

# History lessons we should learn

Tristram Hunt, *The Observer*, Sunday 15 January 2006

5 The Chancellor's call at yesterday's Fabian Society conference for a celebration of Britishness should be cautiously welcomed by patriotic progressives. In an impassioned speech, he made the case for recapturing the union flag as a 'British symbol of unity, tolerance and inclusion'. But despite his best intentions, it is not supranational identities which Britons want to cling to, rather, the more particular identities of Wales, Scotland and, increasingly, England.

10 As a Scottish Chancellor of the Exchequer seeking to be Prime Minister of Great Britain, Gordon Brown has been making similar pronouncements since the mid-1990s. His empathy for and knowledge of the past is widely admired. Yet reservations creep in when the tub-thumping rhetoric drowns out historical analysis. For the Brownite virtues of Britishness - tolerance, fair play, liberty under law, an outward-looking mentality - are neither unique to these isles nor have they always been on display across Britain's long history. All too frequently, the Chancellor slips into a Whiggish narrative of national heroism which pays little attention to the less-becoming elements of our past. Many were dismayed when he chose a recent trip to Africa to celebrate the virtues of empire and demand we stop apologising for it. As academic Paul Gilroy rightly asks: 'When did we start apologising?'

15 Behind much of Brown's thinking is the canonical work *Britons* by Princeton historian Linda Colley. During the 18th century, she suggests, the modern British state was forged under the influence of empire, Protestantism and warfare. Seen in this light, Great Britain cannot be regarded as an ancient nation whose origins are lost in the mists of time. Instead, it should be regarded as the specific construct of the Act of Union between England and Scotland. As such, it is a nation whose history extends not much further than the quintessentially modern national creation, the United States of America.

20 Problematically for prospective leaders of the UK, the very forces which first crafted Great Britain in the 1700s are now in disarray. The ambition for empire is gone; Protestantism in its Anglican and nonconformist varieties is a shadow of its previous magnificence; and while the Prime Minister has done all he can to keep our martial spirit up, we are no longer involved in the kind of totalising military mobilisations of which the Second World War was the last.

25 The ties which bound Englishman to Scotsman to Welshman; the culture which celebrated David Livingstone, Florence Nightingale or Lloyd George as unifyingly British heroes has gone. So, according to Mr Brown, we need a new calendar of rituals and events to reunite the British ethos. Hence his call to convert Remembrance Day into British Day.

30 But at least since the early Seventies, what ever greater numbers have wanted to identify with is their national identity. Celtic nationalism emerged as a major political and cultural force during the Callaghan years and, through the demand for devolution, brought that government down. In the Nineties, English nationalism witnessed a wholly unexpected grassroots revival. On the left, the likes of Billy Bragg and Tony Benn championed the radical heritage of the English common man while on the right, Roger Scruton, Peter Hitchens and a small army of football fans rediscovered the symbolic meaning of St George.

40 Only last week, the government seemed to be encouraging such emotional patriotism. By  
launching the English Icons campaign, a website devoted to public expressions of pride in  
uniquely English products, Culture Minister David Lammy hoped to draw the sting of  
xenophobic nationalism and unashamedly celebrate the specific virtues of England. And if it  
is managed well, what this initiative could help the public realise is the long-established  
45 multicultural component of English identity. For one of the most popular English icons - the  
cup of tea - is a microcosm of our imperial, global history of power politics and cultural  
exchange.

Yet few of these ministerial initiatives will do much good unless we rethink our approach to  
the teaching of history and national identity in our schools. British Day will remain an empty  
initiative (like the Empire and Commonwealth Days of the Fifties), unless children are taught  
50 a far more comprehensive history of Britain. We need to be brave about teaching a rigorous,  
global narrative of British history and identity which goes beyond the obsessive heroism and  
victimhood of the Second World War.

If the union flag is going to mean something to Gordon Brown's future patriots, then they  
need first of all to know our 'warts and all' past.

# Gordon Brown's speech at the "Love Scotland Vote No" rally in Glasgow

By Gordon Brown, September 17, 2014

At today's Better Together rally in Maryhill Community Central Hall, Gordon Brown said:

"I want to tell the people of Scotland of that patriotic vision of the future of Scotland. Proud of our Scottish identity. Proud of our distinctive institutions. Proud of the Scottish Parliament we have created. Proud, that with the powers we have given it and without the need of separation, the NHS in  
5 Scotland will always be in public hands, properly funded and free at the point of need forever or as long as the people of Scotland want it. And proud we are increasing the powers of that Parliament — decided tomorrow with a 'No' vote, delivery the day after tomorrow — which will mean faster, better and safer change than the uncertainty and disruption offered by the Nationalists.

10 And we are proud also — and this too is our patriotic vision — that we Scots led in cooperation and sharing across the United Kingdom, from our common defence policy and our shared currency, to UK pensions and the UK minimum wage across four nations, with contributions on the basis of their ability to pay and to each according to their needs. And contrast this patriotic vision with the Nationalist vision, which is to end all links with the UK, with the risks that entails.

15 And that is what this vote tomorrow is really about. Not about Scotland being a nation, we are a nation forever — yesterday, today and tomorrow. It's not about the Scottish Parliament, we have it and its powers are increasing, but whether — and this is the question — you want to break every last link with the UK and I say I don't want to end UK pensions, UK passports, the UK pound, the UK welfare state,  
20 the UK funded health service or the UK minimum wage.

So let us tell people of what we have done together. Tell them that we fought and won a war against fascism together. Tell them there is no war cemetery in Europe where Scots, English, Welsh and Northern Irish troops do not lay side-by-side. We fought together, suffered together, sacrificed  
25 together, mourned together and then celebrated together.

And tell them that we not only won a war together — we built a peace together, we created the NHS together, we built a welfare state together. We did all this without sacrificing within the union our identity, our culture, our tradition as Scots. Our Scottishness is not weaker, but stronger as a result.

30 And what we created together, let no nationalist split asunder. And tell the undecided, the waverers and those to still make up their mind, being falsely told that you cannot be proudly Scottish and vote no, that this is our Scotland.

Tell them Scotland does not belong to the SNP. Tell them, Scotland does not belong to the 'Yes' campaign. That it doesn't belong to Mr Salmond or Mr Swinney or to me or any other politician.

35 Tell them — Scotland belongs to all of us. And tell the Nationalists, it's not their flag, their culture, their country or their streets. Tell them it's everyone's flag, everyone's culture, everyone's country and everyone's streets. And tell them that our patriotic vision is bigger than nationalism; we want Scotland not leaving the UK, but leading the UK, and through leading the UK, leading in the world.

40 And tell the undecided, the unsure, those thinking of voting yes today but who can be persuaded to vote no tomorrow. Tell them that we who vote 'No' love Scotland.

45 The Scotland of the Scottish Enlightenment and Scottish inventors; the Scotland that is the pioneer of the right to work and yes, the right to free health care; the Scotland that is author of the welfare state and international aid. And we achieved all this and far more not outside the Union, but inside the Union. Not in spite of the Union, but through the Union. And there is not one part of us that is lesser as a result.

50 And so tell the undecided, the persuadable and those who were going to vote yes and now see some of the risks. Tell them of the risks. Tell them of the seven deadly risks pushing us through an economic trapdoor from which there is no escape. A yes vote runs the risks of a disputed currency, debt default, having to immediately raise tens of billions of pounds for currency reserves, higher prices in the shops, higher mortgage rates, making one million jobs in sectors from defence to finance vulnerable and a fiscal black hole.

55 Before, it was the risk of the unknown. Now, it's the risk arising from the reality of the known. But the greatest risk to our health and public services is the one posed by independence. The biggest threat to the NHS is not the Union. With their secret plan for half a billion pounds of cuts, it is the SNP.

60 Let's tell the people of Scotland they are not saving the NHS but using the NHS to save the SNP. Let the people of Scotland be clear that the SNP don't wake up in the morning with a mission to save the NHS, they wake up with a mission to use it to create a separate state. And then tell the undecided, the unpersuaded, those who know the risks and those who think the SNP are progressive, tell them we have a vision for the future of Scotland. A vision that will bring a divided Scotland back together again. Not a Scotland when the eyes of the world are upon us is a Scotland of intimidation, threats, insults, abuse and recriminations.

