worked for the Liberal Democrats from 1987–97 including three years in Paddy Ashdown's office and senior positions in both the 1992 and 1997 general election campaigns.

> They knew that they needed a political narrative that would not abandon their heritage but would enable them to carry the best of their philosophy into the future.

1 The Rainbow Circle was formed in 1896 and together with its publication, *Progressive Review,* was designed to involve members across arts, sciences, politics and media. These included J. A. Hobson and Ramsay MacDonald. As well as influencing the public media debate on social reform, ten of its members were elected in the Liberal landslide of 1906, thus making a significant contribution to the social reform agenda in terms of practical politics.

2 A. G. Gardiner, 'What is the New Liberalism?' Introduction to *The New Liberalism: Speeches by Lloyd George* (London: *The Daily News,* 1909), p.1.

3 John Roach, *Social Reform in England 1780–1880* (London: B.T. Batsford, 1978), p. 16.

4 Michael Freeden, *The New Liberalism: An Ideology of Social Reform* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978), p. 247.

5 Winston Spencer Churchill, *Lord Randolph Churchill* (London: Macmillan, 1906), Vol. I, pp. 268–69.

6 Gardiner, 'What is the New Liberalism?' pp. 1–3.

7 L. T. Hobhouse, *Liberalism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1911; reprint, 1964), pp. 32–33.

8 Jose Harris, *Private Lives, Public Spirit: Britain 1870 – 1914* (Chippenham: Penguin Books, 1994), p. 5.

9 Helen Merrell Lynd, *England in the Eighteen-Eighties: Towards a Social Basis for Freedom* (London: Oxford University Press, 1945), p. 7. Lynd is not alone in making this observation. Both social reform writers at the time and contemporary authors such as Freeden identify this decade as one of internal change in party thinking.

10 Thomas Mackay, *Methods of Social Reform: Essays Critical and Constructive* (London: John Murray, 1896), p. 1.

11 H. V. Emy, *Liberals, Radicals, and Social Politics 1892–1914* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973), p. 107.

12 C. F. G. Masterman (ed.), *The Heart of the Empire: Discussions of Problems of Modern City Life in England* (Ed. B. B. Gilbert; Brighton: Harvester Press, 1973), pp. 5–6.

13 Ibid. p. xviii.

14 Elie Halévy, *Imperialism and the Rise of Labour (1895–1905), Halevy's History of the English People in the Nineteenth Century Vol. 5* (London: Ernest Benn Limited, first paperback edition, 1961), p. vii.

15 George W. Southgate, *English Economic History* (London: J. M. Dent and Sons Ltd., 1962), pp. 344–45.

16 M. W. Flinn, *An Economic and Social History of Britain 1066–1939* (London: Macmillan, 1962), p. 326.

17 This phenomenon became known as the 'sweated trades', lumping together a large range of industries, including nailers and match-box-makers as well as cobblers and piece-workers. The term gradually became more focused on the textile industry and those working at home, domestic workshops and the practice of 'putting out'. (Duncan Bythell, *The Sweated Trades: Outwork in Nineteenth-Century Britain* (London: Batsford Academic, 1978.) The 'Sweated Movement' was a social campaign to address this problem.

18 John Davis, *A History of Britain, 1885–1939* (New York: St Martin's Press, 1999), p. 17.

19 Gregor McLennan, David Held and Stuart Hall (eds.), *State and Society in Contemporary Britain* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1984), p. 17.

20 The Settlement Movement was established by Canon Samuel Barnett as a place for young educated men and women to live in disadvantaged areas to improve understanding.

21 Seth Koven, *Slumming: Sexual Politics in Victorian London* (Princeton and London: Princeton University Press, 2004).

22 Ernest Barker, *Political Thought in England 1848–1914* (London: Thornton Butterworth, 1930), p.19.

23 Ibid., pp. 20, 22, 208.

24 W. Cunningham, *The Progress of Capitalism in England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1916); William Harbutt Dawson, *Protection in Germany: A History of German Fiscal Policy during the Nineteenth Century* (London: P.S. King & Son, 1904); Southgate, *English Economic History.*

25 G. M. Trevelyan in Masterman, *The Heart of the Empire,* p. 408.

26 Ian Adams, *Ideology and Politics in Britain Today* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1998), p. 49.

27 Freeden, *The New Liberalism,* pp. 13–14.

28 L. T. Hobhouse, *The Elements of Social Justice* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1922), p. 67.

29 Hobhouse, *Liberalism,* p. 66.

30 L. T. Hobhouse, *Social Evolution and Political Theory* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1922).

31 Freeden, *The New Liberalism,* pp. 256–57.