

Concours ENS Paris B/L 2022 – ANGLAIS

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence (I conjure you to believe me, fellow citizens) the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake, since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. But that jealousy to be useful must be impartial; else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike of another cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odious, while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people to surrender their interests.

The great rule of conduct for us in regard to foreign nations is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little political connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith. Here let us stop.

Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none or a very remote relation. Hence she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence therefore it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics or the ordinary combinations and collisions of her friendships or enmities.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people under an efficient government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation; when we may choose peace or war, as our interest guided by justice shall counsel.

Why forgo the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalry, interest, humor, or caprice?

It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliances with any portion of the foreign world—so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it, for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements (I hold the maxim no less applicable to public than to private affairs, that honesty is always the best policy)—I repeat it therefore, let those engagements be observed in their genuine sense. But in my opinion it is unnecessary and would be unwise to extend them.

Taking care always to keep ourselves, by suitable establishments, on a respectably defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.

George Washington, "Farewell Address" (1796)

Concours ENS Paris B/L 2022 – ANGLAIS

5 It gives me pleasure to announce to Congress that the benevolent policy of the Government, steadily pursued for nearly thirty years, in relation to the removal of the Indians beyond the white settlements is approaching to a happy consummation. Two important tribes have accepted the provision made for their removal at the last session of Congress, and it is believed that their example will induce the remaining tribes also to seek the same obvious advantages.

10 The consequences of a speedy removal will be important to the United States, to individual States, and to the Indians themselves. The pecuniary advantages which it promises to the Government are the least of its recommendations. It puts an end to all possible danger of collision between the authorities of the General and State Governments on account of the Indians. It will place a dense and civilized population in large tracts of country now occupied by a few savage hunters. (...) It will relieve the whole State of Mississippi and the western part of Alabama of Indian occupancy, and enable those States to advance rapidly in population, wealth, and power. It will separate the Indians from immediate contact with settlements of whites; free them from the power of the States; enable them to pursue happiness in their own way and under their own rude institutions; will retard the progress of decay, which is lessening their numbers, and perhaps cause them gradually, under the protection of the Government and through the influence of good counsels, to cast off their savage habits and become an interesting, civilized, and Christian community.

25 What good man would prefer a country covered with forests and ranged by a few thousand savages to our extensive Republic, studded with cities, towns, and prosperous farms embellished with all the improvements which art can devise or industry execute, occupied by more than 12,000,000 happy people, and filled with all the blessings of liberty, civilization and religion?

30 The present policy of the Government is but a continuation of the same progressive change by a milder process. The tribes which occupied the countries now constituting the Eastern States were annihilated or have melted away to make room for the whites. The waves of population and civilization are rolling to the westward, and we now propose to acquire the countries occupied by the red men of the South and West by a fair exchange, and, at the expense of the United States, to send them to land where their existence may be prolonged and perhaps made perpetual. Doubtless it will be painful to leave the graves of their fathers; but what do they do more than our ancestors did or than our children are now doing? To better their condition in an unknown land our forefathers left all that was dear in earthly objects. Our children by thousands yearly leave the land of their birth to seek new homes in distant regions. Does 35 Humanity weep at these painful separations from everything, animate and inanimate, with which the young heart has become entwined? Far from it. It is rather a source of joy that our country affords scope where our young population may range unconstrained in body or in mind, developing the power and facilities of man in their highest perfection.

Andrew Jackson, Annual Message to Congress, December 6, 1830

Concours ENS Paris B/L 2022 – ANGLAIS

I came here with no desire and no intention to speak; but my heart is full, my country is bleeding, my people are perishing around me. But I feel as a South Carolinian, I am bound to tell the North, go on! go on! Never falter, never abandon the principles which you have adopted. (...) There was a time when I looked upon the Fathers of the Revolution with the
5 deepest sorrow and the keenest reproach. I said to their shadows in another world, "Why did you leave this accursed system of slavery for us to suffer and die under? why did you not, with a stroke of the pen, determine -- when you acquired your own independence - that the principles which you adopted in the Declaration of Independence should be a shield of protection to every man, whether he be slave or whether he be free?" But, my friends, the
10 experience of sixty years has shown me that the fruit grows slowly.

(...) Our fathers, driven out by the oppression of England, came to this country and planted that little seed of liberty upon the soil of New England. When our Revolution took place, that seed was only in the process of sprouting. You must recollect that our Declaration of Independence was the very first National evidence of the great doctrine of brotherhood and
15 equality. I verily believe that those who were the true lovers of liberty did all they could at that time. In their debates in the Convention they denounced slavery - they protested against the hypocrisy and inconsistency of a nation declaring such glorious truths, and then trampling them underfoot by enslaving the poor and oppressed, because he had a skin not colored like their own; as though a man's skin should make any difference in the recognition of his rights,
20 any more than the color of his hair or his eyes. (...)

Had the South yielded at that time to the freemen of the North, we should have had a free Government; but it was impossible to overcome the long and strong prejudices of the South in favor of slavery. I know what the South is. I lived there the best part of my life. I never could talk against slavery without making my friends angry - never. When they thought the day was
25 far off, and there was no danger of emancipation, they were willing to admit it was an evil; but when God in His providence raised up in this country an Anti-slavery Society, protesting against the oppressions of the colored man, they began to feel that truth which is more powerful than arms - that truth which is the only banner under which we can successfully fight. They were comparatively quiet till they found, in the election of Mr. Lincoln, the
30 scepter had actually departed from them. His election took place on the ground that slavery was not to be extended - that it must not pass into the Territories. This was what alarmed them. They saw that if the National Government should take one such step, it never would stop there; that this principle had never before been acknowledged by those who had any power in the nation.

