Half the copybook wisdom of our statesmen is based on assumptions which were at one time true or partly true, but are now less and less true day by day. We invent new wisdom for a new age. And in the meantime we must, if we are to do any good, appear unorthodox, troublesome, dangerous, disobedient to them that begot us.
John Maynard Keynes. 1925.

The measures we advocate in relation to all these things spring from one clear purpose. We believe with a passionate faith that the end of all political and economic action is not the perfecting or perpetuation of this or that piece of mechanism or organisation but that individual men and women may have life and that they may have it more abundantly.
Liberal Yellow Book, 1928.

Our task is a very different one. It is to spell out a clear vision of the society we want to achieve; to provide long-term goals to a people weary of the politics of pragmatism, expediency and compromise.
David Steel, June 1976.

Published and printed by:
North West Community Newspapers, 121 Princess Street, Manchester 1

2nd Edition Revised & Expanded

60p

MICHAEL MEADOWCROFT

LIBERAL VALUES FOR A NEW DECADE

Acknowledgement

This booklet prepared initially for the 1980 Liberal Assembly and now republished with minor amendments to take account of the debate there, has benefited from the comments of a number of friends particularly Ian Brodie-Brown, Andrew Ellis, Peter Knowlson and William Wallace, but the responsibility for its contents remains mine.

Michael Meadowcroft.

Biographical Note

Michael Meadowcroft is 39 and was leader of the Leeds City Council Liberal Group from 1968 to 1981, he was Liberal Party Local Government Officer 1962-67 and secretary to the Yorkshire Liberal Federation 1967-70; he was with the Joseph Rowntree Social Service Trust 1970-75 and is currently General Secretary of the Bradford Metropolitan Council for Voluntary Service; he has chaired the Liberal Party Assembly Committee since 1977; he has a M.Phil degree in Leeds Political History.

2nd Edition - Revised & Expanded - September 1981

LIBERAL VALUES FOR A NEW DECADE

Introduction

In the past decade the political world has changed dramatically and the current need to apply our political principles to the crisis in Western industralised society with its minimal growth, high inflation and increasing unemployment forces us to re-examine the principles themselves.

We will not get out of the present crisis simply by putting together a package of short-term policies. It needs a greater willingness to consider difficult questions than the British public has hitherto shown. Even so, in many campaigns and voluntary groups there are individuals who are becoming increasingly aware that the social trends and political processes that affect them and their work cannot be tackled in isolation. As a consequence there is a greater need to make clear the relevance of a consistent Liberal analysis and view of society – particularly as most of those committed to single issue campaigns and to voluntary and community work will find themselves instinctively in sympathy with liberalism. The Liberal party depends on Liberalism, rather than the other way round. To draw into active, consistent party work the many Liberals around us requires the continued development of a powerful Liberal Movement that is conscious of its history and secure in its philosophy.

Inevitably, and legitimately, different aspects of Liberalism are stressed to meet particular social conditions, for instance the development of the 'dual approach' in the 1970s specifically applied Liberal philosophy to a rapidly changing political scene. This meant allying work with those in the community committed to campaigning on issues important to them, with a representative democracy that seeks to create the conditions within which 'community politics' can thrive. The emphasis on spreading power and on involvement of the community is fully within mainstream liberalism and involves putting a particular emphasis on those aspects of Liberal philosophy that are vitally relevant to current problems.

Liberals endeavour to bring to their political action and thinking a particular awareness of and sensitivity to the need to delight in the success of those with whom they work. In particular Liberals attempt to provide a catalyst and enabling function rather than taking over projects or dominating voluntary groups. Inevitably and properly the aims of community politics dictate its strategy, and it has largely been the enthusiastic espousal of its aims and strategy that has led to the organisational and electoral growth of the Liberal Party in the 1970s.

However, in some respects, Liberals' excitement over the development of community politics led to a certain neglect of consideration of the political context in which it has to be placed. The relative lack of other vigorous thinking about the development of Liberal philosophy contributed to some tension within the party over the priorities that were to be stressed in considering co-operation with other parties, both in 1974 and during the Lib-Lab pact of 1977-78. The exciting volatility of British politics today requires a clear expression of modern Liberalism – not only to attract new workers and supporters but also to enhance the debates and discussions with non-Liberals.

The initiative was grasped at the 1979 Liberal Assembly with a full-length debate on Liberal Philosophy which demonstrated the fundamental unity of the Liberal movement, as well as the many facets of that unity. The following

year the Party's Standing Committee commissioned this booklet for a debate on Liberal values, and the presentation of a draft programme to the 1981 Assembly completes the cycle.

There is now considerable material on which to base discussions with others, such as the Social Democratic Party, who would wish to develop an alliance with Liberals. Similarly there is a yardstick by which to measure their political values and policies as and when they begin to be clarified. The social conditions in Britain today are too serious – and urgent – to be solved by easy options or by superficial judgements. Attention to more fundamental values may well require more effort but the situation demands precisely that.

THE HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

The great Reform Act of 1832 is a convenient marker for the start of the emergence of an identifiable Liberal Party bearing the name. There had been, of course, many Liberals in earlier centuries who fought for liberty and for radical causes, including John Milton, whose "Areopagitica" on the freedom of the Press is handed on symbolically from President to President at the Liberal Party Assembly, and Charles James Fox who championed the sovereignty of the people against the aristocracy. No separate socialist electoral organisation appeared in Britain until much later (in the sense of a root and branch opposition to the possession of private capital and to the organisation of industry for private profit). But socialist ideas were being expounded and formulated from the middle of the nineteenth century, fostered by the gross inequalities around them, and encouraged formally and informally by the growth of non-conformism in religion.

The main strategic emphasis of the early socialists was the promotion of working class candidates through the Liberal Party; initially both strands of "radical" thought found common ground in opposing Conservatives. Thus Chartists, the Rochdale Pioneers and early trade unionists sought electoral representation under the Liberal banner – if they sought it at all. Even when, from the 1890s, Labour candidates began to appear they were often acknowledged to be to the right of 'advanced radicals' in the Liberal party. Socialism at the time of the First International in 1864 was not as exclusive as it was soon to become. Libertarians such as Bakhunin and Proudhon believed they were as entitled to membership as Marx and those who followed his belief in the need for state control of economic power. The split between the two strands in 1872 previewed the later Liberal-Labour divergence and the jealousy over the guardianship of the radical tradition thereafter.

