

# DAVID LLOYD NONCONFORMITY AND RA

David Lloyd George took a natural place in both radical and nonconformist traditions, on account of his family background and his upbringing in Wales. **Ian Machin** examines his story from 1890 to 1906. In particular, he traces how Lloyd George's performance in relation to the Education Bill of 1902 and its aftermath was of pivotal significance in his career, building his political position in time for the Liberals' return to office in December 1905, which in turn enabled him to demonstrate his striking abilities in subsequent years.



**A**LTHOUGH BORN IN Manchester, Lloyd George was taken to Wales by his Welsh parents when he was two months old, in 1863. They lived in Pembrokeshire, his schoolmaster father William's native county, where William took the lease of a smallholding for health reasons, but died from tuberculosis in 1864.

David and his sister (a brother, William, was born posthumously) were then taken by their mother to live at Llanystumdwy, near Criccieth in south Caernarfonshire, at the home of her brother Richard Lloyd, a lay preacher for the Disciples of Christ and owner of a small shoemaking business. 'Uncle Lloyd' acted as a father to his

# DAVID LLOYD GEORGE

## RADICALISM, c.1890 – 1906

sister's three children and greatly influenced them.

When David was born, modern British radicalism – having a central aim of franchise extension and reform, and further aims, especially nonconformist ones, to advance equality – was about a hundred years old; and nonconformity – avowing and demonstrating religious separation from the established Church of England, and to a lesser extent that of Scotland – was about three hundred. The two often formed a natural partnership, though this was by no means an exclusive one – many radicals were not Dissenters, and many Dissenters were not radicals.

Radicals never formed an organised political party of their own, or even an organised section within a party, though radicals who supported a particular reform quite often formed an association to work for it by political means (for example the Anti-Corn Law League, the Chartists, and the Anti-State Church Association, which was founded in 1844 and known as the Liberation Society from 1853). Radicals had been loosely attached to the Whig party before 1830, and generally became part of the broadening Liberal Party, as the Whigs were coming to be known by the mid-1830s. However, there continued to be some marked differences between Whigs and radicals, and between some radicals and other radicals, in the Liberal Party. This was still the case, to a reduced extent, after the party split over Irish home rule in 1886.

Nineteenth-century nonconformity used radical methods and support to seek the abolition of Anglican privilege in regard to education, payment of church rates and tithes to help maintain parish churches, the use of parish burial grounds, and an established position as a state church. By 1880 these aims – though not disestablishment or abolition of tithes – had been largely attained; and disestablishment in general was encouraged by the passage of that reform for Ireland in 1869, though further hopes of achieving it were disappointed in Parliament in the early 1870s and in the general election of 1885.<sup>1</sup> Wesleyanism had initially provided a variation from this radical-nonconformist connection by inclining towards Toryism, but by the later nineteenth century Wesleyans were coming to have more political resemblance to the Congregationalists and Baptists, which (together with the Quakers and Unitarians and some Methodist and Presbyterian denominations) were the strongest radical elements among nonconformists.

His upbringing seemed to make Lloyd George a radical of the radicals and a nonconformist of the nonconformists, impressive in the pronounced religious separatism in which he was reared. His sect, the Disciples of Christ, or Campbellites, had been founded in America by Alexander Campbell earlier in the nineteenth century (they were much more numerous in the United States than they

became in Britain, and one of their most prominent later members was Ronald Reagan). Uncle Richard Lloyd's chapel at Criccieth had previously belonged to the Scotch Baptists (founded in Edinburgh in 1765, and owing their establishment in North Wales to a sea journey from Glasgow to Caernarfon by missionaries). Before joining the Scotch Baptists the chapel had belonged to the main British Baptist denomination, the Particular Baptists. Successive secessions by the chapel from both the Particular Baptists and the Scotch Baptists had resulted from a search for pure and pristine Christianity. The secession from the Scotch Baptists and union with the Disciples took place in 1841, when Richard Lloyd's father (David Lloyd George's grandfather) was minister. The Disciples, although maintaining the practice of adult baptism, were not at that time Baptist by affiliation, though the Welsh ones became so much later when they joined the Welsh Baptist Union in the 1930s. As well as holding to adult baptism, the Disciples believed in the literal truth of the Bible, had no formal creeds and no ordained and salaried ministry, and eschewed the 'elitist' title of Reverend.

