8

"Home Rule all round": Experiments in Regionalising Great Britain, 1886-1914

Elfie Rembold

"Edward I. by the Statute of Rhuddlan endeavoured, with a statesmanship of which no other contemporary ruler was capable, to effect a settlement of the conquered principality. He turned the patrimony of the Welsh Princes - Anglesey, Carnarvon, and Merioneth in the north, Cardigan and Carmarthen in the south - into shire-ground. He did not interfere with the use of the Welsh language. He appointed a commission to inquire into the Welsh laws and customs, and some of them he allowed to remain in force. But he adhered rigidly to one inflexible rule. No Welshman was allowed to govern the country, to administer the law, or to represent the sovereign authority. The Government could be carried on by the King and his officers alone."
(Llewelyn Williams, The Making of Modern Wales, 1919)

"Ever since the Union of the two Crowns, it has been the work of factious turbulent spirits, to foment Jealousies, and to promote differences betwixt the Two Nations"
(Fletcher of Saltoun, State of Controversy betwixt United and Separate Parliaments, 1706)

"What is really the meaning of this high-sounding phrase about the representation of nationalities? What is a nationality if the people of these islands do not form one?"
(The Times, 5 August 1910)

Territorial reform became a matter of increasing political interest in Britain when Irish Home Rule became central to parliamentary politics. Despite industrial modernisation and increasing administrative standardisation great cultural differences remained in the "celtic" regions which could be mobilised for political ends at the beginning of mass democracy. The first elections under the extended franchise in 1885 brought the Irish Question to centre stage; and the ensuing Gladstonian endeavour to introduce Irish Home Rule in 1886, whilst stimulating a Unionist reaction, nevertheless also acted as catalyst for the growth of Home Rule movements in Scotland and Wales, seeking devolution within the United Kingdom.

It will be shown here first that the split of the Liberal party in 1886 and the consequent Home Rule politics of the Gladstonian party supported by re-

gional movements in Scotland and Wales was a modern way to continue the old style of territorial management of benign neglect of local affairs whilst entrusting local elites with their control. Secondly, the different concepts of Home Rule all round and their relation to specific Scottish conditions will be analysed. Finally, some reasons will be put forward as to why the Liberal government did not embark on a fundamental territorial reform in the pre-war years. In a short conclusion it will be pointed out that in the wake of the First World War, further democratisation and social and economic problems shifted the focus of political reform to social reconstruction. Consequently, the idea of Home Rule all round lost attraction and all the more so after Southern Ireland left the Union and became a Dominion in 1921. Ironically, the only people who actually received Home Rule were those who most vehemently opposed Home Rule throughout the period under review, the Unionists of what became Northern Ireland.

The Irish Question And The Split In The Liberal Party

The consequences of the 1884 Reform Act on the parliamentary arithmetic of late Victorian Britain meant that the Irish Question could no longer be ignored. As Gladstone later put it, he had no evidence that Isaac Butt's party was popular, but the result of the 1885 election in Ireland confirmed that Parnell's party was. 'That settled the question. When the people express their determination in this decisive way you must give them what they want.'[1]

However, of the three leading politicians of the Liberal factions[2] only Joseph Chamberlain, the leader of the Radicals, openly declared himself on the Irish problem during the election campaign of 1885[3]. By propagating his idea of Home Rule all round he responded to the Irish demand for land reform and Home Rule. For him this was an expedient means of containing the centrifugal effects of Irish Home Rule on both Britain and the Empire; Home Rule all round offered a way of meeting the Irish demands whilst maintaining a superior imperial Parliament at Westminster.[4] The Radical leader employed this idea in

---

[1] Quoted in the Young Scots Handbook 1911-1912, Young Scots Society, Glasgow 1912, pp 60-61

[2] Apart from J. Chamberlain there was Lord Hartington, the leader of the Whigs and W. E. Gladstone as the main party leader

[3] C. H.D. Howard, Joseph Chamberlain and the 'Unauthorized Programme', in English Historical Review 65 (1950), pp 477-491

[4] In the "Unauthorized Programme" Chamberlain demanded "Home Rule all round, on equal terms for the different nationalities of the United Kingdom, leaving the Imperial

the sense of local governments with extended powers,[5] and as a remedy to the Irish question that would finally end the continuous resort to coercion. Against this background the concept of Home Rule all round can be considered as an alternative to a measure of political reform purely restricted to Ireland. However, this highly controversial question also served his political ambitions to dish the Whigs and challenge Gladstone's position as party leader.[6] Chamberlain's programme of radicalisation of Liberal politics in the age of New Democracy aimed at secularisation and free education, the establishment of popular local governments and sweeping land reform which taxed the propertied classes and thus underpinned financially these democratic reforms.[7] In terms of administration this concept inevitably implied a centralisation of politics, equating a strong central government with efficient politics. However, far from wiping out the Whigs, the Liberal representatives of the landed interest, in its failure it turned out to make them the new allies of the Radicals.

Gladstone responded to Chamberlain's electoral offensive in that he agreed that "on local government for Ireland they [the Radicals] hold a winning position", but he pointed out that he differed from his rival in taking the problem seriously rather than seeking a tactical advantage: "I have never looked much in Irish matters at negotiation or the conciliation of leaders. I look at the question in itself".[8] Both, Liberals and Radicals, after all conceived the Irish problem as an unavoidable political issue that had to be solved during the next session.

These first semi-democratic elections in 1885[9] saw an Irish Home Rule contingent of 86, strengthened by the effects of the franchise reform, exactly holding the parliamentary balance between 335 Liberals and 249 Conservatives. After several weeks of public silence yet busy bargaining behind the

---

Parliament in composition and authority as the supreme legislature of a common realm", J Garvin, The Life of Joseph Chamberlain, ii, p 75-76, quoted in C D H Howard, Joseph Chamberlain, p 478

[5] (Joseph Chamberlain), "Local Government and Ireland", Fortnightly Review (July 1885), pp 1-16 (p 4)

[6] Richard Jay, Joseph Chamberlain A Political Study, Clarendon Press, Oxford 1981 p 126

[7] Ibid , p 12

[8] Gladstone to Lord Hartington, 30 May 1885 (quoted in John Morely, The Life Of Gladstone, vol ii, p 328)

[9] See Neil Blewett, The Franchise in the United Kingdom, 1885-1918, in Past and Present 32 (1965), pp 27-56

scenes[10] the parliamentary stalemate was finally lifted when Herbert Gladstone gave an interview to the press that hinted at his father's commitment to Irish Home Rule.[11] The consequences of this decision are well known: the split of the Liberal Party. Significantly, this split was as much about the future of Liberal politics and the style of Liberal leadership as it was about the immediate question of Irish Home Rule.