The political career of W. E. Gladstone spans the whole formation of the Liberal party; in particular its compassionate reforming politics at home, its determination over home rule for Ireland (and greater autonomy for Scotland and Wales) and its high moral tone on foreign affairs. During his leadership came the formation of the National Liberal Federation as an organised party outside parliament, and the reorientation of Liberal philosophy by T. H. Green towards a more activist or positive assertion of the necessary conditions for liberty. Green's thinking sought to respond to the growing socialist emphasis on inequality and the need for state action to combat exploitation.

Although the term was not used in its present sense, the Fabians in the early part of this century developed 'social democratic' ideas, in which, through the use of resources generated by the state – local as well as national – social conditions would be transformed and the lot of the working class improved. Political attention was concentrated, understandably, on improving the physical circumstances of the poor and deprived whilst Liberals such as L. T. Hobhouse and J. L. Hammond took liberalism closer to the social democratic position.

Even so the early Labour party was not completely monolithic. G. D. H. Cole and his fellow 'Guild Socialists' argued for a decentralised socialism based on workers' guilds. This approach was explicitly rejected by the 1918 Labour Party constitution in favour of state paternalism and by the mid-1920s guild socialism had virtually died out. David Steel recently summed it up excellently:

> "The early Labour party took four wrong turnings which have led the modern Party to its tragic destination. They were its acceptance as signposts to Labour orthodoxy of:
> – The special power of the Trade Unions
> – Class as the basis of the Party's appeal
> – The equation of the centralised State with Socialism
> – The Fabian preference for paternal authority over fraternal democracy.
> If these wrong directions had not been taken I believe the elements which radical liberals and socialists have in common would have found common political expression earlier." *('Labour At 80 – Time to Retire' LPD 1980)*

The recent changes in the Labour Party's policy and constitution – combining a commitment to widespread state ownership with rapidly increasing control over its elected representatives – takes it far nearer to the Eastern European communist model.

The social effects of the First World War and the disastrous divisions within the Liberal party in the decade after it allowed social democracy to gain electoral and political dominance – a development reinforced by the increased membership and influence of the trade unions, and the reorientation of politics around the divide between capital and labour, between the propertied classes and the working classes. With liberalism – and the Liberal party – pushed aside in this conflict, we owe a great debt to such Liberals as Ramsay Muir, Elliott Dodds, Maynard Keynes and William Beveridge, who re-thought and re-applied liberalism to the changing social demands. Through the inception of the Liberal Summer School they provided a forum for new ideas and fresh thinking – based, in Ramsay Muir's phrase on 'popular ownership' rather than public ownership.

The high point of social democracy came with the 1945-51 Labour Governments, much of whose reforming legislation was supported by the Liberal MPs. Having brought key industries such as coal, steel and the railways into public ownership they mistakenly felt that the success of the policy would be self-evident and would be greeted with acclaim. Similarly, the National Health Service was generally expected to meet the individual's medical needs automatically so that the service would before long pay for itself by increasing industrial and commercial productivity. Unfortunately for Labour, valuable though most of their reforms were, changes in physical circumstances do not of themselves change a person's heart and mind. Britain became a somewhat less unequal but no more free society than before.

By 1951 the Liberal Party had almost died. Only 109 candidates fought the General Election that year, of which two thirds lost their deposits. Only six Liberals were elected, and only one of those, Jo Grimond, had a three-cornered contest. But the circumstances were now beginning to be conducive to the revival of liberalism; on the one hand Labour appeared incapable of learning from its experiences in government and clung to the concept of the centralised and bureaucratic public corporation as the model for nationalized ownership, believed in state planning and control and paid too little attention to civil liberties and autonomy. On the other hand the illusion that the Tory party had absorbed some of the values and attitudes of liberalism was dispelled by the practice of Conservative governments and by Suez.

The Liberal Party marked time until Jo Grimond took over the leadership from Clement Davies in 1956 and began to work for his expressed aim 'to create a Left Party for the Left Programme.' Jo Grimond's leadership, perception and radicalism drew new converts to liberalism – particularly amongst young people – and by the early 1960s there was a torrent of new thinking: *New Orbits, Current Topics, New Outlook* and the weighty series of policy reports, through which can be traced the gradual shift once more towards libertarian ideas and away from social democracy. Whilst Labour was fighting itself to a standstill over Clause 4, Liberals were exploring radical ideas that Labour proved unable to come to terms with.

Such a trend was not confined to this country: the American 'New Left' was producing its 'Port Huron Statement' at the same time as the Young Liberals were preparing the 'Harle Skye Declaration' with a similar rejection of the obsession with planning, largeness and bureaucracy and, instead, an encouragement of human values and scale. Also an increasing number of more pragmatic Liberals, such as Wallace Lawler in Birmingham, provided a practical and activist response to such problems and to the lack of information available to ordinary people.

The social democrats' response to these expressions was unimaginative. They stuck to conventional solutions: more nationalisation, more centralisation and a pre-occupation with status, which involved the defence of sterling parity and the maintenance of forces East of Suez. Many idealistic younger people were driven into issue based political groups rather than into parties and interest in 'alternative' societies spread into all sorts of exotic forms. Ralph Turner recognised the trend:

> "Events in many spheres suggest that as an accepted principle, the injustice of material want has become commonplace so that it draws ready assent without arousing excitement and enthusiasm for its alleviation."

Whereas:

> ". . . for the first time in history it is common to see violent indignation expressed over the fact that people lack a sense of personal worth – that they lack an inner peace of mind which comes from a sense of personal dignity or a clear sense of identity . . . The idea that a man who does not feel worthy cannot find his place in life is an old one. The notion that he is indeed the victim of injustice is the new idea."

(in 'Contemporary Social Movements', British Journal of Sociology, December 1969)

The opportunity clearly exists for a radical party alert to the changing social climate to attract a new generation of idealists who are disenchanted with the present party battles but are discontented with inaction. Clearly, like all mass parties, the Liberal Party is a 'broad church' and contains within its ranks many different emphases on policy. But, in Russell Johnston's words:

> "If a political party fails to show itself as a coherent, unified and determined group of people, with specific aims, it will neither get the support of the public nor deserve it."

(in 'To Be A Liberal', SLP 1972)

It is to the framework and extent of that unity that we now turn.

DEFINITIONS, CONSTANTS AND SIGNPOSTS

Liberals sometimes request a snappy phrase to encapsulate liberalism in the way that it is thought that 'public ownership' and 'private enterprise' sum up Labour and Conservative attitudes respectively. Quite apart from the fact that such oversimplifications are harmful to political discussion, it is particularly futile to attempt to reduce liberalism to a single phrase because it is more an attitude of mind and a way of life than a political system. It is because of this crucial fact that an understanding of Liberal *philosophy* is vital to Liberals.