70 I know the Scotland of Adam Smith and John Smith is better and bigger than this. A Scotland, yes, with a strong Scottish Parliament for fairness. And yes, strong for equality across the UK. It is not for ourselves alone that we fight; we do not seek prosperity, security and strength for just us and no one else. Everywhere, at every time, at every level, including within the UK, our instinct, our desire, our demand, and our dream for social justice is not through separation, but for a world of social justice.

75 This is the dream that we can live for and will never die off. This is the great cause that is worth fighting for and will endure. For the real separation we want is not from England, but from poverty. The real independence we want is not from our neighbours, but from inequality and deprivation. And the real freedom and liberation we want is not from one country, but freedom from injustice for every country, in every part of the world, now and for the decades to come. (...)

80 Have confidence to stand up and be counted and say, for Scotland's future, 'No'."

America was created by 17th- and 18th-century settlers who were overwhelmingly white, British, and Protestant. Their values, institutions, and culture provided the foundation for and shaped the development of the United States in the following centuries. They initially defined America in terms of race, ethnicity, culture, and religion. Then, in the 18th century, they also had to define America ideologically to justify independence from their home country, which was also white, British, and Protestant. Thomas Jefferson set forth this "creed," as Nobel Prize-winning economist Gunnar Myrdal called it, in the Declaration of Independence, and ever since, its principles have been reiterated by statesmen and espoused by the public as an essential component of U.S. identity.

By the latter years of the 19th century, however, the ethnic component had been broadened to include Germans, Irish, and Scandinavians, and the United States' religious identity was being redefined more broadly from Protestant to Christian. With World War II and the assimilation of large numbers of southern and eastern European immigrants and their offspring into U.S. society, ethnicity virtually disappeared as a defining component of national identity. So did race, following the achievements of the civil rights movement and the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965. Americans now see and endorse their country as multiethnic and multiracial. As a result, American identity is now defined in terms of culture and creed.

Most Americans see the creed as the crucial element of their national identity. The creed, however, was the product of the distinct Anglo-Protestant culture of the founding settlers. Key elements of that culture include the English language; Christianity; religious commitment; English concepts of the rule of law, including the responsibility of rulers and the rights of individuals; and dissenting Protestant values of individualism, the work ethic, and the belief that humans have the ability and the duty to try to create a heaven on earth, a "city on a hill." Historically, millions of immigrants were attracted to the United States because of this culture and the economic opportunities and political liberties it made possible.

Contributions from immigrant cultures modified and enriched the Anglo-Protestant culture of the founding settlers. The essentials of that founding culture remained the bedrock of U.S. identity, however, at least until the last decades of the 20th century. Would the United States be the country that it has been and that it largely remains today if it had been settled in the 17th and 18th centuries not by British Protestants but by French, Spanish, or Portuguese Catholics? The answer is clearly no. It would not be the United States; it would be Quebec, Mexico, or Brazil.

In the final decades of the 20th century, however, the United States' Anglo-Protestant culture and the creed that it produced came under assault by the popularity in intellectual and political circles of the doctrines of multiculturalism and diversity; the rise of group identities based on race, ethnicity, and gender over national identity; the impact of transnational cultural diasporas; the expanding number of immigrants with dual nationalities and dual loyalties; and the growing salience for U.S. intellectual, business, and political elites of cosmopolitan and transnational identities. The United States' national identity, like that of other nation-states, is challenged by the forces of globalization as well as the needs that globalization produces among people for smaller and more meaningful "blood and belief" identities.

In this new era, the single most immediate and most serious challenge to America's traditional identity comes from the immense and continuing immigration from Latin America, especially from Mexico, and the fertility rates of these immigrants compared to black and white American natives. Americans like to boast of their past success in assimilating millions of immigrants into their society, culture, and politics. But Americans have tended to generalize about immigrants without distinguishing among them and have focused on the economic costs and benefits of immigration, ignoring its social and cultural consequences. As a result, they have overlooked the unique characteristics and problems posed by contemporary

55 Hispanic immigration. The extent and nature of this immigration differ fundamentally from those of previous immigration, and the assimilation successes of the past are unlikely to be duplicated with the contemporary flood of immigrants from Latin America. This reality poses a fundamental question: Will the United States remain a country with a single national language and a core Anglo-Protestant culture? (...)

60 The impact of Mexican immigration on the United States becomes evident when one imagines what would happen if Mexican immigration abruptly stopped. The annual flow of legal immigrants would drop by about 175,000, closer to the level recommended by the 1990s Commission on Immigration Reform chaired by former U.S. Congresswoman Barbara Jordan. Illegal entries would diminish dramatically. The wages of low-income U.S. citizens would improve (...) And most important of all, the possibility of a de facto split between a predominantly Spanish-speaking United States and an English-speaking United States would disappear, and with it, a major potential threat to the country's cultural and political integrity.

Samuel Huntington, "The Hispanic Challenge", *Foreign Policy*, 2004.

65

"The Sinews of Peace" (Fulton Speech) by Winston Churchill

(March, 5, 1946)

1 [...] Now I come to the second danger of these two marauders which threatens the cottage, the home, and the ordinary people - namely, tyranny. We cannot be blind to the fact that the liberties enjoyed by individual citizens throughout the British Empire are not valid in a considerable number of countries, some of which are very powerful. In these States control is enforced upon the common people by various kinds of all-  
5 embracing police governments. The power of the State is exercised without restraint, either by dictators or by compact oligarchies operating through a privileged party and a political police. It is not our duty at this time when difficulties are so numerous to interfere forcibly in the internal affairs of countries which we have not conquered in war. But we must never cease to proclaim in fearless tones the great principles of freedom and the rights of man which are the joint inheritance of the English-speaking world and which through  
10 Magna Carta, the Bill of Rights, the Habeas Corpus, trial by jury, and the English common law find their most famous expression in the American Declaration of Independence.

All this means that the people of any country have the right, and should have the power by constitutional action, by free unfettered elections, with secret ballot, to choose or change the character or form of government under which they dwell; that freedom of speech and thought should reign; that courts of justice,  
15 independent of the executive, unbiased by any party, should administer laws which have received the broad assent of large majorities or are consecrated by time and custom. Here are the title deeds of freedom which should lie in every cottage home. Here is the message of the British and American peoples to mankind. Let us preach what we practise - let us practise what we preach.

I have now stated the two great dangers which menace the homes of the people: War and Tyranny. I have  
20 not yet spoken of poverty and privation which are in many cases the prevailing anxiety. But if the dangers of war and tyranny are removed, there is no doubt that science and co-operation can bring in the next few years to the world, certainly in the next few decades newly taught in the sharpening school of war, an expansion of material well-being beyond anything that has yet occurred in human experience. Now, at this sad and breathless moment, we are plunged in the hunger and distress which are the aftermath of our stupendous  
25 struggle; but this will pass and may pass quickly, and there is no reason except human folly of sub-human crime which should deny to all the nations the inauguration and enjoyment of an age of plenty. I have often used words which I learned fifty years ago from a great Irish-American orator, a friend of mine, Mr. Bourke Cockran. "There is enough for all. The earth is a generous mother; she will provide in plentiful abundance food for all her children if they will but cultivate her soil in justice and in peace." So far I feel that we are in  
30 full agreement.

Now, while still pursuing the method of realising our overall strategic concept, I come to the crux of what I have travelled here to say. Neither the sure prevention of war, nor the continuous rise of world organisation will be gained without what I have called the fraternal association of the English-speaking peoples. This means a special relationship between the British Commonwealth and Empire and the United States. This  
35 is no time for generalities, and I will venture to be precise. Fraternal association requires not only the growing friendship and mutual understanding between our two vast but kindred systems of society, but the continuance of the intimate relationship between our military advisers, leading to common study of potential dangers, the similarity of weapons and manuals of instructions, and to the interchange of officers and cadets at technical colleges. It should carry with it the continuance of the present facilities for mutual security by  
40 the joint use of all Naval and Air Force bases in the possession of either country all over the world. This would perhaps double the mobility of the American Navy and Air Force. It would greatly expand that of the British Empire Forces and it might well lead, if and as the world calms down, to important financial savings. Already we use together a large number of islands; more may well be entrusted to our joint care in the near future.