35 God be praised. Abolitionists never sought place or power. All they asked was freedom; all they wanted was that the white man should take his foot off the negro's neck.

Angelina Grimké Weld, abolitionist, "Address at the Women's National Loyal League"
New York, May 14, 1863

Concours ENS Paris B/L 2022 – ANGLAIS

5 The Yosemite National Park was made October 1, 1890. For many years I had been crying in
the wilderness, "Save the forests!" but, so far as I know, nothing effective was done in the
matter until shortly before the park was organized. In the summer of 1889, I took one of the
editors of the *Century Magazine* out for a walk in Yosemite and in the woods and boulder-
choked cañons around it; and when we were camped one day at the Big Tuolumne Meadows,
my friend said, "Where are all those wonderful flower gardens you write so much about?"
And I had to confess - woe's me! - that uncountable sheep had eaten and trampled them out of
existence. Then he said, "Can't something be done to restore and preserve so wonderful a
10 region as this? Surely the people of California are not going to allow these magnificent
forests, on which the welfare of the whole State depends, to be destroyed?" Then a National
Park was proposed, and I was requested to write some articles about the region to help call
attention to it, while the *Century* was freely used for the same purpose, and every friend that
could be found was called on to write or speak a good word for it. (...) And in a little over a
year from the time of our first talk beside that Tuolumne camp-fire the bill organizing the
15 park passed Congress, and a troop of cavalry was guarding it.

20 But no sooner were the boundaries of the park established, than interested parties began to try
to break through them. Last winter a determined effort was made to have the area of the park
cut down nearly one-half. But the Sierra Club and other good friends of the forests on both
sides of the continent made a good defense, and today the original boundaries are still
unbroken.

25 The battle we have fought, and are still fighting, for the forests is a part of the eternal conflict
between right and wrong, and we cannot expect to see the end of it. I trust, however that our
Club will not weary in this forest well-doing. The fight for the Yosemite Park and other forest
parks and reserves is by no means over; nor would the fighting cease, however much the
boundaries were contracted. Every good thing, great and small, needs defense. The smallest
forest reserve, and the first I ever heard of, was in the Garden of Eden; and though its
boundaries were drawn by the Lord, and embraced only one tree, yet even so moderate a
reserve as this was attacked. And I doubt not, if only one of our grand trees in the Sierra were
reserved as an example and type of all that is most noble and glorious in mountain trees, it
30 would not be long before you would find a lumberman and a lawyer at the foot of it, eagerly
proving by every law terrestrial and celestial that that tree must come down. So we must
count on watching and striving for these trees, and should always be glad to find anything so
surely good and noble to strive for.

John Muir, "The National Parks and Forest Reservations" (November 23, 1895)

Concours ENS Paris B/L 2022 – ANGLAIS

If woman's sense of obligation had enlarged as the industrial conditions changed she might naturally and almost imperceptibly have inaugurated movements for social amelioration in the line of factory legislation and shop sanitation. That she has not done so is doubtless due to the fact that her conscience is slow to recognize any obligation outside of her own family circle, and because she was so absorbed in her own household that she failed to see what the conditions outside actually were. It would be interesting to know how far the consciousness that she had no vote and could not change matters operated in this direction. (...) If conscientious women were convinced that it was a civic duty to be informed in regard to these grave industrial affairs, and then to express the conclusions which they had reached by depositing a piece of paper in a ballot-box, one cannot imagine that they would shirk simply because the action ran counter to old traditions. (...)

Public-spirited women who wish to use the ballot, as I know them, do not wish to do the work of men nor to take over men's affairs. They simply want an opportunity to do their own work and to take care of those affairs which naturally and historically belong to women, but which are constantly being overlooked and slighted in our political institutions. In a complex community like the modern city all points of view need to be represented; the resultants of diverse experiences need to be pooled if the community would make for sane and balanced progress. If it would meet fairly each problem as it arises, whether it be connected with a freight tunnel having to do largely with business men, or with the increasing death rate among children under five years of age, a problem in which women are vitally concerned, or with the question of more adequate streetcar transfers, in which both men and women might be said to be equally interested, it must not ignore the judgments of its entire adult population. To turn the administration of our civic affairs wholly over to men may mean that the American city will continue to push forward in its commercial and industrial development, and continue to lag behind in those things which make a City healthful and beautiful. After all, woman's traditional function has been to make her dwelling-place both clean and fair. Is that dreariness in city life, that lack of domesticity which the humblest farm dwelling presents, due to a withdrawal of one of the naturally co-operating forces? If women have in any sense been responsible for the gentler side of life which softens and blurs some of its harsher conditions, may they not have a duty to perform in our American cities? In closing, may I recapitulate that if woman would fulfill her traditional responsibility to her own children; if she would educate and protect from danger factory children who must find their recreation on the street; if she would bring the cultural forces to bear upon our materialistic civilization; and if she would do it all with the dignity and directness fitting one who carries on her immemorial duties, then she must bring herself to the use of the ballot - that latest implement for self-government. May we not fairly say that American women need this implement in order to preserve the home?