REGIONALISING LIBERALISM

Shortly after Chamberlain resigned from the Local Government Board in dissension with Gladstone's proposals for Irish Home Rule in March 1886 on grounds of "increased taxation (with which Great Britain should burden itself), not in order to secure the closer and more effective union of the Three Kingdoms, but as a currency to purchase the repeal of the Union and the practical separation of Ireland from England and Scotland"[12], Charles Waddie founded in Edinburgh the Scottish Home Rule Association (SHRA), on 20th May.[13] In their appeal to the Scottish people, "both at home and abroad" the founders pointed to the "national aspirations" and "national rights" of the Scottish people and underlined their demand for Scottish Home Rule with reference to "a glorious past" and "yet a greater future" that will be achieved "by securing to her the legitimate control of her own affairs" Surprisingly enough, the first object of their programme was "to protect the integrity of the Empire (...)." and only in the second place they claimed "to promote the establishment of a legislature sitting in Scotland with full control over all purely Scottish questions, and with an Executive Government responsible to it and the Crown" Only a few weeks later the young Thomas Edward Ellis addressed the Merioneth Liberals' selection conference with a clear statement for Welsh Home Rule which embraced the Welsh problems as expressed by the Nonconformists of

---

[10] A B Cooke and J Vincent, The Governing Passion Cabinet Government and Party Politics in Great Britain, 1885-86, The Harvester Press, Bristol 1974

[11] This incident is know to historians as the "Hawarden Kite", named after Gladstones's manor in Hawarden; see D A. Hamer, Liberal Politics in the Age of Gladstone and Rosebery A Study in Leadership and Policy, Clarendon Press, Oxford 1972, p 113

[12] Chamberlain to Gladstone, 15 March 1886. Although Gladstone persuaded him to stay (16th March) he finally accepted his resignation on 23rd March 1886 Gladstone Papers, vol. XLI, Correspondence with J Chamberlain 1884-1893. (BL MS Add 44126, vol XLI, 1884-93).

[13] Pamphlet, Scottish Home Rule Association, 20th May 1886, Glasgow Scrapbooks, No.23, p 165.

Wales.[14] Although no formal Welsh Home Rule association was founded before 1887 when the first Cymru Fydd Societies were set up in Liverpool and London, in April ideas were in circulation to establish "some sort of Welsh organisation" [15] These were realised in the winter of 1886-7 when the North and South Wales Liberal Federations were founded.

In their origin these regional movements doubtless were an offspring of Gladstone's new definition of Liberalism. As political measures in a Union state will usually be applied to all its constituent parts, granting Home Rule to Ireland, as an integral part of the United Kingdom, might as well imply Home Rule for Scotland and Wales.[16] In contrast, instead of regionalising Liberalism Chamberlain's radicalisation of politics pointed, indeed, in the completely opposite direction, to a centralisation of British politics. Arguably, this differentiation of Liberalism in one or the other way met at least in one point: the exclusion of socialism and the integration of the working classes, matters of growing concern in the 1880s, were two sides of the same coin. The Gladstonian espousal of Irish Home Rule appealed to working class Radicals, such as Keir Hardie, happy to view the need for liberation from the oppression of landlordism and alien rule in the same light as they viewed the need for the urban working classes to be liberated from the tyranny of unemployment and the uncertainties of industrial capitalism. Ironically, what made Gladstonian Liberalism attractive to middle class voters, however, was its provision for continuous self-government according to the old tradition of territorial management.

From Welsh Liberalism To Welsh Radicalism: The 'Cymru Fydd' Movement

As Derek W Urwin argues: "the style of British politics did not change very much before the 1880s. The persistence of the traditional constitution de-

---

[14] Emyr W Williams, "Liberalism in Wales and the Politics of Welsh Home Rule, 1886-1910", Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies 37 (1990), pp 190-207 (195)

[15] The Liberal agent Tilston of Wrexham proposed a national organisation in Wales See Graham V Nelmes, Stuart Rendel and the Welsh Liberal political organisation in the late-nineteenth century, in The Welsh History Review 9/4 (1979) pp 468-485, (470)

[16] The Young Scots later argued that devolution for Ireland made no sense without self-government for Scotland See *Young* Scots Handbook, 1911-12, p 8

termined that electoral politics would essentially be local politics" [17] Change came with the electoral reforms in the 1880s when mass party mobilisation "emanating from the centre" was confronted with local initiative. Thus, these political reforms "helped to generate a new debate upon the territorial constitution" of the United Kingdom[18]. "Local initiative" in the 1880s differed from local management hitherto in that it actually tackled the problems and grievances of the people rather than being concerned with the matters of the landed and propertied classes. Consequently, the new regional elites were not only locally closer to the people but were partially themselves of humble descent like, for instance, the Welsh national leader Tom Ellis who was the son of a tenant farmer[19] or David Lloyd George who was brought up by his uncle, a shoemaker in rural Caernarvonshire[20].

When in 1885 Wales returned only four Conservative out of thirty-four candidates[21] this merely confirmed the trend established earlier in the 1880 elections and which was to last until after the First World War. The Whigs representing the Anglican, English-speaking, landowning class had to give way to nonconformist industrialists and manufacturers or to men of the legal professions.[22]

> *"Characteristic"*, as Philip Jenkins puts it *"of the new type of Member were men like Alfred Thomas, an industrialist who was also president of the Welsh Baptist Union; David A. Thomas, the non-*

---

[17] Towards the Nationalisation of British Politics?: The Party System, 1885-1940, in Otto Busch (ed), Wählerbewegung in der europäischen Geschichte, Colloquium Verlag, Berlin 1980, pp.225-257

[18] Ibid , p 235

[19] His uncle was one of the victims in 1859 when farmers were evicted for not voting for the local Anglo-Catholic landlord (in Merioneth); see K O Morgan., Wales in British Politics 1868-1922, University of Wales Press Cardiff 1980, p 20 See also Dictionary of Welsh Biography, Blackwell, London and Oxford 1959, p.214.

[20] K.O. Morgan, Lloyd George, Weidenfeld and Nicholson, London 1974, p 10

[21] Hon G.T Kenyon (Denbigh Boroughs), P Ryce-Jones (Montgomery Boroughs), Hon F.C Morgan (Monmouthshire, South) and Hon. A.H.J. Walsh (Radnorshire)

[22] Of the elected Liberal members of 1880 were "nine ( ) industrialists or manufacturerers, and a further eleven were barristers or solicitors." K.O Morgan, Wales in British Politics, p 40.

conformist coal magnate or the Methodist solicitor David Rendell'[23]

There was one striking deviation from this rule when Stuart Rendel, an English landowner, won Montgomeryshire for the first time in 1880, thereby defeating the High Tory Sir William-Wynn. He was to play a leading role in forming the Welsh Party at Westminster and in giving a voice to distinctively Welsh grievances. His political abilities were twofold: on the one hand he could make himself acceptable to many sections of Welsh political opinion[24], and on the other he was on good terms with the Liberal leadership, being friendly with Mr Gladstone himself[25], which allowed for a transformation of exclusively Welsh issues into British politics and as such to achieve political reform in Wales.