Thus David's early environment was intensely religious. As a boy, he and his family walked two miles each way to and from his uncle's chapel at Criccieth, three times on Sundays and once on Wednesdays. As a fourteen year-old at the National (Anglican) elementary

Left:  
David Lloyd  
George in 1903

school at Llanystumdwy he organised a refusal to recite the Apostle's Creed on an important formal occasion; and this revolt, although failing at first, ultimately succeeded in gaining some local concessions for Dissenting pupils. It was his first known radical action, the first of his repeated challenges to the Established Church, and the first of his many involvements in disputes over religious education. It also brought him his first taste of fame, if only as yet in Llanystumdwy.<sup>2</sup>

By 1884, when he was twenty-one and newly launched as a solicitor in Criccieth, David was developing promising powers of eloquence and organisation as a champion of radical causes which were largely (though not exclusively) nonconformist – such as disestablishment, temperance, opposition to the levy of tithes, undenominational education, and the right of non-Anglicans to burial in parish churchyards. These causes – though none of them required any kind of religious commitment from their supporters, and all of them had some radical Anglican support – were notably strong in Wales because of its nonconformist majority which, through suffrage extension and the introduction of the secret ballot in 1872, enjoyed rapidly increasing political strength from the general election of 1868 onwards.<sup>3</sup> The number of nonconformists returned for Welsh constituencies rose strikingly, from none in 1865 to twenty-two (out of a total of thirty-four MPs) in 1892.<sup>4</sup>

This period coincided with Lloyd George's childhood and youth. In 1892 he was, though now an MP, still under thirty – an aspiring young politician who was strongly identified, as a radical nonconformist, with a very marked contemporary trend in Welsh politics. Behind his return to Westminster in 1890 lay several years of assiduous local radical activity on his part. He had been secretary of the South Caernarfonshire Anti-Tithe League and of the local branch of the United Kingdom Alliance (the main temperance organisation). As a solicitor he successfully vindicated nonconformist claims under the Burials Laws Amendment Act of 1880 by winning the Llanfrothen burial case in 1888. This highly controversial case made his name widely known in North Wales as a radical nonconformist

champion, and was shortly followed by his selection as Liberal candidate for Caernarfon Boroughs.<sup>5</sup>

In these early years the main thrust of Lloyd George's radical activity was opposition to the privileged position of landowners and the Established Church, chiefly in a rural context such as his home area. But he also looked for the support of radicals in the large towns. Nonconformity was strong in many of these, and whereas questions of tithe, denominational education, and churchyard burials flourished more in a rural environment, disestablishment and temperance were at least as strong in the towns as in the country. Lloyd George could also hope to ally with urban reformers through an interest in the general question of social reform. In a speech of February 1890 he said of disestablishment, land and drink reform: 'however drastic and broad they may appear to be, they after all simply touch the fringe of that vast social question which must be dealt with in the near future'.<sup>6</sup> Thus, two months before his election to Parliament, he revealed his concern with alleviating the living and working conditions of society. Later, referring to his own birth in a major industrial city, he proclaimed himself 'a Lancashire lad' to audiences in his native county. However, the general reform of living and working conditions was probably not among his major concerns before he entered government in 1905.

Lloyd George's attachment to radicalism was not questioned before 1906 (when this article's main treatment ends), but thereafter it became in time subject to suspicion and doubt, especially when he took to proposing, and later joining and leading, coalition governments with the Conservatives. More knowledge about his personal life and beliefs might have produced earlier doubts about his loyalty to nonconformity. In public he always appeared as a sure and leading Dissenter, a sound and loyal product of the faith, and even perhaps the morality, which he had been taught. After his election to parliament this image was extended from Wales to England. In England he became a committee member of the fifty-year-old Liberation Society (Society for the Liberation of Religion from State Patronage and Control) and

the National Free Church Council founded in 1896 (representing a great many local Free Church councils, mostly commenced in the 1890s). He addressed the assemblies of the Congregational and Baptist Unions, and initiated the formation of the Nonconformist Parliamentary Council in 1898.<sup>7</sup> He always retained membership of his family chapel at Criccieth, and joined Baptist congregations in London (after 1890 he seems to have been generally regarded as a Baptist).