Other parties may win support on the basis of their policy programmes but Liberals are unlikely to *retain* support on the basis of Liberal policy unless those supporters gain an appreciation of Liberal attitudes and 'gut responses'. This is at the heart of the 'dual approach' of community politics and representational democracy: we often, rightly, win votes on the basis of our campaigns on local issues, but then lose them when the campaign is forgotten, because we are insufficiently clear about how to translate principles into successful practice.

Donald Wade in *'Our Aim and Purpose'*, started by defining the word:

> ". . . 'liberal' is derived from the Latin 'liber' and has a two-fold meaning: (1) free and (2) generous. From the first springs the demand for individual liberty; from the second come the attributes of fair-mindedness and tolerance and of generosity towards those who are oppressed or economically less fortunate than their fellows. These are some of the outstanding characteristics of the liberal attitude of mind."

A useful recent – and objective – definition of liberalism is found in the *'Dictionary of Modern Thought'* (Bullock and Stallybrass, Fontana, 1977):

> "LIBERALISM in its most characteristic contemporary expression emphasizes the importance of conscience and justice in politics, advocates the rights of racial and religious minorities and supports civil liberties and the right of the ordinary individual to be more effectively consulted in decisions which affect him."

The interesting omission from this definition is any reference to economics. It is a definition of *political* liberalism and not of what is claimed as *economic* liberalism by latter-day Conservatives in Britain and the United States.

For political liberals, the organisation of the economy is a secondary issue, to be approached from the perspective of how far different economic policies contribute to or detract from the conditions of liberty. It is not the primary issue, as extreme economic 'liberals' now argue, to which (as in Chile) political

and civil liberties must, if necessary be subordinated. During the period of sustained economic growth which followed the Second World War, Liberals (following Keynes) saw the mixed economy as the best means of pursuing prosperity without massive inequality, and social justice without oppressive centralisation. The transformation of Britain's economic circumstances (and, increasingly, of those of other industralised countries) by energy and resource constraints, by long term prospects of low growth and by continuing technological change, now requires us to reconsider carefully our approach to economic problems.

The preamble to the Liberal Party Constitution to which, theoretically, each member subscribes when joining the party, used to have the phrase 'a Liberal Commonwealth' rather than 'a Liberal Society' and, for all its datedness, I preferred it. If used in a broad sense it expressed a great deal that is of positive help. It includes four aspects that are common to every liberal society:

"wealth" of living standards: every individual has a right to food, shelter and clothing;

"wealth" of compassion; everyone gains from treating, or being treated, with sensitivity and understanding;

"Wealth" of talent and skill; society benefits when individuals within it use their abilities to manufacture, to entertain, or to communicate, for the general good rather than primarily for personal gain;

"Wealth" of culture; each community is enhanced by the guiding and fostering of its heritage.

A political movement that is zealous for values such as these is constantly involved in challenging the status quo. Not least because it is aware that the nature of human organisations is such that, however effectively they begin, they inevitably become staid, automatic and unresponsive. The Liberal knows that there is no Utopia which, when reached, allows him to cease from mental strife. Jo Grimond summed up the understanding and commitment needed:

> "Conviction can only come from a vision of the sort of society we want, from a Party which has picked out the faults in our present society. That fault is the flight from values. It is the uniformity, the discontented dullness, the secretiveness, the bureaucratic bumbledom of our society, combined with the Establishment terror of originality or excellence which are our diseases."
>
> *(The Times, September 1973)*

For the Liberal there are certain constant beliefs. The Liberal is committed to liberty, participation, partnership and diversity, and to a belief in the value of human personality. These are more vital to the Liberal than equality but the existence of great inequalities of wealth is inimical to the development of a Liberal Society and embitters communities and individuals. Consequently the Liberal works to reduce the inequalities between individuals, between communities and, particularly between countries. Significantly, however, the Liberal's belief in equality of resources stems from a commitment to the value of diffusing power rather than from envy or any passion for uniformity.

Liberals, in common with all political parties, have to work in part at least within a framework in which labels of 'Left' and 'Right' are affixed even to the extent of gradations of 'far Left', 'moderate Right' or 'centre'. In Britain the political spectrum is commonly understood in terms of the divide between

public ownership and private control. Donald Wade in 'Our Aim and Purpose' demonstrated the irrelevance of such criteria to Liberals. To us the extremes of radicalism and reaction are on the different, and more important, spectrum of libertarian versus totalitarian. It is an intrinsic aspect of that different spectrum that the extremes of Left and Right are both similarly totalitarian. In other words, the extremes of Left and Right as commonly understood actually bend round to join up, in linked opposition to a Liberal view of society.

Much of the current anxiety amongst some Liberals about 'centre' politics stems from an unnecessary concentration on the wrong set of values. Because the debate is not at the heart of the Liberal's concern we take a legitimately pragmatic and 'centre' position on the 'public' versus 'private' argument, supporting whichever solution offers the greater benefit. Thus Liberals supported the nationalisation of coal and opposed that of steel; similarly, on council house sales, Liberals say 'maybe'. On the question of spreading power and on participation, on which Liberals feel passionately, we are extremists, with both other parties equally reactionary at the opposite end of the spectrum.

Liberals, therefore, concentrate their attack on issues, neglected by others, where their analysis is the most penetrating and where their arguments are the most convincing. Particularly when this is even more urgent than when Jo Grimond wrote:

> ". . . three ideas – Equality, Freedom, Participation – are fundamental to the Left in politics . . . Of these three important ideas Liberals believe that participation at present is the one which needs developing most as far as Britain is concerned."
>
> *('The Liberal Challenge.' 1963)*

Fortunately for Liberals there are a number of recent and current writers who have set signposts for future radical thinking. These writers, whilst not necessarily describing themselves as liberals, have challenged many of the revered and received 'truths' of progressive thinking from a radical stand-point – to our considerable advantage. Paulo Freire on education, E. F. Schumacher on the economics of scale, Aurelio Peccei on human development and culture, Jacques Ellul on technology and moral issues, Noam Chomsky on the State and its power, Fred Hirsch on types of growth, the excellent 'Alternatives' series edited by Harford Thomas in 'The Guardian', and, above all, Ivan Illich on anti-professionalism – with his essentially liberal use of 'conviviality' as a mark of the good society – have all contributed to our application of liberal values to current problems and are well worth reading.