- 45 The United States has already a Permanent Defence Agreement with the Dominion of Canada, which is so devotedly attached to the British Commonwealth and Empire. This Agreement is more effective than many of those which have often been made under formal alliances. This principle should be extended to all British Commonwealths with full reciprocity. Thus, whatever happens, and thus only, shall we be secure ourselves and able to work together for the high and simple causes that are dear to us and bode no ill to any.
- 50 Eventually there may come - I feel eventually there will come - the principle of common citizenship, but that we may be content to leave to destiny, whose outstretched arm many of us can already clearly see.

There is however an important question we must ask ourselves. Would a special relationship between the United States and the British Commonwealth be inconsistent with our over-riding loyalties to the World Organisation? I reply that, on the contrary, it is probably the only means by which that organisation will

55 achieve its full stature and strength. There are already the special United States relations with Canada which I have just mentioned, and there are the special relations between the United States and the South American Republics. We British have our twenty years Treaty of Collaboration and Mutual Assistance with Soviet Russia. I agree with Mr. Bevin, the Foreign Secretary of Great Britain, that it might well be a fifty years Treaty so far as we are concerned. We aim at nothing but mutual assistance and collaboration. The British

60 have an alliance with Portugal unbroken since 1384, and which produced fruitful results at critical moments in the late war. None of these clash with the general interest of a world agreement, or a world organisation; on the contrary they help it. "In my father's house are many mansions." Special associations between members of the United Nations which have no aggressive point against any other country, which harbour no design incompatible with the Charter of the United Nations, far from being harmful, are beneficial and, as I

65 believe, indispensable. [...]

\* The text of Sir Winston Churchill's "The Sinews of Peace" speech is quoted in its entirety from Robert Rhodes James (ed.), *Winston S. Churchill: His Complete Speeches 1897-1963* Volume VII: 1943-1949 (New York: Chelsea House Publishers, 1974) 7285-7293.



There comes a point in a nation's story when the old slogans and the old illusions crumble, and every thinking person comes face to face with reality. For more than a generation now, people have been telling us that Socialism was inevitable. We've been told time and time again by experts that the drift is bound to be towards state control... Resistance, they say, is hopeless. This is the way the world is going... for too long those defeatists have polluted the atmosphere of public debate. Change is coming. The slither and slide to the socialist state is going to be stopped in this United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, stopped, halted and turned back. It can be done, it will be done, and we intend to make a start on the 4th May.

People are rebelling against the bulging Socialist state and its insatiable appetites. Labour, the self proclaimed party of compassion, has betrayed those for whom it promised to care. So in this campaign we'll not only extend and consolidate Conservative support, we'll carry the fight right into what were once the castles and strongholds of Labour, and in many places we'll win...

[...] There used to be in this country, a Socialism which valued people. It had dignity and it had warmth. Its methods were those of the collective, of putting all decisions to the centre, which was why it was not our creed, but its aims to raise the living standards of the people were the same as ours. Well, what a world away that is from the officious, jargon-filled, intolerant Socialism practised by Labour these last few years... What a world away that sort of brotherhood is from flying pickets, from ... the merciless use of the closed shop power, and all the other ugly apparatus which has been strapped like a harness on our people and our country, turning worker against worker, and society against itself.

[...] In a broadcast just before this campaign began, the Labour leader argued that Labour now stood for continuity. It was the Conservatives who wanted to change things, he said. Carry on as we are, that was his message. [...] Well, what appals us is Labour's shameless appeal to voters to accept our national decline as inevitable and simply to make the best of it. It seems to us like a summons to apathy, like some clarion call for inertia and indolence. It seems as if their campaign slogan is 'Carry on downhill with Labour'—carry on wheeling, carry on dealing, carry on declining, carry on down, carry on out.

Well, that's exactly what we've been doing under Labour and the decline is accelerating. What the figures tell in their ominous downwards march, we can now see for ourselves. Travel abroad, and see how much better our neighbours are doing. Travel round our towns and cities and see the shabby scars of Labour Britain, open and unhealing. Look at the ugly truth the record spells out over the last five years of socialism... What a record! Is this the nation that stood alone in 1940 against the collapse of European civilisation? It is, but it's the country we have become under Labour and try as they may, we will not let them escape the record. Because of their subservience to the unions, there's been no industrial progress under Labour. Because of their commitment to equality, rather than equality of opportunity, there's been

35 no social progress under Labour... Half a dozen world recessions can't absolve Labour from the major responsibility for Britain's decline. [...]

40 We're the people that in the past made Great Britain the workshop of the world, the people who persuaded others to buy British, not by begging them to do so, but because British was best. We're a people who have received more Nobel prizes than any other nation save America. With achievements like that, who can doubt that Britain *can* have a great future. But not under Labour. That great future won't happen under Labour. Only if we have a change, and we must have a change. The way to put Britain back into the international race is by giving new life and strength to principles which made our country the great and successful trading nation it used to be. They're good Conservative principles [...].

45 [A]s Conservatives we believe that recovery can only come through the work of individuals. We mustn't forever take refuge behind collective decisions. Each of us must assume our own responsibilities. What we get and what we become depends essentially on our own efforts. For what is the real driving force in society? It's the desire for the individual to do the best for himself and his family. People don't go out to work for the Chancellor of the Exchequer. They go out to work for their family, for their children, to help look after their parents. That's what they work for... That's the way society is improved, by millions of people resolving that they'll give their children a better life than they've had themselves. And there's just  
50 no substitute for this elemental human instinct, and the worst possible thing a Government can do is to try to smother it completely with a sort of collective alternative... They crush and destroy something precious and vital in the nation and in the individual spirit.

55 The proper role of government is to set free the natural energy of the people, and that means real rewards for effort and skill. It means restoring a wide degree of freedom to the forces that make up human society... we're starting to relearn one of the oldest lessons of history, and it is this; that freedom can't be divided into compartments. What use is freedom of speech and of the press in a closed-shop world? What value has a vote if all the real decisions in our lives are going to be taken for us by the state? ... That's why they so often go to take everything over by the state so that you have to go to them for everything, for your house, for your job. They take your money in tax so you haven't got anything left to save for  
60 your old age, and if you do they carry on with inflation so that it is soon worthless. That's the objective of the Socialist society, of people dependent for everything upon the state. [...]

Today, Labour in office stands for the ever growing dominance of the state, with all its despotism and frustration of human happiness. That will never be the Conservative way.

Margaret Thatcher, Speech to Conservative Rally in Cardiff, 16 April 1979

1 **C**OLLECTIVE MEMORY goes up for  
 5 grabs wherever people suffer from  
 dispossession and feel the call of  
 pride. Memories are not born but  
 made, remade, not natural but  
 "constructed," and like the memorials con-  
 10 structed to overcome memory, they are—and  
 of necessity must be—contested.

Where, I've wondered for some time, is the  
 15 national museum on slavery? The story of sla-  
 very and its sequels is not just a story for  
 blacks, just as the Holocaust is not just a story  
 for Jews. Not long ago, I asked Jürgen  
 20 Habermas his view of the dispute over a Ho-  
 locaust memorial in Berlin. The original de-  
 sign by Peter Eisenman and Richard Serra en-  
 visioned a vast field of spiky stones, a field of  
 thorns. After a demurrer from Gerhard  
 Schröder's newly elected social democratic  
 25 government, along with leaders of Germany's  
 Jews, the field was scaled back and a library  
 of Holocaust archives added. Habermas, a  
 center of moral clarity in Germany for some  
 thirty-five years now, told me that he preferred  
 30 the original, more drastic design. "It's not for  
 the Jews," he said emphatically. "It's meant to  
 be a thorn in the flesh of the Germans."

A thorn in the flesh of the Germans.  
 Habermas's ripping phrase came back to mind  
 35 during another recent conversation, this one  
 about the lack of a national museum of the  
 African-American experience. For all the re-  
 gearing of textbooks in recent years, for all the  
 troubled minds on the question of "whiteness,"  
 40 America strangely lacks a serious, centrally  
 placed museum on slavery, and more gener-  
 ally on the multiple experiences of African  
 Americans. Even Rochester, New York, for  
 many years the dwelling place of Frederick  
 Douglass, and later his burial place, lacks a  
 museum devoted to this exemplary man.