It appears, however, that beneath all this public religious commitment and activity he might not have had a consistent Christian faith. During his teenage years he had an extended period of doubt, leading him into strong sympathy with Positivism, though by the time he was twenty he had returned to Evangelicalism.<sup>8</sup> But he was restless, critical and individualistic in personality, and probably continued to speculate about his religion, perhaps having further periods of doubt – though he did not give posterity many clues about this matter. Some of his biographers, for example Ffion Hague, have suggested that he lost his faith as a youngster and did not get it back.<sup>9</sup> On the other hand, one of his daughters, Lady Olwen Carey Evans, tended to present him as a consistent believer in adult life.<sup>10</sup> The matter might be more complex and variable than is suggested by either of these opinions. Perhaps another biographer in the family, his estranged elder son Richard, who succeeded him as Second Earl Lloyd-George but was cut out of his will, was accurate in saying that 'my father's religious beliefs fluctuated, and there were periods in his life when he lost faith'.<sup>11</sup> The Baptist Union Assembly was perhaps over-optimistic (and was not quite accurate in regard to his early denominational connection) in saying of him just after his death: 'They rejoice that in his days of power and in those of retirement he never renounced his early faith but remained loyal to the denomination in which he first heard and confessed it'.<sup>12</sup>

More clearly than over the uncertain matter of his beliefs, Lloyd George stood apart (in practice if not in theory) from nonconformist moral teaching. The problem here was his behaviour

**In these early years the main thrust of Lloyd George's radical activity was opposition to the privileged position of landowners and the Established Church, chiefly in a rural context such as his home area.**

in private life. The difficulty did not occur over drink, as the ardent young temperance campaigner seemed to retain his hatred of over-indulgence in alcohol for the rest of his life. This was one of the reasons for his strained relations with his son Richard, who in his view became too fond of drink. He denounced in trenchant evangelical terms the Unionists' mild Licensing Bill of 1904 (which eased financially the situation of publicans), saying that 'the arm of the Most High is uplifted against it'.<sup>13</sup> He also commented in a letter home on one of Asquith's (when Prime Minister) occasionally rather inebriated entries to the House of Commons: 'The Prime Minister came to the House last night in a very drunken state [to attend a debate on the Protestant succession to the throne]. The Tories behaved very honourably ... Lord Hugh Cecil said privately to Churchill, "I do rather object to settling the fate of the Protestant Succession with the aid of a drunken Christian and two sober Jews [Herbert Samuel and Rufus Isaacs]"'.<sup>14</sup>

Rather, the division between Lloyd George's conduct and the moral injunctions he received in youth occurred over his signal failure to fulfil the role of a model husband and family man which was expected of a leading nonconformist. He was genuinely attached to his first wife, Margaret Owen, to whom he was married for fifty-three years until she died in 1941, and with whom he had five children from 1889 to 1902. But theirs seemed a marriage of opposites. David was restless, gregarious and adventurous, probably happier with a varied metropolitan kind of life (and with continental holidays with a fellow-MP from the Welsh party) than with a domesticated existence in rural Wales. Margaret was comparatively passive and home-loving, seemingly much more interested in life in Criccieth than life in London. Consequently they lived apart for long periods. Margaret spent much of her time in Criccieth while David was absorbed in his parliamentary life in London. In these circumstances it was not altogether surprising that he became involved in a series of amorous relationships in the capital.

But his tendency to do this began in Wales, not in London.

**The division between Lloyd George's conduct and the moral injunctions he received in youth occurred over his signal failure to fulfil the role of a model husband and family man which was expected of a leading nonconformist.**

Almost immediately after his marriage in 1888 he was seeking social companionship elsewhere, and soon became involved with 'Mrs J', a young widow living in Caernarfon who was attached to his political and social circles. In 1889 she gave birth to a son, rumoured to be Lloyd George's.<sup>15</sup> If David was to keep the parliamentary candidacy for Caernarfon Boroughs for which he had been selected the previous year, it was essential to prevent any proof of the rumour from coming out. Another pressing necessity was that no word about the rumour should reach his recently married wife. Fortunately, 'Mrs J' had David's political and family interests at heart. She agreed, in return for an annuity, that no documentary or photographic evidence of her son's existence should ever reach the public eye. David's marriage and parliamentary candidacy were both saved. Probably no other entry of a future Prime Minister to parliament was preceded by such fraught circumstances.