Jane Addams, social reformer, "Why Women Should Vote"
The Ladies' Home Journal, January 1910

5 The great difference between our western Christian world and the atheistic Communist world is not political, gentlemen, it is moral. For instance, the Marxian idea of confiscating the land and factories and running the entire economy as a single enterprise is momentous. Likewise, Lenin's invention of the one-party police state as a way to make Marx's idea work is hardly less momentous.

Stalin's resolute putting across of these two ideas, of course, did much to divide the world. With only these differences, however, the east and the west could most certainly still live in peace.

10 The real, basic difference, however, lies in the religion of immoralism invented by Marx, preached feverishly by Lenin, and carried to unimaginable extremes by Stalin. This religion of immoralism, if the Red half of the world triumphs—and well it may, gentlemen—this religion of immoralism will more deeply wound and damage mankind than any conceivable economic or political system.

15 Karl Marx dismissed God as a hoax, and Lenin and Stalin have added in clear-cut, unmistakable language their resolve that no nation, no people who believe in a god, can exist side by side with their communistic state. (...)

20 Six years ago, there was within the Soviet orbit, 180,000,000 people. Lined up on the antitotalitarian side there were in the world at that time, roughly 1,625,000,000 people. Today, only six years later, there are 800,000,000 people under the absolute domination of Soviet Russia—an increase of over 400 percent. On our side, the figure has shrunk to around 500,000,000. In other words, in less than six years, the odds have changed from 9 to 1 in our favor to 8 to 5 against us.

25 This indicates the swiftness of the tempo of Communist victories and American defeats in the cold war. As one of our outstanding historical figures once said, "When a great democracy is destroyed, it will not be from enemies from without, but rather because of enemies from within."

30 The reason why we find ourselves in a position of impotency is not because our only powerful potential enemy has sent men to invade our shores but rather because of the traitorous actions of those who have been treated so well by this Nation. It has not been the less fortunate, or members of minority groups who have been traitorous to this Nation, but rather those who have had all the benefits that the wealthiest Nation on earth has had to offer the finest homes, the finest college education and the finest jobs in government we can give.

This is glaringly true in the State Department. There the bright young men who are born with silver spoons in their mouths are the ones who have been most traitorous.

35 I have here in my hand a list of 205 a list of names that were made known to the Secretary of State as being members of the Communist Party and who nevertheless are still working and shaping policy in the State Department.

Concours ENS Paris B/L 2022 – ANGLAIS

Oppressed people cannot remain oppressed forever. The urge for freedom will eventually come. This is what has happened to the American Negro. Something within has reminded him of his birthright of freedom; something without has reminded him that he can gain it. Consciously and unconsciously, he has been swept in by what the Germans call the *Zeitgeist*, and with his black brothers of Africa and his brown and yellow brothers of Asia, South America, and the Caribbean, he is moving with a sense of cosmic urgency toward the promised land of racial justice. Recognizing this vital urge that has engulfed the Negro community, one should readily understand public demonstrations. The Negro has many pent-up resentments and latent frustrations. He has to get them out. So let him march sometime; let him have his prayer pilgrimages to the city hall; understand why he must have sit-ins and freedom rides. If his repressed emotions do not come out in these nonviolent ways, they will come out in ominous expressions of violence. This is not a threat; it is a fact of history. So I have not said to my people, "Get rid of your discontent." But I have tried to say that this normal and healthy discontent can be channelled through the creative outlet of nonviolent direct action. Now this approach is being dismissed as extremist. I must admit that I was initially disappointed in being so categorized.

But as I continued to think about the matter, I gradually gained a bit of satisfaction from being considered an extremist. Was not Jesus an extremist in love? -- "Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, pray for them that spitefully use you." Was not Amos an extremist for justice? -- "Let justice roll down like waters and righteousness like a mighty stream." Was not Paul an extremist for the gospel of Jesus Christ? -- "I bear in my body the marks of the Lord Jesus." Was not Martin Luther an extremist? -- "Here I stand; I can do no other so help me God." Was not John Bunyan an extremist? -- "I will stay in jail to the end of my days before I make a mockery of my conscience." Was not Abraham Lincoln an extremist? -- "This nation cannot survive half slave and half free." Was not Thomas Jefferson an extremist? -- "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal." So the question is not whether we will be extremist, but what kind of extremists we will be. Will we be extremists for hate, or will we be extremists for love? Will we be extremists for the preservation of injustice, or will we be extremists for the cause of justice?

Martin Luther King, Jr., "Letter from Birmingham Jail" (1963)

Concours ENS Paris B/L 2022 – ANGLAIS

We must reverse the trend America finds herself in today. Young people between the ages of twenty-five and forty have been born and reared in a different world than Americans of years past. The television set has been their primary baby-sitter. From the television set they have learned situation ethics and immorality—they have learned a loss of respect for human life.

5 They have learned to disrespect the family as God has established it. They have been educated in a public-school system that is permeated with secular humanism. They have been taught that the Bible is just another book of literature. They have been taught that there are no absolutes in our world today. They have been introduced to the drug culture. They have been reared by the family and the public school in a society that is greatly void of discipline and
10 character-building. (...)