SOCIETY TODAY

Applying liberal values to the world around us requires an appreciation of the immense changes that have taken place in the past fifteen years or so. The problems faced by politicians and political thinkers today, particularly in industrialized Western Europe, were hardly dreamed of in the 1960s. Peter Jenkins, writing in *'The Guardian'* in September 1975, expressed it tersely:

> ". . . it remains to be seen whether democracy can thrive or even survive without the rates of growth to which we have been accustomed for a quarter of a century and which it is most improbable the western economies can achieve again for at least the next decade.

"In Britain we are at the threshold of the politics of decline, an unknown territory in the modern world of affluence and, until lately, seemingly boundless technological advance. It is small consolation to consider that we may not be after all, as we have been persuaded to believe, a unique case suffering from a 'British sickness' but rather the first advanced society to experience the tensions of democracy without rapid growth."

There are ten particular aspects of society today that constrain political change:

Its complexity: not particularly in technological terms – although this has relevance to the politician, whose specialism has to be the analysis of specialist advice – but in the apparent inter-relation of everything, even across national boundaries, so that decision making is fraught with 'knock on' problems which make it difficult for the individual to comprehend the effects of a decision or policy.

Its resistance to change: some crucial problems appear to have no solution so that the trends to lawlessness, instability and alienation (as well as economic recession) appear inexorable – particularly when society lacks appropriate mechanisms for change so that the resort to direct action itself contributes to these trends.

Its scale: the evolution of large cities, the development of huge council estates, the extended production and management lines, the size of the multinational company and of the world market it supplies, the emergence of public and private bureaucracies in which decisions are made by no-one.

Its declining resources: society depends on supplies of energy, minerals, timber etc which are being used up at a rate which cannot be sustained.

Its economic interdependence: the growth of integrated international production within multi-national companies, the legitimate competition from the developing countries and the easy mobility of imports and exports are all in conflict with the high wage, low productivity, enterprises that are now the rule in Britain.

Its still-rising expectations: western society has been encouraged – as much by vote-hungry politicians as anyone – to believe that society can continue to raise standards indefinitely, so that, for instance, there will eventually be heart transplants, detached houses and higher education for all.

Its precariousness: the increased tension between NATO and the Warsaw Pact, the volatile nature of the Middle East, the new parochiality and apparent capriciousness of the Islamic countries and the spread of nuclear weapons, all contribute to the possibility of a terminal conflict.

Its confusion: the public generally believes in deterrent punishment, national isolation, clobbering 'scroungers', and the restraint of 'deviants', such as gays and gypsies despite the evidence of 'expert' opinion and the efforts of enlightened leadership.

Its complacency: the lack of concern with the evident threats to our future economic and political stability, the comfortable assumption that something will turn up tomorrow and that we need not worry today.

Its self-defending institutions: unions, businesses, professions, parliament and the media all put out a 'business as usual' sign in the face of a rapidly changing world so as to protect their own existence and the structure they know.

Traditional remedies will have little impact in the face of these constraints and the central thrusts of Labour and Conservative parties, based as they are on economic systems and class prejudices, simply bounce off the problems. The recent rise in support for Liberals has, interestingly, coincided with steps towards very different alternatives. As Professor Ralf Dahrendorf points out:

"One of the most hopeful signs of the times is the discovery – the rediscovery perhaps – of values of human initiative and co-operation which seemed to get lost in the capitalist and social-democratic phase of social development."

(Sunday Times, 30 December 1979)

PRINCIPLES IN CONFLICT

Liberalism is not an abstract theory existing to provide mental stimulus for a handful of philosophers; it is a basis for political action. Its values are guidelines for a practical programme which entails grappling with the problems of government. The nature of the democratic system and the need to maintain stability and personal security inhibit the pace and extent of reforms. The liberating effect of liberalism in practice is as much through the very different style of government as the content of its government.

The following examples illustrate the problem of applying principles to particular issues:

Central government may well wish to impose policies, with which Liberals agree, on local authorities, as in the case of comprehensive education, and we need to decide how far we allow locally elected bodies to be illiberal for the sake of the principle of devolution;

Liberals accept the central theory of ecology and develop policies in the light of ecological imperatives; however the implications of applying the ecological approach to health issues require consideration of the benefit to the individual and the community of say, transplants and of abortions;

For Liberals freedom is the paramount political value but there cannot (as Conservatives implicitly believe) be freedom to exploit. Liberals have therefore been the strongest advocates of legislation in housing, environmental health, and consumer protection, for instance, to prevent the infringements of an individual's civil rights:

Liberals have consistently opposed all forms of censorship but our recognition of the insidious harm of racial hatred has meant that we support legislation which limits publications which incite racial hatred; Freedom to negotiate pay and conditions of work is a theoretical Liberal principle but experience demonstrates that the greater good requires an incomes policy – noting that the public appears ***both*** to want to reduce pay differentials ***and*** also to argue for comparability of pay, which tends to increase differentials.

Thus, although philosophy is a crucial foundation – indeed, the more troubled the times the more important the principles are as a guiding light – the steps to its implementation need to be built into the democratic structure so that the gains fought for and won can themselves be used as the base for the next step. Lord Acton wrote of the need to enshrine radical changes in the law in order to create a legal framework to protect the weaker members of society and

Pierre Trudeau did not hesitate to use the full force of the state when his Liberal Government was threatened by terrorism in the cause of Quebec separatism in 1970, saying that:

> "The Liberal State is an open and democratic State, because it trusts its citizens. But for liberalism to thrive the citizens must also trust the democratic State to protect their rights and freedoms – even, when necessary, by using force to defend itself against violence from those who abuse its trust or destroy the democratic state."
>
> *(Liberal International Colloquium Report 1974)*

The practical politician has to 'muddle through' and cope with the agenda as it exists, rather than wishing the difficult issues away. The crucial differences of a Liberal politician are, firstly, the quality of the items he *adds* to that agenda and, secondly, the style of the administration. For Liberals to succeed in utilising the 'dual approach' we must be sure of the eventual aims being pursued, otherwise the decisions on individual issues are likely to be pragmatic and random.

ACTIVIST POLITICS FOR A FREE SOCIETY

After the preamble to the *Liberal Party Constitution* has set out the aims and objects of the party it tells us that: "The Liberal Party consists of men and women working together for the achievement of these aims". The sad fact is that only a relatively small proportion of those who believe in the aims are working together in the Liberal Party towards their achievement. Indeed many of those who are in sympathy with Liberal aims are not aware that they are. Because of the permanent imminence of elections, which, because of the electoral system, are invariably exceptionally difficult for us, and given that the party has inherited the skeleton of a national hierarchical party from its dominant days, much of the limited effort is put into maintaining a traditional party rather than into building a liberal movement.