The rumours about Lloyd George's fatherhood could not end at this point, however. 'Mrs J's' son was born within a few months of David's eldest legitimate child, Richard, and as time went on it could not fail to be noticed that there was a strong physical resemblance between them. The Lloyd George children apparently came to believe that they had a half-brother living in Caernarfon, and Richard (no doubt David too) was anxious in later years that he and his half-brother should not appear together in public and exhibit the resemblance.<sup>16</sup>

Margaret Lloyd George seems eventually to have become resigned to her husband's repeated infidelities, but his behaviour caused fractious relations with his children, notably with Richard and later with Megan (his youngest child). These relations worsened after he took a permanent mistress, Frances Stevenson, in 1913. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that Lloyd George was disregarding in private the nonconformity, indeed the Christianity, which he upheld in public. Perhaps in regard to faith, and certainly in regard to morality, the most prominent and powerful Dissenter since Oliver Cromwell (in terms of political influence) was a weak and wavering Christian.

The concern over his candidacy created by the 'Mrs J' affair having been surmounted, Lloyd George stood for Caernarfon Boroughs in a by-election in April 1890. Some local nonconformist ministers were prominent among his supporters. He defeated his Conservative opponent by only eighteen votes, but held the seat for fifty-five years without a break, until he was made an Earl a few months before his death in 1945.

There was a long, largely frustrating period before Lloyd George gained a handsome reward for much striving and struggle as a backbencher by the conferment of a Cabinet post when the Liberals took office in December 1905. During this period his radical objectives – whether they had a strong nonconformist tinge or not – had little chance of success. He had to contend with a Conservative government until 1892; a shaky Liberal government from 1892 to 1895, possessing a majority of only forty which was dependent on keeping the support of the Irish Home Rule party; and, for ten years thereafter, a strong Conservative and Liberal Unionist coalition which came into office with an overall majority of 152 in 1895.

These were clearly unfavourable conditions for the passage of radical legislation, and Lloyd George saw little success for his efforts in parliament. Some of the Conservatives' reforms, notably the introduction of compulsory elementary education in 1891 and the passage of a Workmen's Compensation Bill in 1897, appealed to radicals. So too did two measures passed by the Liberal government of 1892–95 – a bill of 1894 establishing additional elected local government councils and Sir William Harcourt's budget of that year introducing death duties. But Irish home rule was defeated in 1893 by the House of Lords, and hopes for the passage of Welsh disestablishment in the two succeeding years came to nothing.<sup>17</sup> The Liberals had one success in opposing Unionist bills – their defeat of an ill-supported Elementary Education Bill of 1896, which sought to strengthen the funding of denominational schools (which were mostly Anglican or Roman Catholic). As well as the resistance of Liberals, there was considerable Unionist opposition to this bill. The government was forced to

withdraw it, and a diluted substitute was passed the following year.<sup>18</sup>

This was a tale of considerable frustration for Lloyd George. He had no success, moreover, in his efforts to give more weight to Welsh radical claims, by making Welsh Liberal MPs more independent of the other Liberal members and supporting a Welsh home rule campaign. In 1894, claiming that a statement by Harcourt, leader of the House of Commons, that a Welsh disestablishment bill would be introduced that session was not a definite pledge, Lloyd George began to talk of the need for more independent action by the Welsh radical MPs. They should 'stand on the ground of independency and tell the Government that they would not receive Welsh support to break their pledges to Wales'. Two other Welsh MPs (Frank Edwards and D. A. Thomas) supported Lloyd George, followed by a third (Herbert Lewis), but no more. The majority of Welsh Liberal MPs isolated them by remaining loyal to the party whips, and Lloyd George's effort was known somewhat pityingly as 'the Revolt of the Four'. It was clearly not an adequate foundation for an independent Welsh party, similar to the Irish Home Rulers, which Lloyd George had said he wanted to create before the next general election.

The Revolt of the Four did inspire a recently-formed Welsh Home Rule League, *Cymru Fydd* (Young Wales).<sup>19</sup> This was originally inspired by Tom Ellis, MP for Merioneth, but Lloyd George led it after Ellis became a Liberal whip. The league broke down at a meeting at Newport, Monmouthshire, in January 1896, through friction between North and South Wales delegates. The South Wales Liberal Federation, not wanting to damage its region's increasingly valuable economic links with England, refused to join the North Wales Liberal Federation in a national home rule organisation; and, in consequence, *Cymru Fydd* collapsed. Yet a third disappointment for Lloyd George in his quest for an independent party for Wales came in 1899, when he failed to persuade the Welsh Liberal MPs to declare themselves an autonomous branch of the Liberal Party.