There is no excuse for what is happening in our country. We must, from the highest office in the land right down to the shoe shine boy in the airport, have a return to biblical basics. If the Congress of our United States will take its stand on that which is right and wrong, and if our President, our judiciary system, and our state and local leaders will take their stand on holy
15 living, we can turn this country around.

I personally feel that the home and the family are still held in reverence by the vast majority of the American public. I believe there is still a vast number of Americans who love their country, are patriotic, and are willing to sacrifice for her. I remember the time when it was positive to be patriotic, and as far as I am concerned, it still is. I remember as a boy, when the
20 flag was raised, everyone stood proudly and put his hand upon his heart and pledged allegiance with gratitude. I remember when the band struck up "The Stars and Stripes Forever," we stood and goose pimples would run all over me. I remember when I was in elementary school during World War II, when every report from the other shores meant something to us. We were not out demonstrating against our boys who were dying in Europe
25 and Asia. We were praying for them and thanking God for them and buying war bonds to help pay for the materials and artillery they needed to fight and win and come back.

I believe that Americans want to see this country come back to basics, back to values, back to biblical morality, back to sensibility, and back to patriotism. Americans are looking for leadership and guidance. (...)

30 My responsibility as a preacher of the Gospel is one of influence, not of control, and that is the responsibility of each individual citizen. Through the ballot box Americans must provide for strong moral leadership at every level. If our country will get back on the track in sensibility and moral sanity, the crises that I have herein mentioned will work out in the course of time and with God's blessings.

35 It is now time to take a stand on certain moral issues, and we can only stand if we have leaders. We must stand against the Equal Rights Amendment, the feminist revolution, and the homosexual revolution. We must have a revival in this country.

Jerry Falwell, *Listen America*(New York: Doubleday, 1980)

Concours ENS Paris B/L 2022 – ANGLAIS

"We the people... in order to form a more perfect union..."

Two hundred and twenty-one years ago, in a hall that still stands across the street, a group of men gathered and, with these simple words, launched America's improbable experiment in democracy. Farmers and scholars, statesmen and patriots who had traveled across the ocean to escape tyranny and persecution finally made real their declaration of independence at a Philadelphia convention that lasted through the spring of 1787.

The document they produced was eventually signed, but ultimately unfinished. It was stained by this nation's original sin of slavery, a question that divided the colonies and brought the convention to a stalemate until the founders chose to allow the slave trade to continue for at least twenty more years, and to leave any final resolution to future generations.

Of course, the answer to the slavery question was already embedded within our Constitution—a Constitution that had at its very core the ideal of equal citizenship under the law; a Constitution that promised its people liberty, and justice, and a union that could be and should be perfected over time.

And yet words on a parchment would not be enough to deliver slaves from bondage, or provide men and women of every color and creed their full rights and obligations as citizens of the United States. What would be needed were Americans in successive generations who were willing to do their part—through protests and struggles, on the streets and in the courts, through a civil war and civil disobedience, and always at great risk—to narrow that gap between the promise of our ideals and the reality of their time.

This was one of the tasks we set forth at the beginning of this presidential campaign: to continue the long march of those who came before us, a march for a more just, more equal, more free, more caring and more prosperous America. I chose to run for president at this moment in history because I believe deeply that we cannot solve the challenges of our time unless we solve them together (...).

This belief comes from my unyielding faith in the decency and generosity of the American people. But it also comes from my own story.

I am the son of a black man from Kenya and a white woman from Kansas. I was raised with the help of a white grandfather who survived a Depression to serve in Patton's Army during World War II and a white grandmother who worked on a bomber assembly line at Fort Leavenworth while he was overseas. I've gone to some of the best schools in America and I've lived in one of the world's poorest nations. I am married to a black American who carries within her the blood of slaves and slave owners—an inheritance we pass on to our two precious daughters. I have brothers, sisters, nieces, nephews, uncles and cousins of every race and every hue scattered across three continents, and for as long as I live, I will never forget that in no other country on Earth is my story even possible.

It's a story that hasn't made me the most conventional of candidates. But it is a story that has seared into my genetic makeup the idea that this nation is more than the sum of its parts—that out of many, we are truly one.

Barack Obama, "A More Perfect Union", Philadelphia, March 18, 2008

St. James's Hotel,
Jennings Street 5th Feb. 1788

Dear Clayton,

1 W. Pitt on Saturday morning sent for me into Downing Street, where I remained from half past
eleven o'clock till three o'clock in the afternoon, and after having minutely gone through the whole detail
of the situation and nature of the African Commerce, the state of the British West Indies, the manufactures
5 exported to each separately and their value, also the quantity of foreign goods exported to both countries,
I expatiated on the value of the imports from Africa and the West Indies and North America to Great
Britain, the number, and quantity of shipping employed in each Trade separately with the number of
seamen, etc., and endeavoured to convince him that these three the principal branches of our foreign and
colonial system of commerce, now mutually blended and connected together, and that should W. Wilberforce's
10 plan for the prohibition of a further importation of Negroes into our Islands take place, or that even any
unnecessary and injudicious instructions should be adopted, that the consequences would be a rapid decline
in the two latter, and total ruin and impending destruction to the former, which could not exist without due
encouragement from the legislature, much less was it enabled to bear the presumptions of an unskilful
political Emperio, who under the specious plea of humanity, universal benevolence, and freedom, was with
a rash and daring hand, attacking the very vitals of the patient.