Both unifying the Welsh members into a politically effective Welsh Parliamentary Party and helping to join local Liberal associations into the North Wales Liberal Federation were certainly his greatest achievements. Welsh nonconformity and its growing demand for disestablishment meanwhile provided a rallying cry for a more coherent Welsh Liberalism. But despite all this Rendell still adhered to a rather moderate apprehension of the goals of Welsh Liberalism. Although he conceded to Welsh Liberals the right to take decisive steps "to secure full consideration of special needs of the principality"[26] he disapproved of measures like William Rathbone's proposal of a Welsh Grand Committee in 1886 or Alfred Thomas's "National Institutions of Wales Bill"[27] of 1891 as he was anxious not to ask for too much of the Liberal leadership that might cause disruption of the Liberal Party.

Opposition to his able but temperate approach to the central Liberal leadership came from among young radical members like Tom Ellis (Merionethshire), David Lloyd George (Caernarfon), Samuel Evans (Mid-Glamorgan), Frank Edwards (Radnorshire) and D.A. Thomas (Merthyr Tydfil). They were founders and prominent representatives of the Welsh national movement 'Cymru Fydd' (Young Wales). In its magazines 'Young Wales' and 'Wales' as well as in several local newspapers Welsh literati propagated ideas

---

23 A History of Modern Wales 1536-1990, Longman, London and New York 1992, p 332

24 G V Nelmes, Stuart Rendel, p 469

25 John Morley, Gladstone, vol ii, p 580

26 Humphreys-Owen to Rendel, 21 December 1891, quoted in ibid, p 481

27 J Graham Jones, Alfred Thomas National Institution's (Wales) Bill of 1891-92, in Welsh History Review 15/26 (1990), pp 218-239

of Welsh nationality while its political agents exerted pressure on the Liberal Party to achieve its ultimate goal of Welsh Home Rule. Men like Tom Ellis and Samuel Evans were educated in their native country, at Aberystwyth College where they studied together with Ellis J. Ellis-Griffith, educationalist and member for Angelsey, (1895-1918), T.F. Roberts, later the second principal of Aberystwyth University, and O.M. Edwards, later editor of Wales and Professor of history.[28] In cultural terms they sought a Welsh national identity by laying emphasis on the vernacular as well as on the history of the Cymru, the Welsh people. For these intellectuals a potential career as a London barrister or lecturer in Oxford was less attractive than the challenge to "make" Wales.

Significantly, they perceived politics in terms of Welsh nationalism rather than British Liberalism. For Tom Ellis and the young David Lloyd George as the leading figures of Welsh radicalism, albeit with rather different concepts of nationalism, the organisation and aims of the Irish Nationalist party served as a model for Wales though never to quite the same degree. Whereas Ellis conceived of "national self-government" as the highest expression of nationality and a pre-condition for uniting North and South Wales Lloyd George's stood for a brand of Welsh nationalism that was an ideology "wholly and narrowly political" and as such very different to Tom Ellis's "gentle visions (...) shot through with cultural and literary values." Lloyd George "represented the spirit of equality just as Ellis reflected that of liberty".[29]

Industrial South Wales Refuses Welsh North Wales

Apart from the fact that Cymru Fydd societies were first formed within Welsh communities outside Wales, in traditional centres of Welsh settlement in England such as Liverpool and London, it was nevertheless in North Wales where radicalism developed into nationalism and from there proliferated into the South. Indeed the bi-partite division of Wales into a rural and Welsh-speaking north and an industrial and anglicised south seduced sceptics and open opponents of Welsh nationalism to speak of Wales as merely a "geographical expression"[30]. This geographical split also reflected the dissension amongst Welsh members regarding unified political action.

---

[28] See Obituary of The Right Hon Sir Ellis J. Ellis Griffith in: Transactions of the Honourable Society of Cymmrodorion (1927), p.184.

[29] K O. Morgan, Rebirth of a Nation. Wales 1880-1980, Oxford University Press, Oxford 1981, p 35.

[30] Bishop Basil Tickell Jones, quoted in Morgan, Rebirth of a Nation, p.3.

The first distinctively Welsh piece of legislation was the Sunday Closing Act 1881 This, however, was followed by the University of Wales Act and the appointment of a Royal Commission on Welsh land in 1893. Gladstone expressed his sympathy with recognition of the Welsh language at the national eisteddfod in Wrexham in 1888, and throughout this period he was generally favourable to Welsh demands. Gladstone "did infinitely more than any other major political figure (...) to advance Welsh causes".[31] This degree of sympathy from the national party leader might have meant that further enactments were possible. And there was general agreement amongst Welsh members about certain measures, like disestablishment and education. However, on a sweeping measure for Home Rule Liberals from South Wales held different views from their compatriots of the north.

When in 1891 and again in 1892 the member for Mid-Glamorgan Alfred Thomas, a prominent businessman from Cardiff and president of the Welsh Baptist Union, introduced his "National Institutions (Wales) Bills" these had have provided for a 'Minister of Wales'[32] similar to the Scottish Secretaryship introduced in 1885. Despite its being supported by Ellis, Lloyd George and six other MPs, when presented under a Liberal government in 1892 it was bound to founder since arguments against it were all too obvious. Firstly, Welsh, unlike Scottish, nationalists could hardly conjure a constitutional tradition of a Welsh Secretary - a fact the Conservatives dwelt upon when defending the administrative uniformity between England and Wales. Secondly, reform of local government in 1888 had had two important effects. It greatly reduced the influence of old Whig and Tory elites in the management of local affairs and passed it on to the representatives of the Welsh people. As a matter of fact, however, this satisfied nonconformist interest in self-government to a great extent. And last, but not least, the Bill roused the suspicions of the Liberals from South Wales that they might fall under the sway of North Wales. Certainly this seemed a risk if the proposed Welsh National Council were to be composed on the basis of the amendment put forward by Ellis to the local government reforms in 1888[33] suggested, by the representatives of the new county councils in an other than a proportional mode.