Thus Lloyd George had campaigned assiduously in the 1890s

**Lloyd George had campaigned assiduously in the 1890s for Welsh radical issues, including home rule, but had achieved nothing. He had become known as 'the MP for Wales' on account of all his efforts for his country.**

for Welsh radical issues, including home rule, but had achieved nothing. He had become known as 'the MP for Wales' on account of all his efforts for his country; and he might have continued in this role for the rest of his life, had not his political involvements and prospects rather dramatically broadened at the beginning of the new century. On the other hand, had home rule for Wales been obtained he might have become First Minister in a Welsh Government, and the wider Britain would have been deprived of his services as outstanding social and democratic reformer, war leader, Prime Minister and world statesman.

Lloyd George's aims might have achieved little in the 1890s, but he had spoken and campaigned widely and the vigour of his comparative youth was seen as a desirable asset. In 1901 Dr Joseph Parker, Chairman of the Congregational Union of England and Wales, said in relation to a current need to strengthen the Liberation Society: 'a strong infusion of Lloyd Georgeism would do us a world of good, and by Lloyd Georgeism I simply mean high spirit, hopeful courage and invincible determination'.<sup>20</sup> 'A strong infusion of Lloyd Georgeism' in the form of Lloyd George himself was what Liberalism was about to get. He shortly made a mark in two episodes – in the first he had a dramatic experience outside parliament which brought him to widespread notice, in the second he engaged in persistent parliamentary debating on a controversial issue which considerably raised expectations of him.

The first episode was the Boer War, which caused bitter divisions amongst Liberals, including nonconformists.<sup>21</sup> Lloyd George opposed the war, one of a small minority in his party. The second episode was a long parliamentary conflict over the Education Bill of 1902, which he also opposed. He succeeded in neither policy. The Boer War continued to be waged regardless of his opposition. The Education Bill got through in spite of his emphatic condemnation, and in spite of very wide admiration of his parliamentary performance (if not of his arguments) among MPs. Though defeated, he was a much better known and a more effective politician after these episodes than before, and after 1902 he was

coming to be seen as a potential candidate for high office.

The Boer War brought Lloyd George a valuable increase in fame at the price of much unpopularity and violent onslaughts on him. He was physically attacked at meetings in Glasgow, Liskeard (Cornwall), Birmingham, and even at Bangor in his own constituency. The Birmingham affray, in December 1901, brought him the most notoriety. A crowd of at least 30,000 tried to storm the building where he had come to address a meeting. Inside the hall missiles were thrown at him on the platform; two deaths occurred in the rioting, and Lloyd George might have been a third mortality if he had not been smuggled out of the hall disguised as a policeman.<sup>22</sup> It was a traumatic baptism of fire for the future premier.

A few months after this, Lloyd George's new fame was reinforced by intense and protracted disputes over education policy. The Unionist government, having been foiled in its attempt to pass a substantial bill in 1896, and having consolidated its rule by another decisive election victory in 1900, revived its effort in the session of 1902 to carry a major education measure. Their bill, applying to England and Wales, sought to ease the financial position of denominational schools by allowing (later, after an amendment, compelling) the education committees of local councils – to which local authority for education would be transferred – to give aid from the local rates to those schools without requiring that they control them (apart from some supervision of their secular teaching). Lloyd George was initially rather ambivalent in his view of the bill, and approved of its proposed administrative arrangements. But the fact that the bill considerably reinforced the influence of clergy over education caused him to take his familiar line of strong opposition to such a policy. One of his sentences in the parliamentary debates on the question showed both anti-Ritualism – though he was happy to welcome the anti-erastianism which was present in the current Ritualist trend in the Anglican Church – and fears for national security at a time of increased foreign hostility to Britain on account of the Boer War. At such a time especially, he indicated, he could only deplore the bill's

proposal to advance the influence of the parson and the priest by means of public aid to church schools: 'For the sake of teaching dogmas to children who cannot understand them, we in the midst of our difficulties and the rocks that surround us propose to put the chaplain on the bridge ... It is a mad proposal'.<sup>23</sup>

In the Commons he was the leading opponent of Arthur Balfour, who was in charge of the bill. In marathon debates at the committee stage, which lasted for over five months (from June to December 1902), Lloyd George spoke 160 times, and his relentless bulldog determination won an unexpected tribute from Balfour: though his views were unacceptable, he was undoubtedly 'an eminent parliamentarian'.<sup>24</sup>