15 From thence, I proceeded to give him an idea of the state of the French African Trade, the attention
paid to that important branch of Commerce by that wise Ministre Mons. de Vergennes, the bounties he
granted both on the shipping employed in it and on the importation of negroes into their Colonies, told
him that his constant expression was *point des Nègres, point des colonies* [sic], that he demonstrated to
the other Ministers of France that by a further importation of 300,000 negroes he could double the produce
20 of the French Islands in the course of a few years; from thence I carried him into their French Islands,
stated their actual situation and importance to the marine of France, the amount and value of their West
Indian produce with the shipping employed in those two branches, without which France could not exist
as a great maritime power, as they were indubitably the foundation of her navy.

25 And after discussing with him a variety of important objects all tending to the same point, the
magnitude of the present question, a greater was never presented to the public eye in any age, or became
the subject of parliamentary investigations; I concluded by assuring him that I did not hesitate in saying
that I had not the least doubt but that the African Merchants of Liverpool would prove to the satisfaction of
every unprejudiced mind in the House of Commons, that so far from the African Trade being founded in *blood*
and a series of fraud, violence and oppression on the coast of Africa, that we should be able to prove the nonsense
30 of our opponents' positions, that the basis of it was founded in humanity and justice to the natives.

His whole reply to these immense considerations, particularly with respect to his situation as the
Minister of a great commercial country whose existence depended on the resources her trade afforded both
to her marine and her finances, was that his private sentiments were for *the abolition of the Slave Trade*
- and that I had authority from him to communicate them immediately to my friends in Liverpool.

35 On Sunday morning, I received a polite note from W. Steele desiring my company to a family dinner
when we could again discuss this subject, at which time I recapitulated all my former arguments, and the
same wide field of Enquiry and staid with him tête-à-tête till late in the evening - and I am sorry to add
that agreeable to my letter to the Mayor yesterday, I think we shall have little chance of success, or that
the African Trade will remain on its present posting except we can prove that it is not carried on with that
40 shocking inhumanity that is imagined by all ranks of mankind out of doors.

Letter to Clayton Tarleton on the slave trade
5 February 1788.

1
5
10
A feeling very generally exists that the condition and disposition of the working classes is a rather ominous matter at present ; that something ought to be said, something ought to be done, in regard to it. And surely, at an epoch of history when the " National Petition " [of the Chartists] carts itself in waggons along the streets, and is presented " bound with iron hoops, four men bearing it ", to a Reformed House of Commons ; and Chartism numbered by the million and half, taking nothing by its iron-hooped Petition, breaks out into brickbats, cheap pikes, and even into sputterings of conflagration, such very general feeling cannot be considered unnatural ! To us individually this matter appears, and has for many years appeared, to be the most ominous of all practical matters whatever ; a matter in regard to which if something be not done, something will do itself one day, and in a fashion that will please nobody. The time is verily come for acting in it ; how much more for consultation about acting in it, for speech and articulate inquiry about it !

15
20
We are aware that, according to the newspapers, Chartism is extinct ; that a Reform Ministry has " put down the chimera of Chartism " [...] So say the newspapers ; — and yet, alas, most readers of newspapers know withal that it is indeed the " chimera " of Chartism, not the reality, which has been put down [...] Chartism means the bitter discontent grown fierce and mad, the wrong condition therefore or the wrong disposition, of the working classes of England. It is a new name for a thing which has had many names, which will yet have many. The matter of Chartism is weighty, deep-rooted, far-extending ; did not begin yesterday ; will by no means end this day or tomorrow [...]

25
30
Delirious Chartism will not have raged entirely to no purpose, as indeed no earthly thing does so, if it have forced all thinking men of the community to think of this vital matter, too apt to be overlooked otherwise. Is the condition of the English working people wrong ; so wrong that rational working men cannot, will not, and even should not rest quiet under it ? A most grave case, complex beyond all others in the world ; a case wherein Botany Bay, constabulary rural police, and such like, will avail but little. Or is the discontent itself mad, like the

35
shape it took ? Not the condition of the working people that is wrong ; but their disposition, their own thoughts, beliefs and feelings that are wrong ? This too were a most grave case, little less alarming, little less complex than the former one. In this case too [...] coercion by itself will not [...] do much. If there do exist general madness of discontent, then sanity and some measure of content must be brought about again, — not by constabulary police alone.

40
45
50
We have heard it asked, why parliament throws no light on this question of the working classes, and the condition or disposition they are in ? [...] A reformed parliament, one would think, should inquire into popular discontents before they get the length of pikes and torches ! [...] The condition of the great body of people in a country is the condition of the country itself : this you would say is a truism in all times ; a truism rather pressing to get recognised as a truth now, and be acted upon, in these times. Yet read Hansard's Debates, or the morning papers, if you have nothing to do ! The old grand question, whether A is to be in office or B, with the innumerable subsidiary questions growing out of that [...] : Canada question, Irish appropriation, West India question, Queen's bedchamber question ; game laws, usury laws ; African blacks, hill coolies, Smithfield cattle, and dogcarts, — all manner of questions and subjects, except simply this the alpha and omega of all ! Surely honorable members ought to speak of the condition-of-England question too.

T. CARLYLE, *Chartism*, 1840.
Carlyle's Works, London : Chapman and Hall,
in 11 vols - vol. 2.
2 tomes en 1 vol. 375 + 308 p.