---

31 K O. Morgan, Gladstone and Wales, in: Welsh Historical Review 1/1 (1960), pp.65-82 (66).

32 J. G. Jones, National Institutions Bills, p.225.

33 Tom Ellis, Wales and the Local Government Act, 1894, in: Speeches and Addresses by the late Tom Ellis, M.P., ed. by Annie J. Ellis, Wrexham 1912, pp.165ff.

This reservation and distrust of nationalists amongst Liberals from the South and their wariness against a North Walian preponderance in any national institution was also partly responsible for the failure of a proposed amalgamation of the two Liberal Federations in 1895. Whereas the Cymru Fydd movement had merged into the North Wales Liberal Federation the South Wales branch decided to remain independent.[34] However, resistance had broader motives.When the industrialist D.A. Thomas convinced his followers from the South to retain their own Liberal association this entailed a decision against further democratisation of the constituencies rather than a repudiation of the Welsh national programme committed to Home Rule and the Welsh language. This was as much about seeking to deny the growing political ambitions of South Wales miners and tinplate workers adequate political representation within the Liberal party. But in addition the demand to foster the Welsh language was less powerful in the South than in the North. After a series of conferences in 1895 showed no sign of a successful unification of the two Welsh Liberal Federations Llewelyn W Williams, an ardent patriot, son of a tenant farmer from Llansadwrn, and later MP for Carmarthen, disappointedly wrote:

> *"But now the Nationalism withstood centuries of armed oppression, of silent neglect, of contemptuous scorn, is withering before the* blighting influence of Industrialism. *Walk through the Vale, and within sight of "Cromlech" and "golwch", beneath the shadows of the dismantled castle of Penmark, a monument of Glydwr's might and strength of a awakened nation, on the banks of the Carvan, where Gildas and Caradoc walked, and on the very site of "Cor Tewdws", you will find* not only the old language disappearing, but, what is worse, a new race springing up which has no sympathy with the past, *and which knows nothing and cares nothing for that "old and haugthy nation" which aroused the admiration of Milton and won the misdirected pity of Wordsworth. This is but an instance of what is slowly taking place throughout the country.* The enemy which Young Wales will be called upon to fight in the future is the industrial and commercial Philistinism of Englishmen and Welshmen. *Let the issue be made clear! Young Wales fights for culture, for true national development, for the only way in which it is possi-*

---

[34] See the excellent study by Emyr W. Williams, Liberalism in Wales and the Politics of Welsh Home Rule 1886-1910, in: The Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies 37 (1990), pp.190-207 (p.202).

ble in Wales to rear a nation of noble men and women, by teaching a lesson of national self-respect - *men who*, while not despising or undervaluing worldly success or prosperity, *recognise that man's duty on earth consists of something higher and nobler than simple "to get on"* (my emphasis)" [35]

This rather lengthy quotation makes it abundantly clear that by 1895 Welsh radicalism has turned into cultural nationalism of a conservative blend that was content in alliance with Gladstonian Liberalism, for it suited both factions of Welsh Liberalism: the South Wales business interest in the British economy and the North Wales intellectuals in making a Welsh nation by the establishment of a genuine Welsh educational system.

Despite the problems the nationalist movement encountered in Wales, it is clear that Gladstone's Irish Home Rule policy evoked regional movements that claimed self-government also for their country in the form of Home Rule all round. In constitutional terms this involved a reorganisation of the relationship of centre and periphery. Hitherto the centre benevolently neglected local affairs which were to be managed by the local elite. Throughout Wales the advance of democracy expelled the old anglicised gentry class from office and entrusted a new middle class elite of professionals and industrialists with the control of regional affairs.

The Scottish national movement was different to the Welsh in that it perceived Home Rule in legal rather than cultural terms. This view was deeply rooted in history and the way Union with its more powerful neighbour, England came about in each case. While under the Welsh Act of Union of 1535 the legal and administrative system of England was merely extended to Welsh territory, the Act of Union in 1707 with the Kingdom of Scotland united two separate parliaments yet provided for the continuation of a different legal, ecclesiastical and educational structure in each country. Social change and political reform during the 19th century however changed the character of a highly decentralised state operating on a basis of "clientelism"[36] into an interventionist and increasingly centralised one. This had different consequences in Wales and Scotland. In Wales it entailed the reawakening of a distinctive cultural identity, and consequently Welsh Home Rule was about achieving an institutional expression of this newly discovered Welshness. In Scotland, however, it brought about a defence of existing Scottish institutions and traditions.

---

[35] Young Wales, Vol. I, 1895, p.21.

[36] D W Urwin considers "it (..) not (.) unfair to apply the term clientelism as a blanket description of traditional British politics ", in: Towards the Nationalisation, p.231.

REGIONAL MOVEMENTS AND SCOTTISH AUTONOMY

Scottish nationalism in the 19th and early 20th centuries never rejected the Union. The commonwealth with England not only enabled many enterprising Scots to build and benefit from an empire abroad[37], but also to develop unimpaired from the political centre a civil society at home. Scottish interest in the Union as a means of maintaining and strengthening the Empire was shared by both Unionists and Liberals. The former also showed their willingness to countenance a measure of "administrative devolution" as opposed to "legislative devolution" to Scotland which was advocated by mainly Liberal dominated Home Rule movements.

"Administrative devolution"[38] as it was called later in 1928, helped to preserve this Scottish autonomy, symbolised in the re-establishment of the Scottish Office in 1885. Neither Tories nor Liberals denied a Scottish national interest in managing their own affairs; what was actually disputed was how to defend this autonomy. It was a Scottish Tory, the Earl of Eglington and Winton, who founded the 'National Association for the Vindication of Scottish Rights' in 1853[39] on the grounds that Scottish affairs were inadequately handled in Westminster. This complaint could be satisfied by expanding local boards. Just over 30 years later, in 1884, the Convention of Royal Burghs persuaded the Liberal government that Scotland wanted administrative change[40] which resulted in the re-establishing of the Scottish Office enacted by the Conservative caretaker ministry in 1885.

When in the following year (April 1886) Gladstone introduced his first Irish Home Rule Bill Scottish Liberals founded in May the 'Scottish Home Rule Association' based on precisely the same line of arguments of "vindicating her [Scotland's] rights" In contrast to its predecessors it went well beyond the claim of "securing her legitimate affairs", i.e. mere administrative autonomy, and demanded "the establishment of a legislature sitting in Scotland with full

---

37 R.A. Cage (ed.), The Scots abroad. Labour, Capital, Enterprise, 1750-1914. Croom Helm, London 1985

38 James Mitchell, Conservatism in Twentieth Century Scotland Society, Ideology and the Union, in: Michael Lynch (ed), Scotland, 1850-1979: Society, Politics and the Union, The Historical Association Committee for Scotland and The Historical Association, London 1993, p.28.