Never before, indeed, had Lloyd George so impressed himself on parliament, despite the failure of his attack on the bill, which moved rapidly through its later stages and became law on 18 December. The education dispute rumbled on for many years. Straight after the bill's passage, local councils containing nonconformist majorities (most of them were in Wales) began to refuse to meet their new obligation to support denominational schools out of the rates. The government countered this 'Welsh Revolt' by passing a Default Bill in 1904, providing for reduction of the state grant to councils which refused to pay their due to denominational schools. But 'passive resistance' – refusal by individuals to pay their rates – continued as a protest against the 1902 measure. In 1904–05 a remarkably strong, though brief, religious revival in Wales (led by the examiner Evan Roberts, with whom Lloyd George became acquainted) added 82,000 members to nonconformist chapels there – strengthening, as long as it lasted, the will to resist the new education policy as well as lending new force to the cause of disestablishment.<sup>25</sup>

It was not only in Wales that the disestablishment cause was currently enjoying some revival. The struggle over educational reform, wrote Guinness Rogers, a leading Congregational minister in London, 'has really gathered round the central idea of a State Church. The practical issue of the government policy has been not only to grant a new endowment to the State

Church, but also to give a fresh legislative sanction to the State Church principle.' Nonconformists were 'resisting the establishment of a State Church School as an annexe to the existing State Church'.<sup>26</sup>

The controversy over education in 1902–04 greatly helped to reunify the Liberals after their divisions over the Boer War. This made them a much more effective threat to the Unionists when the latter began, in 1903, to be weakened by their own divisions over tariff reform (a new protectionist policy which the Liberals opposed in defence of free trade). The Unionist coalition was driven to resign in December 1905, and Campbell-Bannerman undertook the formation of a Liberal government. Lloyd George then reaped the fruits of his impressive political activities since his first return to parliament in 1890, and especially those of the last few years, by being advanced to the Cabinet. He reached this position not directly through his opposition to the 1902 Education Bill – which the Liberal minority in the Commons united in trying to reject but which the Unionist majority successfully passed – but through his opposition to tariff reform, which the united Liberals successfully resisted because the Unionists were divided over it.

However, his performance in relation to the Education Bill of 1902 and its aftermath was of pivotal significance in Lloyd George's career, for the bill was of direct importance to England as well as Wales. He emerged from the education dispute in a more prominent political position. Thereafter, on account of the Liberals' return to office in December 1905 and their decisive election victory in the following month, he was able to build on this position to demonstrate his striking abilities through a variety of outstanding achievements in subsequent years.

*Ian Machin is an Emeritus Professor at the University of Dundee, where he taught modern British history from 1964 to 2002. His research and publishing activities have ranged from the Napoleonic Wars to the late twentieth century. His main publications have been two volumes on politics in relation to Church questions from 1832 to 1921. His shorter books have comprised studies of Catholic emancipation as an issue in the politics of*

*the 1820s; Disraeli; the rise of democracy in Britain from 1830 to 1918; the Liberal governments from 1905 to 1915; and British Churches and social issues in the twentieth century.*

**His performance in relation to the Education Bill of 1902 and its aftermath was of pivotal significance in Lloyd George's career, for the bill was of direct importance to England as well as Wales. He emerged from the education dispute in a more prominent political position.**

- 1 There is an extensive literature on these developments, including G.I.T. Machin, *The Rise of Democracy in Britain, 1830–1918* (Basingstoke, 2001); G.I.T. Machin, *Politics and the Churches in Great Britain, 1832 to 1868* (Oxford, 1977) and *Politics and the Churches in Great Britain, 1869 to 1921* (Oxford, 1987); D.W. Bebbington, *The Nonconformist Conscience: chapel and politics, 1870–1914* (London, 1982); K.O. Morgan, *Wales in British Politics, 1868–1922* (Cardiff, 1963, and later editions); S. Koss, *Nonconformity in Modern British Politics* (London, 1975); M. R. Watts, *The Dissenters*, vol. II: *The Expansion of Evangelical Nonconformity* (Oxford, 1995); J. Munson, *The Nonconformists: in search of a lost culture* (London, 1991); G.I.T. Machin, 'Disestablishment and Democracy, c.1840–1930', in E.F. Biagini, ed., *Citizenship and Community: Liberals, Radicals and Collective Identities in the British Isles, 1865–1931* (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 120–47.
- 2 K.O. Morgan, 'Lloyd George and Welsh Liberalism', in Judith Loades, ed., *The Life and Times of David Lloyd George* (Bangor, 1991), pp. 2–4; G.I.T. Machin, 'Lloyd George and Nonconformity', *ibid.*, p. 35; W.R.P. George, *The Making of Lloyd George* (London, 1976), pp. 17–20, 26–27, 75–76; P. Rowland, *Lloyd George* (London, 1976), pp. 14–15.
- 3 K.O. Morgan, *Wales in British Politics, 1868–1922* (2nd ed., Cardiff, 1970), pp. 1–119. Fifty years after its first edition in 1963, this book remains the fullest and most authoritative treatment of its subject.
- 4 *Ibid.*, pp. 18, 119.
- 5 On the Llanfrothen case see R. Hattersley, *David Lloyd George, the great outsider* (London, 2010), pp. 40–42.
- 6 W.R.P. George, *op. cit.*, p. 166.
- 7 W.R.P. George, *Lloyd George, Backbencher* (Llandysul, 1983), pp. 128–30; D.W. Bebbington, *The Nonconformist Conscience* (London, 1982), p. 75.
- 8 G.I.T. Machin, 'Lloyd George and Nonconformity', in Judith Loades, ed., *The Life and Times of David Lloyd George* (Bangor, 1991), p. 36; W.R.P. George, *The Making of Lloyd George*, p. 104ff.; William George, *My Brother and I* (London, 1958), pp. 75–79, 271–72.