That there is not yet room on the Wash-  
 45 ington Mall for a thoughtful exploration of the  
 core national trauma is a sign of evasion—  
 white evasion, mainly. No Whitney Museum

ejaculations of white guilt, draped as art, can  
 remedy the lack. But whites aren't the only ob-  
 50 stacles. Some African Americans have been  
 heard to say that life is hard enough without a  
 vivid display of the brutalities that marked  
 most of the history of the Africans dragged to  
 this continent and the history that befell them  
 here. In 1995, employees of the Library of  
 Congress protested a photographic show,  
 "Back of the Big House: The Cultural Land-  
 55 scape of the Plantation," that documented the  
 buildings where slaves led their lives around  
 the plantation manors, juxtaposing photos to  
 the texts of slave narratives. Employees pro-  
 60 tested that the show made them feel bad,  
 whereupon squeamish Library administrators  
 took it down. The president of an African-  
 American Cultural Association told a reporter,  
 "An exhibit is supposed to celebrate something  
 positive." The Library also plucked four anti-  
 65 lynching cartoons out of an exhibit of NAACP  
 graphics, saying the images were "difficult."  
 Since the Smithsonian canceled a Hiroshima  
 memorial show, there's been a panic on in  
 Washington, a flight from exhibits that any-  
 70 one might disagree with for any reason.

No doubt a museum on slavery and racial  
 oppression would be contentious. No doubt  
 there would be horrendous disputes about just  
 how to tell the frightful story and just how to  
 75 end it. No doubt other groups would lay their  
 own claims. No doubt a thorn in the flesh is  
 disturbing.

An excess of memory can drive people  
 80 mad. People, even—or especially—a wronged  
 people, can drown in spiritual irredentism.  
 (Surely Kosovo and the West Bank abundantly  
 illustrate the point.) Forgetfulness has its vir-  
 85 tues, as long as what the forgetters agree to  
 forget are grievances that blind them to the  
 legitimate grievances of the other populations.  
 But painful as officially sanctioned memory is,  
 the alternative, a smiley-face theory of history,  
 is worse.

TODD GITLIN

## The Third Way: Tony's ology for sceptics

David Walker, September, 22, 1998. *The Guardian*.

- 4 After Thatcherism the latest ism isn't Blairism. It's called the Third Way. It's the subject of pamphlets, a new book and - Tony Blair was there yesterday - a high-powered New York seminar. It's good to have a thinking prime minister, says David Walker, but a bit more rigour wouldn't go amiss (...)
- 5 The trouble with trying to form ideology in an unideological age is that you end up describing what you are doing and giving it a fancy title. Thus the Third Way becomes what Tony Blair and his Cabinet have done since May 1997 but, presumably for modesty's sake, they won't call it Blairism. Third Way is a far from original label. As a political idea it is at least as old as Eduard Bernstein's bid in the last decade of the 19th century to detach the German Social Democrats
- 10 from marxian communism by taking the parliamentary road. In 1959 the postwar German SPD did it again by 'accepting' capitalism. It's also been claimed by the Right. Felipe Gonzalez, the former Spanish social democratic prime minister, remarked sardonically the other day that when he was a lad Franco claimed his was the Third Way between capitalism and communism.

- 15 For Tony Blair, the First Way is individualism, aka neo-liberalism or Thatcherism. It did some good things (and he wants to keep it in personal relationships) but it neglected social solidarity and national cohesion. The Second Way is old-style social democracy embracing the nationalisation associated with Peter Mandelson's granddaddy Herbert Morrison. It's interesting that in Mr Blair's new Fabian pamphlet there is no reference to earlier Labour or Social Democratic Third Ways or revisionists. Tony Crosland and David Owen have been airbrushed
- 20 out of history.

- The Third Way cleaves to social democracy's old egalitarian goals - opportunity for poor people plus social solidarity - but is pragmatic about how to achieve them. It offers 'not a shopping list of policy prescriptions . . .' so much as a set of reflexes. Partnership is a key word. Government's
- 25 job is to be kind and supportive to capitalism, or as the Prime Minister prefers to put it, has to ensure business is confident, successful and profitable. The state must not second guess employment decisions by private firms. It should, instead, promote competitive markets, boost human capital and ensure 'effective access to the labour market'. About reciprocal obligations by private employers to the public weal, the pamphlet is silent.

30 Yet in the Third Way citizens do have responsibilities as well as rights, including the social obligation to bring up children as competent, responsible citizens and to support those such as teachers who are employed in the task (does that include forking out more in taxes so teachers get paid more?).

35 Third Way government is inherently limited . . . 'one of the strongest claims for the Third Way is that tax must be kept under control'. Because he is, after all, a British politician, Tony Blair's version is pretty thin on theory. For more of that we need to turn to a book published last Thursday by the sociologist Tony Giddens, director of the London School of Economics, where there are more signs of the Demos-influenced, 'post-modernist' agenda and, among other things, environmental sustainability gets a look in. Professor Giddens, the dust jacket says, is frequently referred to as the prime minister's guru. He does, it's true, go some way towards filling gaps in the Prime Minister's pamphlet. For example, on gender and the family. The Prime Minister counsels Third Wayers against fatalism and cynicism. But according to Professor Giddens some acceptance of the inevitable is in order when it comes to personal behaviour: it is beyond the capacity of the state to change the way men and women come together, mate and procreate and split up. The traditional family is dead, he says, but divorce is a bad thing. The way forward (the process of deduction is obscure) is family democratisation. This means 'equality, mutual respect, autonomy, decision-taking through communication and freedom from violence'. Relate couldn't have put it better.

40 Tony Blair's fans on the right will be disappointed that all he can say about the infernal Sixties is that they were 'a decade of personal liberation' and will be affronted that he attributes to Mrs Thatcher carrying Sixties' individualism into the economic sphere. Third Way women, by the way, should be offered the chance 'to fulfil their full potential according to their own choices'. Could the husband of Cherie Booth have said anything else?

55 WHAT the Third Way does not do is give much of a steer on some of the crucial issues of the day. Is spending more than 40 per cent of GDP on government - a level identified as the portals of serfdom by the new right - to fall into old socialist habits? Continental social democrats would say no and cite annual rates of growth of real income per head showing how the low taxing United States achieved precisely the same figure as the high taxing Germans and Italians between 1980 and 1997.

60 Does the Third Way help relieve us of our present discontents? Or, to put that more concretely, are controls on international investment justified when, as the New York Times said on Sunday, experts prepare to re-think systems as free flowing capital sinks nations? Professor Giddens talks about establishing an Economic Security Council within the United Nations - an intriguing proposal given the popularity still in that body of the statist and interventionist reflexes the Third Way is meant to be expunging from the domestic body politic. It is at this point that the intellectual weaknesses of the Third Way become obvious. This is not *Das Kapital* or *the Constitution of Liberty* it's more an odyssey by Candide. When, in March, the International Monetary Fund's newsletter said capital liberalisation was 'irreversible' it was asserting the kind of teleological confidence marketeers have commonly exhibited of late. Is it misplaced? The answer can surely only be convincing if it is couched in terms of some theory of world economic order or even, whisper it who dares, analysis of capitalism, the word used with such Gallic style by Lionel Jospin - whose own programme for action turns out, surprise, to be as vague and hopeful as Tony Blair's.