39 R.J. Morris and Graeme Morton, The Re-making of Scotland. a Nation within a Nation, 1850-1920, in. ibid., p.16

40 Lindsay Paterson, The Autonomy of Modern Scotland, Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh 1994, p.62

control over all purely Scottish questions, and with an Executive Government responsible to it and the Crown".[41] Ever since, regional movements in Scotland have never considered anything but the creation of a separate parliament the adequate "expression of their national aspirations"[42]. However, none of these more radical movements ever intended to repeal the Act of Union. Thus the *Young Scots Society*, a Liberal pressure group founded during the Boer War in 1900, expressly declared:

> *"Modern Scottish Home Rulers do not propose the repeal of the Treaty of Union, not even of Article III under which the ancient sovereign Parliament of Scotland was abolished."*

What they wanted was simply to "extend the Treaty by creating subordinate Parliaments"[43]. Similarily the second[44] SHRA set up in 1918 emphasised the same ideal of self-government within the context of the Empire. Their sensitivity to potential criticism is revealed by the lengths they went to proclaim,

> *"We are not a separatist party. We merely wish for Scottish self-government, leaving the Imperial Parliament to deal with the higher questions of Imperial policy."*[45]

CONCEPTS OF HOME RULE ALL ROUND

As mentioned above, it was Gladstone's Irish Home Rule policy which provoked a regional Home Rule movement in Scotland in 1886. When Gladstone introduced his first Home Rule bill for Ireland the most controversial clause was that about the exclusion of Irish representation from Westminster.

---

41 Scottish Home Rule Association, Edinburgh, 20th May 1886.

42 Ibid, John Stuart Blackie, the romantic nationalist, circumscribed Scottish national rights as follows: "As an independent Kingdom, inheriting its own traditions, using its own laws, boasting its own Church, and marked by a distinctive type of character and culture, Scotland had a right to demand that her public business shall be conducted seriously on Scottish grounds, in a Scottish atmosphere, and under Scottish influence (...)."; Young Scots Handbook 1911-12, p.21.

43 Ibid., p.59.

44 The pre-war SHRA fell into decay in the mid 1890s and finally "collapsed after the outbreak of hositilities", R. Finlay, Independent and Free. Scottish Politics and the Origins of the Scottish National Party 1918-1945, John Donald, Edinburgh 1994; see also R. Drost-Hüttl, Die schottische Nationalbewegung zwischen 1886 und 1934. Nationalistische Ziele und Strategien im Wandel, Universitätsverlag Dr. N. Bockmeyer, Bochum 1995, pp.70-71.

45 Quoted in: R. Finlay, Independent and Free, p.4.

For this representation was a symbol of the constitutional difference of Ireland from the colonies as these had no share in the financial obligations of the different parts of the United Kingdom. In other words, the exclusion of Irish members was contradictory to the venerable principle of 'no taxation without representation'.[46] Chamberlain considered the "difficulties of any plan (...) almost insurmountable", and believed that "the worst of all plans would be one which kept the Irishmen at Westminster while they had their own Parliament in Dublin" [47] Both ways were tried and both ways failed. The first bill in 1886 excluding Irish members was defeated in the Commons with Chamberlain strongly opposing this proposal, while the second attempt in 1893 providing for Irish representation in the imperial parliament was rejected by the Lords.

Apparently Chamberlain's prime objective in 1885 aimed at more democracy in the localities when he propagated his national council scheme, wrapped up as "Home Rule all round" But this also implied the need for greater efficiency at the centre and, as Jay rightly states, "Chamberlain's Radicalism at least demanded a strong imperial parliament"[48], able to implement his policies. Consequently, after he parted company with the Gladstonians he also dropped any plans for extended local governments and concentrated on the consolidation of the empire. Gladstonian Liberalism, however, continued traditional laissez faire liberalism and its Home Rule commitment assured the constitutent parts of the United Kingdom, and Scotland in particular, not to impair their local autonomy within the Union but rather to enhance it.

Quite apart from political deliberations, Gladstone's bias to national self-determination, as he abundantly demonstrated in his campaign on the Eastern Question in 1876/7, favoured his conversion to Irish Home Rule. Though he was also sympathetic to Scottish aspirations for more self-government he however, never pursued this. Ireland came first, and there was a clear electoral imperative for tackling this problem.[49] His main objective was to do justice to Ireland, whatever the costs of political and constitutional rupture. In contrast with this somewhat destructive approach to Home Rule, Scottish regional movements, however, put forward alternative concepts of how regional self-government might be organised.

---

[46] Lord Loreburn, Form of Home Rule, in: The Contemporaray Review 99/1 (1911), pp.259-273 (pp.261-62).

[47] Richard Jay, Joseph Chamberlain, p.124.

[48] Ibid, p.125.

[49] See above, p.1

Three such concepts were predominantly circulated in political discussion - "Home Rule all round", "devolution" and "federalism" which basically all contained the same idea of creating regional sub-parliaments whilst recognising the overall supremacy of Westminster These concepts were often elided, confused or misused in the political discourse of the day; which concept was chosen at a particular time depended on the political opportunity a certain perspective on regional self-government might present. Evidently, "Home Rule all round" was meant to apply the idea of Home Rule to the different countries within a union state and thus to avoid obvious injustice as well as illogical legislation. William Mitchell, one of the founders of the SHRA described himself and his colleagues as "Home Rulers on principle, not only for Ireland but for their own country"[50]. Therefore they opposed Gladstone's Irish Home Rule policy, whilst generally supporting Gladstonian liberalism. The favourite argument of the Young Scots, recurring in their writings, underlined that Home Rule for Ireland cannot be granted "without introducing many anomalies at Westminster".[51] According to their principles of New Liberalism they argued on rational rather then nationalist lines and pointed out that any Home Rule legislation also demands equal treatment of all parts of the Union. Since the activities of the Young Scots Society to influence a Liberal government arose only after the election triumph of 1906 the debate on Home Rule was closely related to the contemporary reconstruction of the Empire and society at home in the light of the Boer War, and proposed measures were generally embedded in a more comprehensive plan of Empire federation.