*concluded on page 74*

## REVIEWS

Although the ex-Prime Minister's influence is difficult to assess, this study shows that Lloyd George's support for Hitler's disregard for existing agreements did nothing to halt the Fuhrer's progress or reduce the likelihood of war. Lloyd George was an appeaser, not because he was compelled by Britain's dwindling resources combined with the multitude of threats facing the British Empire, but through a misplaced faith in German intentions, whoever held power in Berlin. While some of

Rudman's conclusions may be challenged, her thought-provoking study identifies more motives for appeasement and is a welcome addition to the historiography.

*Dr Chris Cooper was recently awarded his PhD at the University of Liverpool. His doctoral thesis analysed the political career of Douglas Hogg, 1st Viscount Hailsham (1872–1950). He has published a number of journal articles on different aspects of modern British history and he teaches history at university.*

### Lloyd George and Leadership

*Continued from page 11*

- 25 Doris Kearns Goodwin, *Team of Rivals. The Political Genius of Abraham Lincoln* (Simon and Schuster, New York, 2005), p. 669.
- 26 Lord Riddell's *War Diary*, p. 135 (5 Nov. 1915).
- 27 Keith Middlemas (ed.), *Thomas Jones: Whitehall Diary*, Vol. I (Oxford University Press, 1969), p. 203 (13 June 1922); Lloyd George, *War Memoirs*, Vol. 2, pp. 2014–15.
- 28 Keith Middlemas (ed.), *Thomas Jones: Whitehall Diary*, Vol. III (Oxford University Press, 1971), p. 60 (27 April 1921).
- 29 Merrill D. Peterson, *Lincoln in American Memory* (Oxford University Press, New York, 1994), pp. 178–80. For Wilson, see David W. Blight, *Race and Reunion: the Civil War in American Memory* (Oxford University Press, New York, 1994), pp. 11–14.
- 30 David Lloyd George, *The Truth about the Peace Treaties* (Gollancz, 1938), Vol. 1, p. 232.
- 31 Ibid.
- 32 Lord Riddell, *Intimate Diary*, p. 226 (24 July 1920).
- 33 William D. Jones, *Wales in America* (University of Wales Press, 1976), pp. 184ff. There is a file on this visit in the Lloyd George of Dwyfor Papers (Parliamentary Archives, House of Lords, G/165).
- 34 Text of speech, Lloyd George of Dwyford Papers, G/165.
- 35 *The Times*, 31 Oct. 1923.
- 36 Text of speech in Lloyd George of Dwyfor Papers, G/165.
- 37 Drinkwater's play 'Abraham Lincoln' was first performed in 1918. He followed it up with a book, *Lincoln: the World Emancipator* (Houghton, Mifflin, Boston and New York, 1920).
- 38 Kenneth O. Morgan, *Michael Foot: the Life* (HarperCollins, London, 2007), p. 9.
- 39 John Vincent, *The Formation of the Liberal Party* (Constable, London, 1966), p. 211 on these themes.