## THE ASSOCIATION OF THE SONS OF LIBERTY OF NEW YORK

5 It is essential to the freedom and security of a free people, that no taxes be imposed upon them but by their own consent, or their representatives. For "What property have they in that which another may, by right, take when he pleases to himself?" The former is the undoubted right of Englishmen, to secure which they expended millions and sacrificed the lives of thousands. And yet, to the astonishment of all the world, and the grief of America, the Commons of Great Britain, after the repeal of the memorable and detestable Stamp Act, reassumed the power of imposing taxes on the American colonies; and insisting on it as a necessary badge of parliamentary supremacy, passed a bill, in the seventh year of his present Majesty's reign, imposing duties on all glass, painters' colours, paper, and teas, that should, after the 20th of November, 1767, be "imported from Great Britain into any colony or plantation in America". This bill, after the concurrence of the Lords, obtained the royal assent. And thus they who, from time immemorial, have exercised the right of giving to, or withholding from the crown, their aids and subsidies, according to their own free will and pleasure, signified by their representatives in Parliament, do, by the Act in question, deny us, their brethren in America, the enjoyment of the same right. As this denial, and the execution of that Act, involves our slavery, and would sap the foundation of our freedom, whereby we should become slaves to our brethren and fellow subjects, born to no greater stock of freedom than the Americans-the merchants and inhabitants of this city, in conjunction with the merchants and inhabitants of the ancient American colonies, entered into an agreement to decline a part of their commerce with Great Britain, until the above mentioned Act should be totally repealed. This agreement operated so powerfully to the disadvantage of the manufacturers of England that many of them were unemployed. To appease their clamours, and to provide the subsistence for them, which the non-importation had deprived them of, the Parliament, in 1770, repealed so much of the Revenue Act as imposed a duty on glass, painters' colours, and paper, and left the duty on tea, as a test of the parliamentary right to tax us. The merchants of the cities of New York and Philadelphia, having strictly adhered to the agreement, so far as it is related to the importation of articles subject to an American duty, have convinced the ministry, that some other measures must be adopted to execute parliamentary supremacy over this country, and to remove the distress brought on the East India Company, by the ill policy of that Act. Accordingly, to increase the temptation to the shippers of tea from England, an Act of Parliament passed the last session, which gives the whole duty on tea, the company were subject to pay, upon the importation of it into England, to the purchasers and exporters; and when the company have ten millions of pounds of tea in their warehouses exclusive of the quantity they may want to ship, they are allowed to export tea, discharged from the payment of that duty with which they were before chargeable. In hopes of aid in the execution of this project, by the influence of the owners of the American ships, application was made by the company to the captains of those ships to take the tea on freight; but they virtuously rejected it. Still determined on the scheme, they have chartered ships to bring the tea to this country, which may be hourly expected, to make an important trial of our virtue. If they succeed in the sale of that tea, we shall have no property that we can call our own, and then we may bid adieu to American liberty. Therefore, to prevent a calamity which, of all others, is the most to be dreaded-slavery and its terrible concomitants-we, the subscribers, being influenced from a regard to liberty, and disposed to use all lawful endeavours in our power, to

- 50 defeat the pernicious project, and to transmit to our posterity those blessings of freedom  
which our ancestors have handed down to us; and to contribute to the support of the  
common liberties of America, which are in danger to be subverted, do, for those  
important purposes, agree to associate together, under the name and style of the sons of  
New York, and engage our honour to, and with each other faithfully to observe and  
55 perform the following resolutions, viz.  
1st. Resolved, that whoever shall aid or abet, or in any manner assist, in the introduction  
of tea from any place whatsoever, into this colony, while it is subject, by a British Act of  
Parliament, to the payment of a duty, for the purpose of raising a revenue in America, he  
shall be deemed an enemy to the liberties of America.
- 60 2d. Resolved, that whoever shall be aiding, or assisting, in the landing, or carting of such  
tea, from any ship, or vessel, or shall hire any house, storehouse, or cellar or any place  
whatsoever, to deposit the tea, subject to a duty as aforesaid, he shall be deemed an  
enemy to the liberties of America.
- 65 3d. Resolved, that whoever shall sell, or buy, or in any manner contribute to the sale, or  
purchase of tea, subject to a duty as aforesaid, or shall aid, or abet, in transporting such  
tea, by land or water, from this city, until the 7th George III, chap. 46, commonly called  
the Revenue Act, shall be totally and clearly repealed, he shall be deemed an enemy to  
the liberties of America.
- 70 4th. Resolved, that whether the duties on tea, imposed by this Act, be paid in Great  
Britain or in America, our liberties are equally affected.
- 5th. Resolved, that whoever shall transgress any of these resolutions, we will not deal  
with, or employ, or have any connection with him.

« The Association of the Sons of Liberty of New York : Agreement to Resist the Tea Act of  
1773. »

*Source: Hezekiah Niles, Principles and Acts of the Revolution in America (Baltimore,  
1822), pp. 169-170.*

1 [...] I put aside the whole set of objections which were also used against men before 1832; but if you care to be antiquarian enough to go back along that line of research, you will find that the terrible things that will come from women's suffrage it was then said would flow from extending the suffrage to men. Those I put on one side, as discounted by results.

Then you find the remarkable statement that it will imperil social order. I find that Mr. Goldwin Smith wrote an important letter in the "Times" of May 8, 1897, in which he said there is "a passionate desire of masculinity which has taken possession of a certain number of women who are seeking to force their way into everything male, without taking much thought for the interest of institutions... You are in the face of a revolt against the limitations of sex." I shall venture generally, on all the objections on the ground of sex, to point out that

#### NATURE IS QUITE STRONG ENOUGH

15 to take care of herself, and that the "limitations of sex" can never be over-leaped as long as sex lasts. An advantage of the difference of sex is, of course, the difference of viewpoint, so that you get a public question looked at from the two sides of the nation instead of only from that of one side. This was the kind of argument that was heard in 1897.

20 Then we have some mutually destructive arguments that I think we need not bother about, such, for instance, as one set of people saying that all the women will vote like their husbands and fathers and brothers, and so their vote will be superfluous, the other set of people crying out that if women have the vote it will introduce dissension in the family circle. We will allow those two sets of people to balance each other and settle which is right. We can leave them on one side.

Then you come to the more modern objections. First, it is said women don't want it. That is a very difficult question to settle. I would point out to you that there is no public measure at present before Parliament for which

#### 1,000 PEOPLE HAVE GONE TO GAOL,

30 which looks as though *they* at least wanted it; that there is no public measure before Parliament for which so many petitions have been sent up to Parliament, petitions from councils and from representative bodies, to say nothing of the great suffrage societies, one of which alone counts some 40,000 women in its ranks [The National Union, 42,000. From 1852 to 1906 petitions with 795,747 signatures were presented to Parliament and in 1909-10 a petition was presented signed by 280,000 electors.]. It is always difficult to say whether a particular class or sex want or do not want the vote. The point is that those who want it ought to have it, and that there is no proposal to pass a law that those who do not want it should be compelled to vote. They can so easily avoid it by simply not voting, and there is no need, therefore, to go into any special ground of argument on their behalf. But what is a considerable answer to that is, that if it be true that a majority of women do not want it, then the same is true of every great reform which has been battled for and ultimately won. A majority of men did not want the franchise in 1832, although those who did want it did a little more rioting than women have done, and were not regarded as so terribly wicked because they did it. It is always the intelligent minority that wins every popular battle. But you might, I think, perhaps say on this matter that you would get a very large number of wealthy women who do not want it, and a still larger number of women who aspire to belong to a higher class than that into which they happen to have been born. The social aspirants, as a rule, are exceedingly conservative in these matters, and they are always willing to join anti-suffrage societies, because they find that some of the wealthiest and most highly placed women in the country are against the vote. But I submit these are not the women who need it. It is the poorer women who want it, the women who are badly housed and whose children are underfed, the women whose labour is sweated. It is not the wealthy women who want protection from the depths of degradation into which so many working women are forced; it is not the daughters of the nobles and the millionaires who are cast out into the streets as prostitutes. It is the poorer women who want protection, and not the highly placed and the wealthy. [...]



1 [...] This night is to decide between the policy of continued relaxation of restriction, or the return to restraint and prohibition. This night you will select the motto which is to indicate the commercial policy of England. Shall it be "advance" or "recede"? Which is the fitter motto for this great Empire? Survey our position, consider the advantage which God and nature have given us, and the destiny for which we are intended. We stand on the confines of Western Europe, the chief connecting link between the old world and the new. The discoveries of science, the improvement of navigation, have brought us within ten days of St. Petersburg, and will soon bring us within ten days of New York. We have an extent of coast greater in proportion to our population and the area of our land than any other great nation, securing to us maritime strength and superiority. Iron and coal, the sinews of manufacture, give us advantages over every rival in the great competition of industry. Our capital far exceeds that which they can command. In ingenuity – in skill – in energy – we are inferior to none. Our national character, the free institutions under which we live, the liberty of thought and action, an unshackled press, spreading the knowledge of every discovery and of every advance in science – combine with our natural and physical advantages to place us at the head of those nations which profit by the free interchange of their products. And is this the country to shrink from competition? Is this the country to adopt a retrograde policy? Is this the country which can only flourish in the sickly artificial atmosphere of prohibition? Is this the country to stand shivering on the brink of exposure to the healthful breezes of competition?

20 Choose your motto. "Advance" or "Recede." Many countries are watching with anxiety the selection you may make. Determine for "Advance," and it will be the watchword which will animate and encourage in every state the bonds of liberal commercial policy. Sardinia has taken the lead. Naples is reducing her protective duties and favouring British produce. Prussia is shaken in her adherence to restriction. The Government of France will be strengthened; and, backed by the intelligence of the reflecting, and by conviction of the real welfare of the great body of the community, will perhaps ultimately prevail over the self-interest of the commercial and manufacturing aristocracy which now predominates in her Chambers. Can you doubt that the United States will soon relax her hostile Tariff, and that the friends of a freer commercial intercourse – the friends of peace, between the two countries – will hail with satisfaction the example of England? [...]