CONGESTION AND DEVOLUTION

Much earlier when the Irish policy of obstruction heavily impeded parliamentary business Liberal party leaders came up in speeches and memoranda with suggestions for parliamentary devolution. In 1880 Gladstone ventilated ideas on how to economise on parliamentary time by devolving parts of its business to Grand Committees.[52] These considerations then, in the 1890s, constituted the starting point for Scottish regionalists to justify Scottish Home Rule in terms of devolution and on grounds of congestion of parliament. Thus whilst

---

[50] William Mitchell, Is Scotland to be sold again? Home Rule for Scotland, Scottish Home Rule Association, Edinburgh 1892, p.7

[51] Young Scots Handbook 1911-12, p 13

[52] Gladstone outlined his thoughts in a confidential memorandum on "Obstuction and Devolution" destined for the Cabinet. It is reprinted in J L Hammond, Gladstone and the Irish Nation, Longman, London 1938, pp 198-204

arguments for Scottish Home Rule had hitherto been focussed on complaints about the neglect of Scottish affairs they now shifted into a wider context affecting the whole Kingdom.

The principle of devolution was derived from the problem of legislative congestion in the Imperial parliament which was aptly diagnosed by Sir Henry Dalziel, a Scottish Home Ruler, in 1894: "We are agreed that the disease from which the patient is suffering is congestion"[53]. To base the political demand of Home Rule on the contention of a congestion of parliament was enormously convenient as it could appease Unionists and other opponents[54] of Irish Home Rule - which, on the contrary, was defended on nationalist grounds. Devolution, in this light, was more a standard measure of parliamentary reform comparable with the extension of the franchise or the more controversial reform of the Lords. Moreover, it was logical in itself for it treated the four countries equally should Parliament decide to devolve upon each constituent country of the Union "the control of all those affairs which concerns its own well being"[55] and to grant them their own legislatures. Even more important, devolution did not involve any constitutional disruptures and was therefore acceptable to a wide range of political opinon. It could have been enacted as a cross-party measure and, as stated by Dalziel, there was a consensus on both sides of the House that Scottish business must be separately dealt with:

> *"Yesterday and to-day two proposals have been made for Committees - one by the government, and the other by an influential Member of the Tory Party. The proposals differ in character and in detail, but they are alike in this - that they proceed upon the assumption that the state of business in the House has arrived at a point when, if the Parliamentary machine is to discharge all the functions that are properly expected of it, some new and bold departure will have to be undertaken."*[56]

---

[53] Hansard, Parl. Deb., 4th ser., vol. 22, 1894, col. 1287

[54] A typical representative of this kind of Liberal who declined Home Rule for Ireland was the somewhat eccentric John Stuart Blackie, Professor of Greek at Edinburgh University and member of the SHRA. At the third annual conference of the association he proclaimed "that he belonged to the Association for Scottish Home Rule, and he had nothing to do with Ireland. He knew Scotland, and he knew Scotsman." The Times, 25 September 1890, p.7.

[55] GB Clark, Member for Caithness and President of the SHRA, in his motion for Scottish Home Rule, Hansard, Parl. Deb., 3rd series, vol. 341, 1890, col. 684.

[56] Op. cit., Hansard, Parl. Deb., 1894.

The devolution scheme was indeed to a broad extent truely Scottish. Local autonomy in Scotland worked on a system of private bill legislation which enhanced the powers of various local bodies such as "governing councils of cities, towns, universities"[57] Granting Scotland its own legislature would have formally consolidated the hitherto rather informal system of a virtually decentralised state. Despite the fact that this moderate scheme for constitutional change was not pursued any further it, however, influenced conciliatory Irish Unionists for whom it served as a model to settle the political implications of the Irish question.[58] But even if the Conservatives had agreed on Scottish devolution they would never have conceded its application to Ireland since staunch Irish Unionists had vehemently refused it.

EMPIRE AND FEDERALISM

Another approach to Home Rule all round discussed the example of a federal in contrast to a unionist constitution. Here again, the Scottish nationalists were in the vanguard when they claimed that Scotland had always "desired (...) a federal, and not a incorporating union"[59] To prove this they conjured up history. For, as John Morrison Davidson pointed out in 1890, it was Fletcher of Saltoun who fought for a federal union, and he proudly described him as "one of the few genuine patriots"[60] who did not betray the Scottish nation when others sold Scotland to England in 1707 Whilst A.V Dicey in his famous anti-Home book of 1885 proclaimed the Americans as being "the original inventors of the best federal system in the world"[61] Morrison Davidson claimed this merit for the Scots:

---

[57] L Paterson, Autonomy of Scotland, pp 49 and 54

[58] Immediately after its constitution in August 1904 the Irish Reform Association with Lord Dunraven as its president issued a preliminary report on 31 August which pronounced "that such [political] union is compatible with the devolution to Ireland of a larger measure of local government than she now possesses" and continued about how the Association perceived it possible, "to extend to Ireland the system of private bill legislation which has been so successfully worked in Scotland", quoted in F S L Lyons, The Irish unionist party and the devolution crisis of 1904-5, in Irish Historical Studies, 6/21, (March 1948), pp 1-22 (2).

[59] A Scottish Home Rule manifesto, The Times, 18 February 1888, p 15

[60] Scotia Rediviva. Home Rule for Scotland With lives of Sir William Wallace, George Buchanan, Fletcher of Saltoun and Thomas Spence, London 1890, p 7 (so are following quotations).

[61] England's Case against Home Rule, Surrey, Richmond 1973 [Reprint of 1885 edition], p 160

> *"In a word, the "country" or patriotic party were* extreme federalists *at the time when not one of the framers of the justly vaunted Federal constitution of America was yet born. And that Fletcher; Lord Belhaven, and their followers were entirely right there can be no earthly doubt. A* federal union *would have secured to both countries the advantages which have flowed from the existing incorporating union, without any of the serious drawbacks which it will be easy to show have accrued more particularly to the less powerful nationality* (my emphasis)*."*

Besides this complaint common amongst Scottish nationalists that the "incorporating union" discriminated against Scotland, J.M. Davidson also praised the sought-for federal union as a constitutional model that would have helped to avoid the present Home Rule trouble:

> *"Had a federal compact been struck between England and Scotland in 1707, it is not too much to say that the example would have been followed by the legislatures of England and Ireland in 1800 or earlier, and there would be no interminable Home Rule agitation today."*

Davidson's nationalist polemics not only flattered Scottish self-consciousness but also anticipated future political propaganda. At the time when the reform of the House of Lords was pending and the unity of the Empire was at stake federalism appeared a panacea in the political trafficking of nationalists and unionists alike. As mentioned above, the different terms expressing ideas of regional self-government were never clearly distinguished and this again accounts for the equal use of words such as "federalism", "federal Home Rule" and "federal devolution".