### Lloyd George's Coalition Proposal of 1910

*Continued from page 23*

- 8 'Cabinet Memorandum: secret', 31 May 1910, Asquith papers, 23.
- 9 *The Times*, 13 April 1908.
- 10 M. V. Brett, *Journal and Letters of Reginald Viscount Esher*, vol. II (1934) p. 370.
- 11 Masterman, C. F. G. *Masterman*, p. 160.
- 12 Lloyd George to Balfour, 11 October 1910, Balfour papers Add Mss. 49692.
- 13 'The Criccieth Memorandum', 17 August 1910, in K. O. Morgan, *The Age of Lloyd George* (1971), pp. 150–55.
- 14 Austen Chamberlain, *Politics from Inside* (1936), p. 293.
- 15 Crewe to Asquith, 22 October

### David Lloyd George, Nonconformity and Radicalism

*Continued from page 17*

- 9 Ffion Hague, *The Pain and the Privilege: the women in Lloyd George's life* (London, 2008), p. 31.
- 10 Lady Olwen Carey Evans, *Lloyd George was my Father* (Llandysul, 1985), pp. 70–71. Cf. F. Owen, *Tempestuous Journey: Lloyd George, his life and times* (London, 1954), pp. 30–31.
- 11 Richard, Second Earl Lloyd-George, *My Father, Lloyd George* (London, 1960), pp. 20–21.
- 12 *Baptist Times*, 24 May 1945, p. 10.
- 13 J. Grigg, *Lloyd George, the people's champion, 1902–11* (London, 1978), p. 71.
- 14 Lloyd George to his wife, 21 Apr. 1911; K. O. Morgan, ed., *Lloyd George Family Letters, 1885–1936* (Cardiff and London, 1973), p. 155, including footnote 4.
- 15 Ffion Hague, op.cit., 104–06.
- 16 Ibid., p. 106.
- 17 G. I. T. Machin, *Politics and the Churches, 1869 to 1921* (Oxford, 1987), pp. 210–16; copy of memorial drafted by Lloyd George, dated 26 June 1893, signed by thirty Welsh Liberal MPs and sent to Gladstone as premier, in S. T. Evans Papers, National Library of Wales, p. 185; Lloyd George to his wife, 5 July, 7 Aug. 1893 (K. O. Morgan, ed., *Lloyd George Family Letters*, pp. 60–61); Gladstone to Stuart Rendel (MP for Montgomeryshire), 5 July 1893 (copy in Gladstone Papers, British Library Add. Mss. 44549, fo. 101; see also Rendel Papers, National Library of Wales); T. E. Ellis to D. R. Daniel, 3 Sept. 1893 (Daniel Papers, National Library of Wales, 41b); Lloyd George to William George, 24 Nov. 1893 (W. R. P. George, *Lloyd George, Backbencher*, p. 122); Lloyd George to his wife, 3 May 1894 (Lloyd George Papers, National Library of Wales 20412C, fo. 425); K. O. Morgan, *Wales in British Politics* (second ed., Cardiff, 1970), p. 140ff.; P. Rowland, *Lloyd George*, pp. 102–11; J. Grigg, *The Young Lloyd George* (London, 1973), pp. 146–49.
- 18 Machin, *Politics and the Churches, 1869–1921*, p. 212; D. Cregier, *Bounder from Wales: Lloyd George's career before the First World War* (Missouri, 1976), pp. 52–54.
- 19 Machin, *Politics and the Churches, 1869–1921*, pp. 225–30.
- 20 Machin, 'Lloyd George and Nonconformity', in Judith Loades, ed., *The Life and Times of David Lloyd George*, pp. 37–38.
- 21 D. W. Bebbington, *The Nonconformist Conscience*, pp. 106, 122–23; S. Koss, *Nonconformity in Modern British Politics*, pp. 32–33; H. McLeod, *Class and Religion in the late Victorian city* (London, 1974), p. 178.
- 22 S. Constantine, *Lloyd George* (London, 1992), p. 21.
- 23 Machin, *Politics and the Churches, 1869–1921*, p. 263 (and pp. 260–65).
- 24 Ibid., pp. 265–70; Grigg, *Lloyd George, the people's champion, 1902–11*, pp. 25–30, pp. 32–34; Bentley B. Gilbert, *David Lloyd George, a Political Life: the architect of change, 1863–1912* (London, 1987), pp. 215–66; D. Cregier, op.cit., pp. 80–85.
- 25 W. R. P. George, *Lloyd George, Backbencher* (Llandysul, 1983), p. 355.
- 26 J. Guinness Rogers, *An Autobiography* (London, 1903); quoted Machin, *Politics and the Churches, 1869–1921*, p. 270.