Charles Walkwyn Radcliffe Cooke (1841-1911) was a conservative judge who was sitting for Hereford in 1893.

1 [...] Mrs. Fawcett, speaking of the majority of seventy-one, by which the second reading of the Bill of last Session was carried, as "the affirmation by a

substantial majority in the representative House of the principle that women who pay rates and taxes ought to be allowed to vote," considers it to be "an important point gained." Had she been enabled to hear the real opinions of members of the majority, and the hopes they openly expressed that, having now by a delusive vote redeemed their pledges, means would be found to prevent the measure from reaching a further stage, she would probably think the "point gained" to be incorrectly described as "important." Instead of falling foul of the avowed and manly opponents of Women's Suffrage, styling their arguments "trumpery" and their speeches "wild and whirling," she would do well to reserve the vials of her wrath for the traitors in the camp - the men who, affecting in public a fervent desire to see women enfranchised, in private denounce every measure projected for that object, and excuse their duplicity on the ground that they are "the victims of the importunate widow." If the leaders of the movement could subject their alleged supporters in the House of Commons to a process of winnowing, and separate the wheat from the chaff, they would be surprised to find how poor would be the yield of sound grain.

It is not unnatural that women with strong convictions on the subject should resent the style in which it appears to be treated in debate. It is right, therefore, they should know that the reporters, taking their cue from the temper of the House, and on the look-out to present their readers with food for merriment, give undue prominence to the jocose speakers, and cut down to the meagrest proportions the argumentative, with the result - quite natural, as I say - not only of irritating earnest women with their heart in the cause, but also of impressing them with the belief that their opponents, having no solid reasons to allege against the enfranchisement of women, are forced to take refuge in ridicule.

I base my main objection to Women's Suffrage on a different ground from that usually taken. Representation no longer now follows as a consequence of taxation. We have given votes to men who, if they do not consume excisable articles, as beer and tobacco, need contribute nothing to the national revenue. Nor is property now an essential qualification for the granting of a vote, since we have the service and the lodger franchise, which may be possessed by persons owning no land, no houses, and not a stick of furniture. All we require of the voter of full age and sound mind is an indication that he has for the time being some kind of fixed position from which we may infer that he is not a mere waif and stray, but a person with a sufficient concern in the affairs of the community to entitle him to a voice in the choice of those who are to make laws for and govern the community; that, in short, he has some interest in some place for some time.

When we have arrived at this conclusion and see that, if we except the plural and the University vote, both clearly anomalies, all men, whatever their diversities of intelligence and wealth, are, as voters, placed on precisely the same footing, we must acknowledge that the arguments founded on the injustice of giving votes to poor ignorant men, and withholding them from intelligent and wealthy women who pay rates and taxes, are unsound.

Men are given the right to a share in the selection of members of the body by which the country is governed and its business transacted because it is by men alone that the country is made such as it is, and is maintained as it is. We need a system of government because of the complexity of those business and social relations at home and abroad which go to make up, and in fact do constitute, what we call civilisation. All matters that require management, all the material parts, all the framework of the State, have been constructed by and are maintained and preserved by the labour of men. Everything that enables us to enjoy a high state of civilisation is due to the labour of men. Without roads, railways, buildings, docks, ships, and innumerable other works of men, where would our civilisation be, and where our need of Parliament and Parliamentary electors? [...]

NATIONAL UNION OF WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE SOCIETIES. *Women's Suffrage in Parliament* - Mrs Henry Fawcett and Mr C.W. Radcliffe Cooke, M.P. London, National Union of Women's Suffrage Societies, 1898, 11 p.: 6-8.

5 [...] It is our business in all these new countries to make
smooth the paths for British commerce, British enterprise, the
application of British capital, at a time when [...] other outlets
for the commercial energies of our race are being gradually
closed by the commercial principles which are gaining more
and more adhesion. Everywhere we see the advance of com-
merce checked by the enormous growth which the doctrines of
Protection are obtaining. We see it with our three great
10 commercial rivals, France, Germany, and America. The doc-
trines of Protection are stronger and stronger, and operate to
the exclusion of British commerce wherever their power
extends. We see even in our own colonies the same sinister
influence at work. [...] It is the duty of the Government to
15 spare no opportunity of opening fresh outlets for the energy of
British commerce and enterprise, and I confess that not
wholly, but in a great measure, this great undertaking of
England with respect to Uganda has been taken, to my mind,
and, I believe, to the mind of vast numbers in this country, for
20 the reason that it is a country of enormous fertility, and it has
what many countries of fertility have not — a large, increasing
population, or, at least, a population that will increase under
the favourable conditions of peace, and a population of very
fair intelligence. It is a matter of vital importance that British
25 commerce should have free access to that country, free access
to the whole of the upper valley of the Nile. [...] There are
four, if not five, Powers that are steadily advancing towards
the upper waters of the Nile. There will be a competition — I
will use no stronger word — for the advantages which pre-
dominance in that region will confer. I hope that it will be a
30 competition of a friendly and tranquil character, but no one
can foresee what the future will be. At all events it will be a
most severe competition, and while you are sitting with your
hands before you they are advancing. Many rumours reach us
of diplomatic events and diplomatic engagements which have
35 but one meaning, and that is that others covet the predomi-
nance in those fertile regions which have so rich a promise of
future prosperity. [...] In this competition that is preparing
between various nations we fight with special weapons, weap-
ons which, if we give them a chance, will confer upon us
40 enormous advantages, but which it is necessary that we should
be able to handle properly. If this competition is ultimately
settled merely by negotiations, by diplomatic weapons, by a
protocol of some European capital, I know not what the issue
may be. We have so many interests in so many parts of the
45 world, we are so much exposed, that it may be doubtful