In 1909 a group of Unionists, among them the Lords Robert Cecil, Selborne and Wolmer and publicists like Frederick Scott Oliver (who wrote under the pseudonym 'Pacificus' in "The Times"), Lionel Curtis and Leo Amery formed the 'Round Table Movement' which ultimately aimed at the federation of the Empire.[62] Before this goal could be achieved they concluded that Federalism in the United Kingdom had to come first, which they justified with the well-known arguments of congestion in the Imperial Parliament. So while this Imperialist movement tried to influence the Unionist party they assisted Scottish and Welsh Home Rulers in their pursuit for regional self-government in-

---

[62] See J.E. Kendle, The Round Table Movement and 'Home Rule all round', in: Historical Journal, 11/2 (1968), pp.332-353.

sofar as they linked the debate on Home Rule to the concern about the British Empire.

Adopting the arguments of "Pacificus" the Scottish Liberal J.A. Murray Macdonald for example defended federal Home Rule as an ideal solution for the controversy over the Lords and the Irish question since it "would pass (large powers) from the immediate control of the Imperial Parliament to the subordinate Legislatures in England, Scotland, Ireland and Wales"[63]. Yet in contrast to J.M. Davidson, though in accordance with his chief interest in the maintainance of the Empire, he went even so far as to contend that federal Home Rule was consistent with the existing Union:

> *"Each of these countries [excluding Wales] has now its own law and its own administrative system regulating and controlling its own domestic interests; and to each of them might be given independent powers of dealing with these interests without any radical departure from the spirit of our present practice."*[64]

This, in fact, was a rather simple understanding of federal Home Rule. However, a more thoughtful exposition of the subject highlighted its genuine complexity if it was to include the Dominions, as was indeed the intention of the 'Round Table Movement'. In a confidential memorandum the Liberal Unionist Lord Selborne outlined the connotations of a "federal constitution" that opens the vista to "a federal or semi-federal system of the United Kingdom (if a Home Rule Act was passed for Ireland)":

> *"We cannot refuse to Ireland a voice on imperial affairs, or on the common affairs of the United Kingdom. Therefore the consequence of the establishment of Home Rule in Ireland will be the establishment of Home Rule in England and in Scotland. This means a federal constitution, (...) it will mean subordinate Parliaments for England, Scotland, Ireland and possibly Wales; and a Parliament for the management of the common affairs of the Empire (...) Four Parliaments, an English, a Scottish, an Irish, a Welsh concerned only with the local affairs of those parts of the United Kingdom. A fifth Parliament for the United Kingdom concerned only with affairs common to all parts of the United Kingdom, but which are not im-*

---

63 The Constitutional Controversy and Federal Home Rule, in: Nineteenth Century, 70/1 (July 1911), pp.33-43 (34).

64 Ibid., p.41

perial affairs. And a sixth Parliament concerned only with imperial affairs common to all parts of the Empire."[65]

THE FEDERAL IDEA AND POLITICAL REALITY

The most favourable condition to have Home Rule all round enacted occurred in the period from 1910, when the constitutional conference over the House of Lords crisis took place, until the introduction of an Irish Home Rule Bill by the Asquith government in April 1912. Scottish M.P.s seized the opportunity and for the first time acted in co-ordination when they founded the 'Scottish National Committee'[66] to put pressure on Government. Neither was this chance lost on Welsh Home Rulers who were represented by the restless though somewhat naïve E.T John. He was the Member for Anglesey where the Liberal Association had carried "a resolution supporting federal devolution (...) which urged 'similarity and spontaneity' of treatment of Scotland and Wales with Ireland.[67] Additionally, he also presided over the "Welsh Nationalist League" which shortly after its formation in Criccieth in January 1911 issued a manifesto demanding "a definite pledge from the Cabinet that Home Rule on federal lines will be introduced this Parliament"[68].

Public meetings, manifestoes, contact between Scottish and Welsh Home Rulers[69] and concerted parliamentary action[70] on the one side and the propaganda of the Unionist federalists on the other signify this pregnant Home Rule period. Considering also Lloyd George's and Winston Churchill's thrusts in

---

[65] Lord Selborne to Austen Chamberlain, 4 September 1911, quoted in D George Boyce (ed.), The Crisis of British Unionism. The Domestic Political Papers of the Second Earl of Selborne, 1855-1922, Historians Press, London 1987, pp 70-71

[66] The Times, 30 June 1910, p.12. To this Scottish National Committee were associated "fouty-four Scottish M.P.s under the general leadership of W H. Cowan (East Aberdeen)"; see K.O. Morgan, Wales in British Politics, p.256

[67] J Graham Jones, E.T John and Welsh Home Rule, 1910-14, in. The Welsh Historical Review 13/4 (1987), pp 453-467 (456).

[68] Quoted in: ibid., p.459. For the Welsh Nationalist League a major point in favour of a regional parliament was its power to enact Disestablishment.

[69] see K.O. Morgan, Wales in British Politics, p.256

[70] Asquith could not turn a cold shoulder to the Scottish National Committee and invited its members for an interview before the second reading of the Irish Home Rule Bill as Mr Pirie declared in the Commons in 1912: "Had it not been for the interview which the Scottish Members had with the Prime Minister yesterday, my vote would have been absolutely against the Second Reading." Hansard, Parl. Deb., 5th ser., 38, 1912, col 337

Cabinet in favour of grand devolution measures it is all the more surprising that nothing in fact happened. These two were the only Cabinet members actually presenting plans for an extended Home Rule bill. Churchill's memo dealt with the English situation in which Home Rule all round was to be realised and concluded that the solution was to break up England into seven regions. It was rejected, not least because of its similarity to the ancient Anglo-Saxon Heptarchy.

Lloyd George approached the problem in the spirit of the Welsh Nationalist League in that he suggested that the government should introduce the Irish bill first but simultaneously promise to proceed next to introduce similar legislation for England, Scotland and Wales. In the meantime regional affairs should be delegated to Grand Committees for Scotland and Wales.[71]

With such powerful advocates in the Cabinet and with public support from some influential Unionists why after all did Home Rule all round not come to pass? Four points should be advanced here:

Firstly, the Unionist Round Table Movement was primarily interested in the federation of the Empire and promoted Home Rule all round within the United Kingdom only as a logical and plausible means to achieve this goal. Traditional Tories, like the Marquess of Salisbury, however, distrusted ardent Home Rule all round advocates like J.L. Garvin with opinions varying according to political opportunities.[72] This in fact limited their chances to capture party opinion. The case of the 'Round Table or Tariff Reform Movement' was only as strong as the Dominions' desire for a closer economic and defence union (Zoll- und Kriegsverein). All they accepted was the connection to the mother country through the Imperial Conferences. But, with the Liberals back in power since 1906 any aspirations of the Dominions for preferences were destroyed. Plans for imperial federation meanwhile coincided with increasing

---

71 For a profound treatment of this problem on Cabinet level see Particia Jalland, United Kingdom Devolution 1910-14 political panacea or tactical diversion, in English Historical Review 94 (1979), pp 765-767