It seems to be incident to great prosperity that there shall be a reverse – that the time of depression shall follow the season of excitement and success. That time of depression must perhaps return; and its return may be coincident with scarcity caused by unfavourable seasons. Gloomy winters, like those of 1841 and 1842, may again set in. Are those winters effaced from your memory? From mine they never can be. Surely you cannot have forgotten with what earnestness and sincerity you re-echoed the deep feelings of a gracious Queen, when at the opening and at the close of each Session, She expressed the warmest sympathy with the sufferings of Her people, and the warmest admiration of their heroic fortitude. [...]

Commune with your own hearts and answer me this question: will your assurances of sympathy be less consolatory – will your exhortations to patience be less impressive – if, with your willing consent, the Corn Laws shall have then ceased to exist? Will it be no satisfaction to you to reflect, that by your own act, you have been relieved from the grievous responsibility of regulating the supply of food? Will you not then cherish with delight the reflection that, in this the present hour of comparative prosperity, yielding to no clamour, impelled by no fear – except, indeed, that provident fear, which is the mother of safety – you had anticipated the evil day, and, long before its advent, had trampled on every impediment to the free circulation of the Creator's bounty?

When you are again exhorting a suffering people to fortitude under their privations, when you are telling them, "These are the chastenings of an all-wise and merciful Providence, sent for some inscrutable but just and beneficent purpose – it may be, to humble our pride, or to punish our unfaithfulness, or to impress us with the sense of our own nothingness and dependence on His mercy;" when you are thus addressing your suffering fellow subjects, and encouraging them to bear without repining the dispensations of Providence, may God grant that by your decision of this night you may have laid in store for yourselves the consolation of reflecting that such calamities are, in truth, the dispensations of Providence – that they have not been caused, they have not been aggravated by laws of man restricting, in the hour of scarcity, the supply of food!

Sir Robert PEEL, *Hansard's Parliamentary Debates*, 3rd Series, 1846, Vol. LXXXIII, 16 February 1846, columns 1041-1443.

1 The industrial revolution in Britain, which had its most intense phase in the  
latter end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth century, cast out  
of our rural and urban life the yeoman cultivator and the copyholder, the  
5 domestic manufacturer and the independent handicraftsman, all of whom owned  
the instruments by which they earned their livelihood ; and gradually substituted  
for them a relatively small body of capitalist *entrepreneurs* employing at wages an  
always multiplying mass of propertyless men, women and children, struggling,  
like rats in a bag, for the right to live. This bold venture in economic reconstruction  
10 had now been proved to have been, so it seemed to me, at one and the  
same time, a stupendous success and a tragic failure. The accepted purpose of  
the pioneers of the new power-driven machine industry was the making of  
pecuniary profit ; a purpose which had been fulfilled, as Dr. Johnson observed  
about his friend Thrale's brewery, " beyond the dreams of avarice ". Com-  
15 modities of all sorts and kinds rolled out from the new factories at an always  
accelerating speed with ever falling costs of production, thereby promoting what  
Adam Smith had idealised as *The Wealth of Nations*. The outstanding success of  
this new system of industry was enabling Great Britain, through becoming the  
workshop of the world, to survive the twenty year's ordeal of the Napoleonic  
Wars intact, and not even invaded, whilst her ruling oligarchy emerged in 1815 as  
20 the richest and most powerful government of the time.

On the other hand, that same revolution had deprived the manual workers  
— that is, four-fifths of the people of England — of their opportunity for  
spontaneity and freedom of initiative in production. It had transformed such of  
25 them as had been independent producers into hirelings and servants of another  
social class ; and, as the East End of London in my time only too vividly  
demonstrated, it had thrust hundreds of thousands of families into the physical  
horrors and moral debasement of chronic destitution in crowded tenements in the  
midst of mean streets. There were, however, for the manual working class as a  
30 whole, certain compensations. The new organisation of industry had the merit  
of training the wage-earners in the art of team-work in manufacture, transport and  
trading. Even the oppressions and frauds of the capitalist profit-maker had their  
uses in that they drove the proletariat of hired men, which capitalism had made  
ubiquitous, to combine in Trade Unions and co-operative societies ; and thus to  
35 develop their instinct of fellowship, and their capacity for representative institu-  
tions, alike in politics and in industry. Moreover, the contrast between the  
sweated workers of East London and the Lancashire textile operatives made me  
realise how the very concentration of wage-earners in the factory, the ironworks

and the mine had made possible, in their cases, what the sweater's workshop, the  
independent craftsman's forge and the out-worker's home had evaded, namely, a  
40 collective regulation of the conditions of employment, which, in the Factory Acts  
and Mines Regulation Acts on the one hand, and in the standard rates of wages  
and the normal working day of the Trade Unions on the other, had, during the  
latter part of the nineteenth century, wrought so great an improvement in the  
status of this regulated section of the World of Labour. It was, in fact, exactly  
45 this collective regulation of the conditions of employment, whether by legislative  
enactment or by collective bargaining, that had raised the cotton operatives, the  
coal-miners and the workers of the iron trades into an effective democracy ; or,  
at least, into one which, in comparison with the entirely unorganised workers of  
East London, was eager for political enfranchisement and education ; and which,  
50 as the chapels, the co-operative societies and the Trade Unions had demon-  
strated, was capable of self-government. I wished to probe further this contrast  
between the wage-earners who had enjoyed the advantages of collective regula-  
tion and voluntary combinations, and those who had been abandoned to the  
rigours of unrestrained individual competition. But I wanted also to discover  
55 whether there was any practicable alternative to the dictatorship of the capitalist  
in industry, and his reduction of all the other participants in production to the  
position of subordinate " hands ". For it was persistently asserted that there was  
such an alternative. In this quest I did not turn to the socialists. *Fabian Essays*  
were still unwritten and unpublished ; and such socialists as I had happened to  
60 meet at the East End of London belonged to the Social Democratic Federation,  
and were at that time preaching what seemed to me nothing but a catastrophic  
overturning of the existing order, by forces of whose existence I saw no sign, in  
order to substitute what appeared to me the vaguest of incomprehensible utopias.

There was, however, another alternative lauded by idealists of all classes : by  
65 leading Trade Unionists and the more benevolent employers, by revolutionary  
socialists and by Liberal and Conservative philanthropists : an experiment in  
industrial organisation actually, so it was reported, being brought into operation  
on a small scale by enthusiastic working men themselves. This was the ideal of  
" self-employment ", and the peaceful elimination from industry of the capitalist  
70 *entrepreneur* ; to be secured by the manual workers themselves acquiring the  
ownership, or at any rate the use, of the capital, and managing the industry by  
which they gained their livelihood. It was this ideal, so I was told, that animated  
the Co-operative Movement in the North of England and the Lowlands of  
Scotland — a movement barely represented in the London that I knew.

# 'Facing Up to Britain's Race Problem'

Enoch Powell, *Daily Telegraph*, 16th February, 1967

5 For over ten years, from about 1954 to 1966, Commonwealth immigration was the principal, and at times the only, political issue in my constituency in Wolverhampton. Between those dates entire areas were transformed by the substitution of a wholly or predominantly coloured population for the previous native inhabitants, as completely as other areas were transformed by the bulldozer. My uppermost feeling on  
10 looking back upon those years is of astonishment that this event, which altered the appearance and life of a town and had shattering effects on the lives of many families and persons, could take place with virtually no physical manifestations of antipathy. This speaks volumes for the steadiness and tolerance of the natives. Acts of an enemy, bombs from the sky, they could understand; but now, for reasons quite inexplicable, they might be driven from their homes and their property deprived of value by an invasion  
15 which the Government apparently approved and their fellow-citizens – elsewhere – viewed with complacency. Those were the years when a 'For Sale' notice going up in a street struck terror into all its inhabitants. I know; for I live within the proverbial stone's throw of streets which 'went black'. 'Why?' the people used to ask me, 'is the Government bringing these people into our country in ever-growing numbers? And where is it all to end?' I tried to explain that the law of England could not distinguish  
20 between one British subject and another and that therefore the inhabitants of India, Africa and the West Indies were all the same in law as the inhabitants of Wolverhampton. It was a fiction, perhaps a romantic fiction, but one which could only be maintained if no practical effect was given to it. Year after year, in government and out of it, I begged colleagues to bring the law into line with reality; but the majority of Ministers and Members had no personal knowledge of what was happening in a few concentrated areas.  
25 At last the rising flood of immigration which came on the post-election boom of 1960 forced the Government – but oh, how slowly and timidly – to make our law like that of every other country on earth, in recognizing the difference between its own people and the rest. To subsequent generations it will seem incredible that this was not done until almost a million Commonwealth immigrants had entered. Even when the Act began in 1962, the inhabitants of the areas affected still could not believe the menace was over. That reassurance came to be felt only after the limitation had taken effect, and after the facts of life and the loss of Smethwick and Leyton had driven the Labour Government to maintain and enforce it.