It is only the existence of a powerful, radical, non state-socialist movement, however diffuse, that can guarantee the progress of an effective radical party. As stressed earlier, the Liberal party depends on liberalism, not the other way round, and its leaders, candidates and workers are likely – and preferably – to come from those who are involved in local campaigns on liberal issues, and who are in groups concerned with idealism rather than reaction. Such a movement can involve fellow travellers – which Acton called "sincere friends of freedom" – who are equally anxious to combat racism, to protect the environment or to oppose nuclear power, as well as those whom we support and work with at a community level.

Liberal involvement in neighbourhood work and in issue-based campaigns for their own sake encourages political discussion. Such discussion can be a catalyst for electoral politics and enables Liberals to demonstrate the weaknesses of separately tackling issues or local campaigns, compared with the advantages of concerted action to control the statutory structures and to utilise public resources in ways more conducive to the development of tolerant, caring, involved and aware communities.

The disparaging attitude towards politics and politicians which has grown up in this country encourages cynicism and superficiality. Elections tend not to be won by the challenging parties but rather lost by governing parties. There is no

incentive other than to offer the public what they want to hear rather than what they ought to hear. Liberals cannot compete at this game, nor ought we to. Our task is to enhance the political process in its broadest sense, to get stuck into local campaigns and to link local action with a clear analysis of the reasons for action. For instance we must link campaigns against centralised bureaucracy and indifference with discussion of the appropriate sizes of authority for different services. In education, for instance, who should run nurseries, primary and high schools, further education and universities? Also we must grapple openly with the problems of community control, such as decision making on house lettings when a tenants' committee might discriminate against minorities or 'problem' families.

The mobilisation of human resources is the only way forward. That is not going to happen without a deliberate policy of making information and technical expertise available to individuals and to community groups. If participation is to be more than token consultation the community and individuals in the community, need knowledge, expertise and confidence. There is still a feeling of 'them' and 'us'. 'They' who are in authority, will never be able to understand nor to resolve 'our' problems; it is in the challenging of the traditional structures that the sharpest conflict will come. Those with power do not willingly give it away; no-one with four aces asks for a new hand and to that extent the resources necessary will be hard won. As David Donnison says in a recent book "The Good City" there is no "subsidised revolution".

J. K. Galbraith pointed out that modern society tended to produce private affluence, with consumer goods in abundance, and public squalor, with run down school buildings. Insofar as it was ever more than a generalisation we are now reaching the limits of acquisitiveness and have an acute poverty of spirit. The Liberal Society reverses these values to place 'being' above 'having'.

ECONOMIC QUESTIONS

The strength of modern Liberalism lies in its commitment to the open society and in its understanding of the relationship between collective and individual rights and responsibilities in such a society. No more than the Socialist or the Conservative traditions, however, do we have a clear view of the relationship between political and economic priorities in the particularly difficult circumstances which we face today. We do not find it very hard to define the sort of open and decentralised economic structures we would ideally like; the difficulty is to see how to get there from here. Liberals find it understandably repugnant to contemplate illiberal policies to cope with immediate crises. But it is clearly no use, for example, placing too much emphasis on the formation of co-operatives of, say, thirty workers each when large firms make employees redundant at a thousand a time.

It is vital to establish economic values that are as liberal and as practicable as possible. Liberal in that it is:

> ". . . an economic system which enables each individual to achieve fulfilment through his work, which distributes the proceeds of industry to all, and which, denying excessive power to the bureacracy and to those who own capital, guarantees to each worker the right to share in the direction and rewards of his labour."
>
> *(Young Liberal Statement 1970)*

Practicable in that it either produces items that the public will purchase at a reasonable cost-effective price, or utilises individuals, if necessary, subsidised, in socially useful work.

The problems are considerable:

the problem of scale. The large corporation dominates our economy. The top one hundred companies account for about a half of manufacturing output and employment, control more than half of export trade and set price trends through key sectors of the economy. Whether we like it or not the multi-national company in today's world of advanced technology is here to stay.

the problem of open frontiers. An open domestic economy which operates on Liberal lines would have difficulty in competing with 'closed', subsidised highly centralised, economies elsewhere, and is likely to be incompatible with an open world economy. A further difficulty is that other governments suppress trade unions, thus keeping export prices down, or hold to values of hard work and limited individual self-expression (as in Japan) which we would not wish to emulate.

the problem of resources. How far should Britain continue to depend on imported raw materials in short supply, with its implications not only ecologically but also economically in the problems of payment via exports? The case of the motor car is a classic example. Dependence on the motor car is socially and ecologically detrimental – quite apart from its effect on the economics of road building and public transport. To compete effectively in world markets we need to produce the same number of vehicles with roughly half the workforce. We cannot contemplate redundancies on such a scale but if we cease to produce cars we shall have redundancies on an even larger scale.

the problem of employment. What are the psychological and economic effects of a much smaller workforce being able to produce the same manufacturing output? Or, of a small and highly-paid productive sector contrasted with a large, lower-paid, sector provided with socially useful, non-competitive employment through say, Manpower Services Commission schemes?

Further problems include the question of government intervention, for the promotion of industrial change or the implementation of stringent anti-inflation measures, and the question of taxation, pay differentials and financial incentives for entrepreneurs.

The Liberal economic strategy that is being developed must be flexible enough to permit a response to a different order of economic priorities as the current economic crisis develops.

WAYS AND MEANS

The framework in which a liberal society is built is particularly important. Without appropriate political institutions it is difficult to build liberal reforms into a progressive structure. Advances that enhance freedom and devolution, that develop civil rights and, that prevent exploitation are by their nature reversible and gain from being entrenched.

The struggle to take power away from the centre is continuous and the hardwon gains need protection by a written constitution which amongst other provisions, sets out the legitimate powers of different levels of government, including regions. The tensions that currently tempt local authorities to rebel 'illegally' against central government over housing finance powers, education selection and block grants would thus be eased. It would also enhance the position of parish councils.

Similarly a Bill of Rights entrenches individual and group freedoms for their own sake rather than in relation to a particular dispute or topic. Public access to official material is a further important constitutional reform that unlocks other opportunities and combats secrecy in government.

Electoral reform is urgently needed as the key to more careful and sensitive political debate and development. By protecting the parties from grossly exaggerated gains and losses of seats and by guaranteeing an electoral outcome which corresponds to votes cast, a proportional system of representation is thus a necessary ingredient of Liberal reforms of the machinery of government. The present inability to vote other than for or against the 'ticket' of one's preferred party has lead to the current Labour obsession with internal factions which, once in control dictate a national party line for every candidate to follow.