72 Lord Selborne communicated his suspicions towards such views as expressed in the "Pall Mall (newspaper edited by Garvin) with extreme Tariff Reform" and speculated "that a man who could so lightly throw over fundamental conservative principles because they did not at the moment happen to pay, would certainly not hestitate to throw over food taxes, if he thought they did not pay " Selborne to Salisbury, 19 September 1911, in The Crisis of British Unionism, p 74 Selborne alluded to Garvin's sudden advocacy of Home Rule all round in July 1910 when the Constitutional Conference was going on and opened chances to a general re-construction of the constitution See J E Kendle, Round Table and 'Home Rule all round', p 340 and especially n 18

economic and political independence of Canada, Australia and South Africa. Canada "was showing more interest in reciprocity with the United States and with Botha's support Laurier [the Canadian Prime Minister] opposed Dominion interference in British self-government"[73], which would have been a corollary of the creation of an Imperial Parliament. Already during the Colonial Conference in 1902 it became clear that the outlook in the larger colonies, in Canada and Australia, was very different to plans of Imperial Federation at home which were only supported by the smaller colonies. Julian Amery concluded that

> *"the same factors which had revived their Imperial sentiment had also strengthened their local nationalism (...). The immense disparity in population, wealth and experience, which separated them from the United Kingdom, robbed Imperial Federation of its attractions."*[74]

Secondly, the British constitution was/is based on the principle of the "sovereignty of parliament". Yet the formation of regional sub-parliaments or, in the words of a distinguished Unionist, "Home Rule however curtailed, means the surrender of Parliamentary authority"[75]. It is A.V. Dicey, the influential constitutional historian and formal Liberal who, intellectually, crossed the floor and turned into a convinced Unionist[76], who can be quoted as the champion of the *status quo*. In numerous articles and in his famous book "England's case against Home Rule" he vigorously defended the Union against any proposals for a federal scheme. For him

> *"the principle (...) which gives its form to our system is (to use a foreign but convenient expression) 'unitarianism', or the habitual exercise of supreme legislative authority by one central power, which in the particular case is the British Parliament".*[77]

---

[73] The Cambridge History of the British Empire, vol. III: The Empire - Commonwealth, 1870-1919, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1959, p.403.

[74] The Life of Joseph Chamberlain, vol. iv, 1901-1903, p.415.

[75] England's case against Home Rule, p.24.

[76] It is worthwhile mentioning that "acadmic opinion on the whole tended towards unionism" See Christopher Harvie, Ideology and Home Rule: James Bryce, A.V Dicey and Ireland, 1880-1887, in: English Historical Review 91 (1976), pp.298-314 (298).

[77] Intoduction into the study of the law of the constitution, Macmillan, London 1961 [1886], pp.138-168.

Contrary to a unitary system, he explains, the federal system is based upon the supremacy of the constitution. According to him, the flaws in this principle were threefold:

(I) a federal system requires a written constitution; but laws reduced to writing are open to misintepretation.
(II) a written constitution is "rigid" or "inexpansive" The American constitution, for example can be changed only when proposed amendments are ratified by three quarters of all several states.
(III) the division of powers is carried beyond necessary limit.

Basically his arguments can be reduced to the political prejudice that federal government means weak government.

Thirdly, a decisive factor against Home Rule all round was the position of the Irish Parliamentary Party. Although the Irish members were not given a part in the negotiations of the Cabinet Committee on Home Rule they nevertheless exerted influence through leading Cabinet ministers. Augustine Birrell, the Chief Secretary for Ireland, played a pivotal role in advocating Irish interests and helped to remove from the second draft of the Bill Lloyd George's devolution clause which provided for temporary Scottish and Welsh Grand Committees. These trajectories to federalism could have caused prolonged debates in the House "and the possible killing of the Bill, with the inevitable consequence that Home Rule for Ireland will again be postponed indefinitely" so that the Irish leaders definitely rejected it.[78] Thus, the Irish being adamantly opposed to federal plans eventually succeeded, not least because they were actively supported by Birrell, Morley and indirectly by other Cabinet members including the Prime Minister who were unenthusiasitc about a federal solution.

Finally, there existed no Home-Rule-all-round-Party. However, Home Rule for Ireland was voiced in parliament by a monolithic party and based on a nationalist movement in the country. Regionalism was to a great extent the Scottish and Welsh offspring of Liberalism facing the onset of mass democracy and consequently falling apart. Geographically Scotland and Wales were like Ireland divided into one mainly agararian and another predominantly industrial part. The latter produced a strong middle class which was not only traditionally bound to the Liberal Party but also beneficially pursued its economic and career interests within the United Kingdom and the Empire. These interests ruled out sectional and national particularism in Scotland and Wales, unlike in Ireland, and united their respective countries under the Liberal banner tinged

---

[78] Redmond's and Dillon's critique expressed in a memorandum laid before the Cabinet on 25 January 1912, quoted in. P Jalland, U K. devolution, p 768.

with the St. Andrew's cross and the Red Dragon. As regionalism also appealed to the working classes and their leaders in the nascent Labour Party the death of the Liberal Party after the First World War did not wipe out the idea of Home Rule.

Home Rule agitations continued after the war almost on the same lines as before. In Wales conferences were held at the well-known places of the 1890s and the Scottish Home Rule Association was re-established immediately after the war, in September 1918. The pursuance of "war socialism"[79] had fundamentally changed economic and social conditions[80] and thus added to the traditional Liberal approach to regional Home Rule more radical movements. As the Liberal Party was in a process of rapid decline and the Labour Party on the other had entered upon centralist politics the various regional Home Rule movements concentrated forces and founded for the first time independent nationalist parties: the Welsh 'Plaid Cymru' in 1925 and the National Party of Scotland in 1928. Moreover, the excision of Southern Ireland from the United Kingdom by 1922 made it abundantly clear that any opportunity for a sweeping constitutional reform had now been postponed to an indefinite future. Home Rule all round had indeed not been implemented, institutional recognition of a separate nationality, however, had taken place. But it is open to discussion whether, for example, the remodelling of the post of the Scottish Secretary into a Secretary of State in 1926 or the opening of St. Andrew's House in 1939 which moved the centre of Scottish administration from Whitehall to Edinburgh can be accounted as genuine administrative devolution or as merely symbolical acts to satisfy Scottish national aspirations.

---

[79] K O Morgan, Rebirth of a Nation, p.169.

[80] See for the Scottish case Christopher Harvie, No Gods and Precious Few Heroes. Scotland 1914-1980, Edward Arnold, London 1981, pp.1-34.