The net intake from Africa, Asia and the Caribbean since 1962 has been as follows:

1963: 53,351 1964: 54,729                      1965 48,684    1966 43,110 (first ten months only).

30 In any one year this rate of inflow is imperceptible; but 50,000 a year would still mean an additional net immigration from these countries of 1¼ million by the end of the century. There are two other factors which reinforce the significance of these figures. The Registrars General estimate that the United Kingdom will have *nil* net immigration by about 1975; but note how the balance is arrived at:

*inwards*: 30,000 from Eire; 60,000 from the Commonwealth; 30,000 from foreign countries;

35 *outwards*: 120,000 U.K. citizens.

The figures are obviously highly conjectural; but they illustrate the effect which the combination of immigration with emigration can have on the composition of the population. The remaining factor, obviously, is natural increase. Like all population projections, any estimate of this is bound to be also conjectural. One estimate is that by the end of the century it will have been sufficient to raise the total coloured population to about 3 ½ millions, or 5 per cent of the whole. But this is in the future. For the moment, compared with the past decade or so, there is a feeling of stabilization; the immigrants are 'shaking down' and 'shaking out', rather than visibly increasing; and the subject has disappeared below the surface of public consciousness. In my own constituency (where I estimate that about 10 per cent of the population are immigrants from Asia or the Caribbean) I have the impression that, as no doubt elsewhere, the first phase, the sudden impact of Commonwealth immigration, is over. I am going to prophesy, however, that there will be subsequent phases, when the problem will resume its place in public concern and in a more intractable form, when it can no longer be dealt with simply by turning the inlet tap down or off. Long before the coloured population reaches 5 per cent of the total, a proportion will have filtered into the general population, mingled with it in occupation, residence, habits and intermarriage. On the other hand, the rest, numerically perhaps much the greater part, will be in larger or smaller colonies, in certain areas and cities, more separated than now in habits, occupation and way of life. The irregular pattern of population and living which grew up higgledy-piggledy in the early years of immigration will have been tidied up. It is for these colonies, and the problems thereby entailed on our descendants, that they will curse the improvident years, now gone, when we could have avoided it all. A number of lines of least resistance converge on the preservation of the immigrant colonies: for causes both external and internal they soon become self-perpetuating, and a number may have done so already. How, then, are the dangers at least to be minimized? The one undeniable and obvious action is to limit the size of the problem by virtually terminating net immigration. I think it not impossible that if this were done a small but significant net emigration might soon follow, especially given aid, inducements and encouragements to immigrants to rejoin families in their countries of origin or to return thither when they encounter prolonged unemployment or other economic difficulties. Only if the situation were thus numerically stabilized would it be practicable to apply methods of dispersal, though these will never affect more than minorities, and those the minorities which are anyhow most easily assimilated to the general population. The best I dare to hope is that by the end of the century we shall be left not with a growing and more menacing phenomenon but with fixed and almost traditional 'foreign' areas in certain towns and cities, which will remain as the lasting monuments of a moment of national aberration. Even this relatively happy outcome, however, implies that vigorous action to limit and if possible reduce total numbers is taken as from now. I fear it will not be.

5 We recommit ourselves to the ideas of the American Founding. Through the Constitution, the Founders created an enduring framework of limited government based on the rule of law. They sought to secure national independence, provide for economic opportunity, establish true religious liberty and maintain a flourishing society of republican self-government.

10 These principles define us as a country and inspire us as a people. They are responsible for a prosperous, just nation unlike any other in the world. They are our highest achievements, serving not only as powerful beacons to all who strive for freedom and seek self-government, but as warnings to tyrants and despots everywhere.

15 Each one of these founding ideas is presently under sustained attack. In recent decades, America's principles have been undermined and redefined in our culture, our universities and our politics. The self-evident truths of 1776 have been supplanted by the notion that no such truths exist. The federal government today ignores the limits of the Constitution, which is increasingly dismissed as obsolete and irrelevant.

20 Some insist that America must change, cast off the old and put on the new. But where would this lead — forward or backward, up or down? Isn't this idea of change an empty promise or even a dangerous deception?

25 The change we urgently need, a change consistent with the American ideal, is not movement away from but toward our founding principles. At this important time, we need a restatement of Constitutional conservatism grounded in the priceless principle of ordered liberty articulated in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution.

30 The conservatism of the Declaration asserts self-evident truths based on the laws of nature and nature's God. It defends life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. It traces authority to the consent of the governed. It recognizes man's self-interest but also his capacity for virtue.

35 The conservatism of the Constitution limits government's powers but ensures that government performs its proper job effectively. It refines popular will through the filter of representation. It provides checks and balances through the several branches of government and a federal republic.

40 A Constitutional conservatism unites all conservatives through the natural fusion provided by American principles. It reminds economic conservatives that morality is essential to limited government, social conservatives that unlimited government is a threat to moral self-government, and national security conservatives that energetic but responsible government is the key to America's safety and leadership role in the world.

45 A Constitutional conservatism based on first principles provides the framework for a consistent and meaningful policy agenda.

- It applies the principle of limited government based on the rule of law to every proposal.
- It honors the central place of individual liberty in American politics and life.

- 50 • It encourages free enterprise, the individual entrepreneur, and economic reforms grounded in market solutions.
- It supports America's national interest in advancing freedom and opposing tyranny in the world and prudently considers what we can and should do to that
- 55 end.
- It informs conservatism's firm defense of family, neighborhood, community, and faith.

60 If we are to succeed in the critical political and policy battles ahead, we must be certain of our purpose.

We must begin by retaking and resolutely defending the high ground of America's founding principles.

65 « The Mount Vernon Statement: Constitutional Conservatism For the 21st Century »  
February 17, 2010

- Edwin Meese, former U.S. Attorney General under President Reagan*  
*Wendy Wright, president of Concerned Women for America*
- 70 *Edwin Feulner, Jr., president of the Heritage Foundation*  
*Lee Edwards, Distinguished Fellow in Conservative Thought at The Heritage Foundation, was present at the Sharon Statement signing.*  
*Tony Perkins, president of the Family Research Council*  
*Becky Norton Dunlop, president of the Council for National Policy*
- 75 *Brent Bozell, president of the Media Research Center*  
*Alfred Regnery, publisher of the American Spectator*  
*David Keene, president of the American Conservative Union*  
*David McIntosh, co-founder of the Federalist Society*  
*T. Kenneth Cribb, former domestic policy adviser to President Reagan*
- 80 *Grover Norquist, president of Americans for Tax Reform*  
*William Wilson, President, Americans for Limited Government*  
*Elaine Donnelly, Center for Military Readiness*  
*Richard Viguerie, Chairman, ConservativeHQ.com*  
*Kenneth Blackwell, Coalition for a Conservative Majority*
- 85 *Colin Hanna, President, Let Freedom Ring*  
*Kathryn J. Lopez, National Review*  
*Tom Winter, Editor in Chief, Human Events*  
*Morton Blackwell, President, The Leadership Institute*

90

Senator Robinson, Members of the Democratic Convention, my friends:

5 Here, and in every community throughout the land, we are met at a time of great moment to the future of the Nation (...)

America will not forget these recent years, will not forget that the rescue was not a mere party task. It was the concern of all of us. In our strength we rose together, rallied our energies together, applied the old rules of common sense, and together survived. In those days we feared fear. That was why we fought fear. And today, my friends, we have won against the most dangerous of our foes. We have conquered fear. But I cannot, with candor, tell you that all is well with the world. Clouds of suspicion, tides of ill-will and intolerance gather darkly in many places. In our own land we enjoy indeed a fullness of life greater than that of most Nations. But the rush of modern civilization itself has raised for us new difficulties, new problems which must be solved if we are to preserve to the United States the political and economic freedom for which Washington and Jefferson planned and fought.