Liberals need to seek changes in the machinery of decision making and administration which would ease the introduction and implementation of Liberal policies. For instance a great deal of the administrative machine – both nationally and locally – is specifically concerned with the delivery of a service rather than coping with the needs of an area. This is one cause of the immobility and resistance to change of the 'establishment' under successive governments. The composition and powers of a second chamber need radical revision to accommodate the benefits of specialisms and experience, with the necessity of political flexibility – neither of which is adequately met by the present House of Lords.

Liberals need to continue to be especially vigilant in promoting the rights of minorities. Our consistent record on race relations must not lull us into complacency but must encourage us actively to work for genuinely equal opportunities. There is a need for positive discrimination, particularly in the public sector, in respect of resources and jobs. The party itself must also do much more to involve ethnic minorities in its work and as candidates.

We must be ready to assist cultural diversity and to understand and appreciate radical movements within the black and coloured communities. Equally Liberals ought to be forthright in their support for gay rights: an individual's personal life must not be the cause of oppression nor discrimination. Only when the exercise of personal freedom impinges detrimentally on others should the state concern itself. This criterion when applied, for instance, to gypsies must determine policy. Thus the key step is to establish the circumstances within which gypsies are most likely to be able to avoid direct nuisance to others and only to demand the minimum standard of conformity thereafter.

I am becoming more and more aware of the insidious discrimination against women and the unhelpful assumptions about female roles. I believe firmly that women's rights should become a major Liberal theme. The potential of the

women's movement not only to dispel foolish illusions about sex roles but also to liberate men from themselves and to promote a healthier balance to society's expectations and desires, is considerable and vital.

Giving attention to these, and other important causes within Britain must not blind our eyes to the immense problems in the rest of the world. Charity that begins at home has had a regrettable tendency to stay at home or to return home through trade agreements. Whatever the supposed constraints of practical politics the rights we fight for in our country cannot in principle be denied to people everywhere. It is perhaps the most serious indictment of the current widespread agitation against public expenditure cuts that the laudable aim of preserving social provisions focuses only on the high standards achieved in Britain and pays little or no regard to the abject lack of even basic provisions in much of the world.

In equity we have to call attention to the desperate plight of humanity in so many parts of the world and determine to campaign for support of measures to rectify the huge imbalance – even if it adds to the sacrifices we have to make. Lines on maps and divisions between countries are largely arbitrary or artificial, as the map of Africa graphically demonstrates, and it is no part of the Liberal's task to prop up the essentially conservative notion of the nation-state. Liberal support for a united Europe has always had its emotional roots in the supra-national idea rather than in aid to trading or a prop to prosperity. We need to re-emphasise this central purpose, not least to counter the widespread belief – fostered by reactionaries of right and left for their own purposes – that we could and should go it alone.

Liberalism's international dimension and its commitment to the European ideal can only be reconciled if the European community is seen as being a first step – albeit a very brave and crucial first step – towards a broader international grouping. The inclusion of Greece, Spain and Portugal must be welcomed and links forged with Yugoslavia, Romania and the Warsaw-Pact countries, with the eventual aim of reducing dependence on the two confronting military alliances. Liberals should strive to change the emphasis of the E.E.C. from trade to politics.

The implications of current developments in nuclear weaponry appear to be strengthening the pacifist tendency within Liberalism, though many Liberals prefer still to support the NATO alliance, or to depend on a build up of conventional forces. The high cost of defence at a time of public expenditure cuts elsewhere will also ensure that this issue will remain the subject of keen debate.

The Liberal Party has opposed the development of nuclear energy, believing it to have unacceptable implications for individual liberty and public safety. It also involves what are in essence the same processes for the production of nuclear energy as for military use. Conservation and combatting pollution are modern political issues and groups such as Friends of the Earth have done an excellent job in forcing ecological questions on to the political agenda. Liberals, with their key emphasis on the qualify of life and on the development of human potential have been the front runners amongst the mainstream parties but we can and must do more. It is not sufficient to rely on worldwide economic forces and the growing awareness amongst developing countries of the influence their possession of raw materials gives them. We must emphasise the primacy of ecological considerations in attempting to meet the expectations of the public. Not only is the imbalance of consumption between the developed world and the

rest untenable on humanitarian grounds but it is also unsustainable in terms of the sources available.

Politically it is difficult for parties that rely on mass public support to stress unpopular policies but the outlook is grave and we cannot just wait for it to hit us. However awkward the message is it is essential for Liberals to emphasise the urgent need to adapt life styles, living standards and future consumption patterns in order to develop a resource conserving economy. The broad impact of ecology and environmental factors is a major challenge.

The debate on conservation has in recent years centred on energy resources, in the knowledge that we cannot guarantee to get much beyond the turn of the century if we continue to use up known resources at the present rate. The total demand for energy has to be reduced and the search for alternative sources continued.

Conservation of land and liberal policies on land have a considerably longer pedigree. In particular Liberals historically have sought to retain for the community the increases in the value of land that are created by the community in general. Reliance has always been placed on the taxation of land values, by which an annual tax or rate is levied on the unimproved value of land based on its maximum permitted use. The simple attraction of this policy is that it curbs the inflation of land prices, encourages development up to the maximum permitted, cannot be passed on to tenants or leaseholders and is very difficult to evade. Its principal drawback lies in the need to have extremely detailed planning maps, with an inbuilt encouragement for the planning authority to overplan so as to maximise income. Even so, in Liberal hands, the process provides the mechanism for protecting land and encouraging compatible development without recourse to acquiring freeholds or to our current highly unsatisfactory and insensitive planning procedures. Additionally we need to give positive and practical assistance for conservation and reclamation.

Liberals should view with concern the impediments to the development of our agricultural capacity. We need to press for reforms that encourage new people to enter farming and that support co-operatives – linked where necessary to share high cost machinery – rather than large single units.

Similar aims can be applied to industry in general, in which the co-operative ethic is equally appropriate. For all the existing concentration on large scale industrial units future developments and initiatives are more likely – and more healthily – to come from small businesses, including producer co-operatives. Even so we recognise that economic forces still determine that a large proportion of industry will continue to be organised traditionally. It is vital, therefore, that co-operative approaches to management be urged in existing businesses and that participation at work be extended.

For Liberals any economic system is a means to political and social ends rather than an end in itself. Consequently the free market often transgresses into insensitivity in its dealing with its workers and in its lack of concern for the environment and resources; similarly state control often degenerates into complacency and an inbuilt antipathy to innovation.