50 whether we shall be willing to run anything approaching to
risk for the sake of this African possession; but we have
another means of making ourselves secure — a means which it
may be said belongs to us alone — and that is not the power
of our Government or the negotiation which they may carry
on, but the energy, the initiative, the force, the individual force
which our people carry with them into any new country which
they inhabit. [...] See the splendid work Mr. Rhodes has done
55 in the southern end of Africa. He has obtained little from any
Government in this country, but he has laid the foundations of
a splendid empire, and even the Government of the Transvaal,
hostile as it has been to us, is finding the pressure of English
activity all round them so strong that they are slowly giving
60 way, and we have no doubt that by friendly and peaceful, and
yet by irresistible force, they will be compelled to fall into line
and to join the great unconscious confederation that is grow-
ing up. My Lords, this is tremendous power, but it requires
one condition. You must enable it to get to the country where
its work is to be done.

Whilst serving my apprenticeship under Charles Booth, I had reached a tentative conclusion about the most far-reaching "experiment in the lives of other people" that the world had then witnessed; though it has since been equalled in ruthlessness, and excelled in speed and violence, but not, I think, in thoroughness and permanence, by the Russian Revolution that began in 1917.

5 The industrial revolution in Britain (...) cast out of our rural and urban life the yeoman cultivator and the copyholder, the 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 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 pioneer of the new power-driven machine industry was the making of pecuniary profit. (...) Commodities 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 years' ordeal of the Napoleonic Wars intact, and not even invaded, whilst her ruling oligarchy emerged in 1815 as 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 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 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 develop their instinct of fellowship, and their capacity for representative institutions, alike in politics and 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 collective regulation of the conditions of employment, which, in the Factory Acts and Mines Regulation Acts on the one hand, and the standard rates of wage and the normal working day of the Trade Unions on the other hand, 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 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.

Beatrice Webb, 'Chapter VII: Why I Became a Socialist', *My Apprenticeship*, New York & London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1926, pp. 393-396.

1 The present centralisation of power into the hands of one person has gone too far and amounts to a system of personal rule in the very heart of our parliamentary democracy. My conclusion is that the powers of the prime minister, and party leader, must be made more accountable to those over whom they are exercised, so that we can develop a constitutional premiership in Britain. To transform an absolute premiership into a constitutional premiership would involve making some fundamental changes in its functions comparable to those made over the years, when the crown was transformed from an absolute monarchy to a constitutional monarchy. (. . .)

10 Britain's political history has been marked by a long series of struggles to wrest powers away from the centre and redistribute them to a wider group of interests. From the truly absolutist monarchy of William the Conqueror, there was a succession of bitter battles from which the monarchy emerged with its powers trimmed, first by the feudal barons at Runnymede, then by the House of Lords itself and, later still, by the revolution of the gentry at the time of Cromwell. The growing power of the House of Commons after 1688, and the development of cabinet government in the century that followed, led to the situation under which the crown's own ministers were required to command a majority in the elected chamber. After the 1832 Reform Act the processes of extending the franchise were carried to the point which we have reached today, when ministers are accountable to a House of Commons chosen following an election at which all adults may vote. Under this textbook version of the development of our constitutional monarchy, within a parliamentary democracy, the powers of the prime minister can be seen as a great achievement because they have been wrested away from the throne, and are now only exercised at the will of the electorate — but the analysis leaves out of account the impact that the powers of the prime minister may have on the rights of those in parliament, in the political parties and on the electorate as a whole. The establishment of an "elected monarch" may reproduce, in a significant sense, the very system of personal rule which earlier struggles were intended to end. Indeed, it is quite legitimate to ask whether we have not, accidentally, made a very good job of reproducing feudalism, complete with a whole new generation of barons, who owe their positions of power to a new "monarch" dispensing power and status of a much more significant kind, as well as the old honours. This is not to suggest that all the very real achievements of British democracy have been eroded by these tendencies. The ultimate power of the House of Commons to topple a prime minister remains unaffected, as does the even greater power of the voters to get rid of both governments and the MPs who support them: the very fact that this power is there operates to restrain the exercise of all powers by prime ministers and their ministers. Within that broad framework of public and parliamentary consent, however, there has certainly been a greater centralisation of personal power in the hands of one man or woman than outward appearances would suggest.

Tony BENN, "The Case for a Constitutional Premiership",
in Anthony KING (ed.), *The British Prime Minister*.
London: Macmillan, 1985, pp. 222-223.

'This insidious urge to reshape Britain'

Stephen Glover

(Daily Mail, 23 June 1998) abridged

1 [The] characteristic representative of the new [British] establishment... is based on money, business and popular culture ...

... [Often this representative] ... [besides being metropolitan and rich ... is essentially non-ideological ...

5 Throughout our history colourful men have batted on to the establishment of the day. What is different now is that Tony Blair, allegedly the most conservative of politicians, is in the throes of building his own new establishment ... Mr Blair is deliberately altering the landscape of our society. A new élite is being created, quite different from the old.