15 Philadelphia is a good city in which to write American history. This is fitting ground on which to reaffirm the faith of our fathers; to pledge ourselves to restore to the people a wider freedom; to give to 1936 as the founders gave to 1776—an American way of life. That very word freedom, in itself and of necessity, suggests freedom from some restraining power. In 1776 we sought freedom from the tyranny of a political autocracy—from the eighteenth century royalists who held special privileges from the crown. It was to perpetuate their privilege that they governed without the consent of the governed; that they denied the right of free assembly and free speech; that they restricted the worship of God; that they put the average man's property and the average man's life in pawn to the mercenaries of dynastic power; that they regimented the people.

20 And so it was to win freedom from the tyranny of political autocracy that the American Revolution was fought. That victory gave the business of governing into the hands of the average man, who won the right with his neighbors to make and order his own destiny through his own Government. Political tyranny was wiped out at Philadelphia on July 4, 1776.

30 Since that struggle, however, man's inventive genius released new forces in our land which reordered the lives of our people.. The age of machinery, of railroads; of steam and electricity; the telegraph and the radio; mass production, mass distribution—all of these combined to bring forward a new civilization and with it a new problem for those who sought to remain free.

35 For out of this modern civilization economic royalists carved new dynasties(...)They created a new despotism and wrapped it in the robes of legal sanction. In its service new mercenaries sought to regiment the people, their labor, and their property. And as a result the average man once more confronts the problem that faced the Minute Man.

40 The hours men and women worked, the wages they received, the conditions of their labor—these had passed beyond the control of the people, and were imposed by this new industrial dictatorship. The savings of the average family, the capital of the small business man, the investments set aside for old age—other people's money—these were tools which the new economic royalty used to dig itself in. Those who tilled the soil no longer reaped the rewards which were their right (...) An old English judge once said: "Necessitous men are not free men." Liberty requires opportunity to make a living—a living decent according to the standard of the time, a living which gives man not only enough to live by, but something to live for (...) For too many of us life was no longer free; liberty no longer real; men could no longer follow the pursuit of happiness.

50 Against economic tyranny such as this, the American citizen could appeal only to the organized power of Government. The collapse of 1929 showed up the despotism for what it was. The election of 1932 was the people's mandate to end it. Under that mandate it is being ended. (...)

55 Today we stand committed to the proposition that freedom is no half-and-half affair. If the average citizen is guaranteed equal opportunity in the polling place, he must have equal opportunity in the market place.

60 These economic royalists complain that we seek to overthrow the institutions of America. What they really complain of is that we seek to take away their power. Our allegiance to American institutions requires the overthrow of this kind of power. In vain they seek to hide behind the Flag and the Constitution. In their blindness they forget what the Flag and the Constitution stand for. Now, as always, they stand for democracy, not tyranny; for freedom, not subjection; and against a dictatorship by mob rule and the over-privileged alike. The brave and clear platform adopted by this Convention, to which I heartily subscribe, sets forth that Government in a modern civilization has certain inescapable obligations to its  
65 citizens, among which are protection of the family and the home, the establishment of a democracy of opportunity, and aid to those overtaken by disaster.

70 Franklin D. Roosevelt: "Acceptance Speech for the Renomination for the Presidency, Philadelphia, Pa.," June 27, 1936.



The problem of our age is the administration of wealth, so that the ties of brotherhood may still bind together the rich and poor in harmonious relationship. The conditions of human life have not only been changed, but revolutionized, within the past few hundred years. In former days there was little difference between the dwelling, dress, food, and environment of the chief and those of his retainers. The contrast between the palace of the millionaire and the cottage of the laborer with us today measures the change which has come with civilization.

This change, however, is not to be deplored, but welcomed as highly beneficial. It is well, nay, essential for the progress of the race that the houses of some should be homes for all that is highest and best in literature and the arts, and for all the refinements of civilization, rather than that none should be so. Much better this great irregularity than universal squalor. Without wealth there can be no Maecenas (...)

This, then, is held to be the duty of the man of Wealth: First, to set an example of modest, unostentatious living, shunning display or extravagance; to provide moderately for the legitimate wants of those dependent upon him; and after doing so to consider all surplus revenues which come to him simply as trust funds, which he is called upon to administer, and strictly bound as a matter of duty to administer in the manner which, in his judgment, is best calculated to produce the most beneficial result for the community-the man of wealth thus becoming the sole agent and trustee for his poorer brethren, bringing to their service his superior wisdom, experience, and ability to administer-doing for them better than they would or could do for themselves.

We are met here with the difficulty of determining what are moderate sums to leave to members of the family; what is modest, unostentatious living; what is the test of extravagance (...)

The best uses to which surplus wealth can be put have already been indicated. Those who would administer wisely must, indeed, be wise; for one of the serious obstacles to the improvement of our race is indiscriminate charity. It were better for mankind that the millions of the rich were thrown into the sea than so spent as to encourage the slothful, the drunken, the unworthy. Of every thousand dollars spent in so-called charity to-day, it is probable that nine hundred and fifty dollars is unwisely spent-so spent, indeed, as to produce the very evils which it hopes to mitigate or cure. A well-known writer of philosophic books admitted the other day that he had given a quarter of a dollar to a man who approached him as he was coming to visit the house of his friend. He knew nothing of the habits of this beggar, knew not the use that would be made of this money, although he had every reason to suspect that it would be spent improperly. This man professed to be a disciple of Herbert Spencer; yet the quarter-dollar given that night will probably work more injury than all the money will do good which its thoughtless donor will ever be able to give in true charity. He only gratified his own feelings, saved himself from annoyance-and this was probably one of the most selfish and very worst actions of his life, for in all respects he is most worthy.

In bestowing charity, the main consideration: should be to help those who will help themselves; to provide part of the means by which those who desire to improve may do so; to give those who desire to rise the aids by which they may rise; to assist, but rarely or never to do all. Neither the individual nor the race is improved by almsgiving. Those worthy of assistance, except in rare cases, seldom require assistance. The really valuable men of the race never do, except in case of accident or sudden change. Every one has, of course, cases of individuals brought to his own knowledge where temporary assistance can do genuine good, and these he will not overlook. But the amount which can be wisely given by the individual for individuals is necessarily limited by his lack of

50 knowledge of the circumstances connected with each. He is the only true reformer who  
is as care ful and as anxious not to aid the unworthy as he is to aid the worthy, and,  
perhaps, even more so, for in almsgiving more injury is probably done by rewarding vice  
than by relieving virtue.

55 The rich man is thus almost restricted to follow ing the examples of Peter Cooper,  
Enoch Pratt of Baltimore, Mr. Pratt of Brooklyn, Senator Stanford, and others, who know  
that the best means of benefiting the community is to place within its reach the ladders  
upon which the aspiring can rise-free libraries, parks, and means of recreation, by which  
men are helped in body and mind; works of art, certain to give pleasure and improve the  
60 public taste; and public institutions of various kinds, which will improve the general  
condition of the people; in this manner returning their surplus wealth to the mass of  
their fellows in the forms best calculated to do them lasting good.

Thus is the problem of rich and poor to be solved. The laws of accumulation will  
be left free, the laws of distribution free. Individualism will continue, but the millionaire  
will be but a trustee for the poor, intrusted for a season with a great part of the  
65 increased wealth of the community, but administering it for the community far better  
than it could or would have done for itself. The best minds will thus have reached a stage  
in the development of the race in which it is clearly seen that there is no mode of  
disposing of surplus wealth creditable to thoughtful and earnest men into whose hands  
it caws, save by using it year by year for the general good.

70 This day already dawns. Men may die without incurring the pity of their fellows,  
still sharers in great business enterprises from which their capital cannot be or has not  
been withdrawn, and which is left chiefly at death for public uses; yet the day is not far  
distant when the man who dies leaving behind him millions of available wealth, which  
was free for him to administer during life, will pass away "unwept, unhonored, and  
75 unsung," no matter to what uses he leaves the dross which he cannot take with him. Of  
such as these the public verdict will then be: " The man who dies thus rich dies  
disgraced."

A. Carnegie, "Wealth", *North American Review*, June 1889.