Personally I cannot foresee any significant reduction in unemployment through reliance on market forces. New opportunities will depend on government intervention. Thus if, in the new era of subsidised jobs, we have to consider the best use of scarce resources then they are surely best placed in support of

socially useful projects and enterprises. We have seen the benefits of the various Manpower Services Commission programmes, particularly in their ability to provide workers for voluntary sector projects. Liberals ought to perceive the value of increased and more flexible assistance through the Manpower Services Commission.

The present Conservative Government's monetarist policies expressly link the problems of manufacturing industry with the lack of funds available for public expenditure and uses this as an excuse for penalising the underprivileged members of society. The harsh and discriminatory effects of such rigid economic policies put at risk the survival and recovery of services long thought essential.

Liberals however, do not believe that good health and social services are automatically measured through ever higher spending levels. Clearly a considerable amount of residential care is needed, and there is no doubt that this is expensive, but far more people can be helped to stay in the community than at present, with consequential benefits to the individual, the volunteer and incidentally to the Exchequer. A better partnership with voluntary bodies, better supporting professional services, and the provision of day care facilities will provide a service that is both more humane and economical.

The same principal is true in housing and transport. Rehabilitating older houses in partnership with private owners and housing associations is substantially cheaper than demolition, compensation and new build and also makes more environmental and social sense. Equally the provision of resources for mortgages on older houses enables many individuals to acquire an asset that they will then put their own time and skills into. In round terms the capital required to build one new council house will provide three such mortgages – with obvious gains all round.

In transport the equivalent shortsighted tendency is to continue to build new roads at vast social and financial expense instead of making public transport cheaper and more accessible. It is extremely difficult to justify the millions of pounds required to construct even short stretches of urban through ways which benefit only a minority of the population and cause considerable destruction to communities. At the same time public transport is spiralling down with higher fares causing usage to fall, leading in turn to worse services and higher fares. There is clearly no way that public transport can survive without subsidy.

Liberals' emphasis in education is on tailoring provision to the individual's talents and interests rather than on moulding pupils and students into predetermined roles and jobs. It is not possible to abandon the examination system nor to ignore totally the likely employment opportunities but the changes in society that Liberals are working towards will, in turn, ease the pressures on the education system to conform to traditional attitudes.

Financially education poses a dual problem: much of it is inevitably expensive, requiring a large workforce and much equipment, for which the state, having done all it can to make it efficient and cost conscious, can only pick up the bill. The other half of the problem is similar to the other personal services, particularly in relation to the foolish preference for new, expensive, central buildings and the diseconomies of size. We also need to look at the possibilities of very much broader definitions of adult education. In particular there are considerable gains to be made by encouraging self-programming "courses", often community based, with much less than a full-time "teaching" presence.

Extending Liberal values to cultural provision entails a determination to open up the enjoyment of the arts to the whole community and the acceptance of a far wider definition of culture than has been the general rule hitherto. At the present time the subsidy provided out of public funds for the arts, locally and nationally, tends not to go to those who could not otherwise afford to attend or to participate but to those who would probably be involved in any case.

The arts belong to everyone or they do not belong at all. It is crucial that this aspect of our common but diverse humanity be made accessible to all. We can ill afford to do without the individual's talent to amuse, to entertain and to move us through their chosen medium, particularly in these hard times. We neglect this aspect of our personality at our peril.

This brief sketch of the application of liberal values to a number of current issues leaves many areas untouched or inadequately dealt with. For this reason there is a short reading list appended to enable Liberals to follow up the outlines here.

CONCLUSION

Even when the Liberal Party has been electorally at its weakest its presence, its leaders, and, more particular, the sound of its individual and collective voice, have been a vigilant guard against the worse excesses of authoritarianism. The hard won and substantial gains of Liberal Governments have been largely preserved.

Even so the need for implementation of Liberal policies and a general understanding and acceptance of Liberal values is paramount. As it becomes clear that a steady increase in our standard of living is an impossible goal and that, in any case satisfying man's material needs alone is not enough,the instinctive search for a different kind of society will increase. Solving economic problems – important though that is – leaves untouched the relationship of the individual to the different communities in which he or she is, or could be, involved.

Our values depend on the recognition everywhere of the potential of the individual based on those innate qualities of people as friends, citizens, parents, workers and neighbours. The future of our society depends on these same qualities and we need to invest our skills and energy into making government, both nationally and locally, establish the conditions in which they can flourish, at the same time working for the acceptance of these vital liberal values within the community itself.

This booklet will amply serve its purpose if it helps Liberals to recognise afresh the urgent need and relevance of these values and prompts us to tackle their implementation with zeal and enthusiasm. The renewal of our communities from bottom to top depends on it.

APPENDIX

Those who want a short statement of the marks of a Liberal Society to supplement the preamble to the party's constitution need look no further than the Report of the Liberal Commission of 1969. The opening section is reprinted below. The only addition I have made to cover the different emphasis of recent years is the reference to co-operative principles in the penultimate paragraph.

THE LIBERAL SOCIETY

The first duty of any political party is to make clear the type of society it wants. All too often this is obscured by an over-abundance of short-term promises or by a pre-occupation with immediate problems and partisan tactics. Yet a party which loses sight of its long-term ideal can offer the electorate only a confusion of piecemeal and inconsistent policies.

It would not be practicable to outline the precise structure of a Liberal society, since of its very nature it would be open, dynamic, subject to constant change and evolution. It is a characteristic of the Liberal approach that political programmes should be open to adaptation in the light of new evidence, new circumstances and new problems. Liberals put a high value on the search for new evidence and the need for experiment. This is important, for too many political idealists have made the mistake of aiming at a static Utopia, based on a set of rigid and unchangeable institutions. The need for an open society is greater today than ever before, because the circumstances in which we live are changing so rapidly. Nevertheless, it is important to stress at the outset the permanence of the fundamental Liberal values. These values are not expendable.

Liberalism is about liberty. It is concerned with people not as a mass but as individuals. Rejecting the philosophical myths which have claimed the supreme value of the state, the nation, the aristocracy, or the working class, the Liberal insists on the value of human personality. The state and the community are the creation of individual experience; they exist to serve man, not he them. Yet men are not isolated creatures; their personality is moulded by their membership of human communities, limited or expanded by the opportunities open to them. When men are subjected to authoritarian rule, they are cramped in spirit by the nature of their society and become little more than the passive recipients of other men's commands. For a man to be able to find full expression for the development of his personality, a free society is necessary; a society in which he has some say in its governance and some part to play in its many communities. If he is to feel himself a full member of the communities in which he lives, he must also be accepted as a member on an equal basis with all his fellows; discrimination between different sections in any society will embitter the disadvantaged and brutalise those on top. Nor are men a mass of identical creatures who will happily or readily conform to a single imposed pattern. Diversity, variety, eccentricity are the essence of individual personality; enforced conformity or uniformity can only stunt the character of those who suffer it. Liberalism begins, therefore, with a commitment to liberty, participation, partnership and diversity.

The role of the state is to provide, to protect and to develop the conditions of liberty. These must include the right of each individual to speak freely and write freely and to conduct his affairs without fear of arbitrary interference or arrest. They must include the right to participate in the process of government, on an open, regular and equal basis, so that each plays his part in shaping the laws which he is called upon to obey. They must include, further, the impartial protection of the law for all citizens under an independent judiciary. Since poverty, squalor, economic insecurity or illness threaten the basis of individual liberty, the state must protect its citizens from these dangers. Since education plays so important a part in the development of personality, the state must ensure the provision of adequate education for all. These are the positive conditions which make a full and free life possible for all citizens.

A Liberal society will contain a multitude of communities, through which its members express their interests and take part in its direction. The state will encourage and protect the development of such communities. A Liberal society will be a tolerant society – though not tolerant of injustice or oppression. A Liberal society will be compassionate and generous; since these are amongst the highest of civilised values, which in an open and free society men may learn to cherish. Men cannot be made good through Act of Parliament. Neither can they be made compassionate or tolerant. But the moral values which people hold are deeply influenced by the political, social, economic and cultural, conditions under which they live.

Great inequalities of power or of wealth, would destroy the basis of a Liberal society. Liberals, therefore, believe in spreading property, wealth, power and responsibility as widely as possible. The possession of wealth contributes to individual independence and security and, thereby, extends a man's freedom. But the concentration of political and economic power, whether into the hands of the state or into the possession of a private minority, diminishes the freedom of the remainder; it reduces their status, and their involvement in the government of the community to that of a proletariat.

In a Liberal society the economic system must never be more than the means to an end. Competition between independent enterprises, wherever possible, is more likely to ensure the accountability and efficiency of industry than an extension of state-owned monopoly; but the spread of power which Liberals demand requires a new concept of industrial ownership. This is increasingly urgent as the scale of industrial enterprises grows larger and larger. Industry in a Liberal economy must ideally be based upon co-operative principles or upon a new partnership between those who provide capital and those who are employed in whatever capacity.

The belief in the value of human personality, the Liberal compassion for the condition of one's fellow men, cannot be confined within the boundaries of a single state. Man has learnt from bitter experience that the loss of freedom anywhere diminishes his own freedom; and he has been forced to fight world wars, to protect and restore the conditions of liberty for himself and others. The growing interdependence of world society, as travel, trade, commerce and communications bring countries into more regular and widespread relationships, make it clearer than ever that no man or nation is an island. Liberalism is international.

FOR FURTHER READING:

Liberal Philosophy:

The Liberal Tradition, Bullock and Shock, OUP, 75p
The Common Welfare, Jo Grimond, Temple Smith, £7.50
To Be A Liberal, Russell Johnston, SLP, 25p
The Liberal Way Forward, David Steel, LPD,
1984 – The Real Alternative, Richard Holme, LPD, 50p
Liberalism, D. J. Manning, Dent £1.95
The Theory and Practice of Community Politics, Bernard Greaves and Gordon Lishman, ALC, 60p

Liberty in general:

The New Liberty, Ralf Dahrendorf, RKP, £1.50
A Study of Liberty and Revolution, Edward Goodman, Duckworth, £1.95
The Debate on Anarchism, Noam Chomsky and Eric Hobsbawn, Spokesman, 25p
The New Radicals, Paul Jabocs and Saul Landau, Vintage Books, £1.00
After Social Democracy, Ralf Dahrendorf, Unservile State Group, 50p
Life Chances, Ralf Dahrendorf, Weidenfield & Nicolson £7.95

Radical ideas:

Celebration of Awareness, Ivan Illich, Penguin, 80p
Tools for Conviviality, Ivan Illich, Calder and Boyars, £1.00
The Human Quality, Aurelio Peccei, Pergamon, £3.25
Pedagogy of the Oppressed, Paulo Freire, Penguin, 50p
Small is Beautiful, E. F. Schumacher, Abacus, 75p
Technological Society, Jacques Ellul, Wildwood House, £1.25
Social Limits to Growth, Fred Hirsch, RKP £5.50
Creating Alternatives Futures, Hazel Henderson, Berkeley Publishing, £3.10
The Yellow Brick Road, Tim Beaumont, LPD, 50p
Good Work, E. F. Schumacher, Abacus, £1.95

Liberal History:

The Optimists, Ian Bradley, Faber £12.50
History of the Liberal Party 1895-1970, Roy Douglas, Sidgwick and Jackson, £2.50
A Short History of the Liberal Party 1900-1976, Chris Cook, Macmillan, £3.95
The Collapse of the British Liberal Party, ed. J. A. Thompson, D.C. Heath, £1.10
The Liberal Party – Retrenchment and Revival, J. G. Rasmussen, Constable, £2.25
Liberal Party Politics in Britain, Arthur Cyr, Calder, £9.95
A House Divided, David Steel, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, £6.50

Liberal Policy:

Directory of Liberal Party Resolutions 1967-1979, New Gladstone Press, £5
Directory of Liberal Party Resolutions Supplements Nos 1 and 2 1978/79 and 1979/80, New Gladstone Press, £1.00 each
The Real Fight is for Britain, 1979 Liberal Manifesto, LPD, 50p
Foundations for the Future, LPD, 75p
Liberalism and Social Democracy, Liberator Press, 75p

Other items:

Labour at 80 . . . Time to retire, David Steel, LPD, 40p
North-South – A Programme for Survival, Brandt Commission Report, Pan, £1.95
Voluntary Action in a Changing World, Francis Gladstone, Bedford Square Press, £3.95

Periodicals:

Liberal News, 20p weekly from newsagents or by post (£12.50 p.a.) from 1 Whitehall Place, London SW1A 2HE.
New Outlook, quarterly, (by post £6.00 p.a.) from 24 Finthorpe Lane, Almondbury, Huddersfield, West Yorks.
Liberator, monthly, (by post £5.50 p.a.), from 34a Hackford Road, London SW9 0RF.

A cassette with extracts from the 1979 Assembly Debate on Philosophy, plus accompanying literature, is available at £5.00 from Liberal Publications Department, 1 Whitehall Place, London SW1A 2HE, as is a cassette with extracts from the 1980 Assembly Debate on 'Liberal Values', also at £5.00.