10 If Mr Blair's creation of this new establishment were merely a little sideline, one might not complain too much. In fact it is part of a wholesale transformation of our society. Everything must be changed. In this Mr Blair is the faithful disciple of Margaret Thatcher who, untypically for a Conservative, saw politics as a never-ending long march, a permanent revolution. But whereas Thatcherism used economics as its engine of change, whose effects admittedly spread far throughout our institutions, New Labour plans to shake up the whole of our society from top to bottom.

20 On the surface it looks like business as usual. The economy is run on generally prudent lines. But the Blairites are addicted to the idea of change for change's sake. Their only ideology is change. They want to change our image and our view of our history. They want to change the nature of the Union, and in so doing risk that very Union itself, so that within a year of a referendum Scotland is almost visibly breaking away. They want to change our relationship with Europe, whatever they may say.

25 So far New Labour's project has found no disfavour with the British people in their present mood of stupefaction.¹⁴ I doubt whether this will continue to be the case. I believe that Mr Blair's craving for ceaseless change will eventually contribute to his undoing. For more than any generation that has ever lived, we already inhabit a world of change. I don't just mean technological change - CDs, computers, the Internet and all the other wonders of modern life. I mean the cultural and social change of which these things are part. I mean our feeling that our world is being transformed before our eyes.

35 Most of us feel ambivalent about these changes. In our hearts we recognize that there is little we can do about them. We seize upon some innovations and reject others. But only those who naturally head towards the big dipper whenever they see a fun fair are likely to want their government to pile changes of its own upon those which are already happening. The rest of us yearn for some measure of stability. Far from providing a still centre in a turning world, Mr Blair is himself an agent of change, egged on by a media class for whom politics is a form of entertainment in which change is the ultimate thrill.

40 Is it too much to expect William Hague and modern Conservatives to turn this to their advantage? The old Tory Party - the party of Knights of the Shires and gentlemen with stiff collars - is dead and nothing is going to revive it. But that does not mean the Tories' natural scepticism about engineered change should be disowned. It is, after all, called the Conservative Party, and has been since 1830 ...

... Yet I fear that Mr Hague, while perhaps a natural Conservative at heart ... is surrounded by spin doctors and management consultants who are almost as addicted to change as Mr Blair ...

50 We are not the first people to be bewildered by the disappearance of familiar landmarks. The Victorians were devastated by the pace of change. Towards the end of a life that had seen more change than most, W.E. Gladstone wrote: 'I am for old customs and traditions against needless change. I am for the individual as against the state. I am for the family and the stable family as against the state.' This from a man who began his political life as a High Tory and became a Liberal, and who himself presided over many upheavals.

... A country cannot be reshaped like a political party and relaunched like a detergent. We will eventually tire of Mr Blair's appetite for change and Mr Hague, if he has any sense at all, will be on hand to deliver us.

1 I intend this short book as a contribution to the debate now going on in many countries about the future of social democratic politics. The reasons for the debate are obvious enough - the dissolution of the 'welfare consensus' that dominated in the industrial countries up to the late 1970s, the final discrediting of Marxism and the very profound social, economic and technological changes that helped bring these about. What should be done in response, and whether social democracy can survive at all as a distinctive political philosophy, are much less obvious.

5 I believe social democracy can not only survive, but prosper, on an ideological as well as a practical level. It can only do so, however, if social democrats are prepared to revise their pre-existing views more thoroughly than most have done so far. They need to find a third way. As I explain in the text, the term 'third way' is of no particular significance in and of itself. It has been used many times before in the past history of social democracy, and also by writers and politicians of

15 quite different political persuasions. I make use of it here to refer to social democratic renewal - the present-day version of the periodic rethinking that social democrats have had to carry out quite often over the past century.

20 In Britain 'third way' has come to be associated with the politics of Tony Blair and New Labour. Tony Blair's political beliefs have frequently been compared to those of the New Democrats in the US, and indeed there have been close and direct contacts between New Labour and the New Democrats. It has been said that 'like the Thatcher and Major governments, the Blair government looks across the Atlantic for inspiration, not across the channel. Its rhetoric is American, the intellectual influences which have shaped its project are American; its political style is American.'

40 The statement is not wholly true. Labour's welfare to work programme, for instance, may have an American-style label, but arguably draws its inspiration more from Scandinavian active labour market programmes than from the US. In so far as the observation is valid, however, the emphasis is one that needs correcting. The debate around New Labour, lively and interesting though it is, has been carried on largely in ignorance of comparable discussions that have been going on in Continental social democracy for some while. Tony Blair's break with old Labour was a significant accomplishment, but a similar sort of break has been made by virtually all Continental social democratic parties.

50 In many respects the debate in the UK needs to catch up with the more advanced sectors of Continental social democracy. Yet the UK is also in a position to

55 contribute actively to the new ideas now emerging. Rather than merely appropriating American trends and notions, Britain could be a sparking point for creative interaction between the US and Continental Europe. Most countries on the Continent have not experienced lengthy periods of neoliberal government as the UK has. Whatever else Thatcherism may or may not have done, it certainly shook up British society. Margaret Thatcher, like most other neoliberals, was no ordinary conservative. Flying the flag of free markets, she attacked established institutions and elites, while her policies lent further force to changes already sweeping through the society at large. The Labour Party and its intellectual sympathizers first of all responded largely by reaffirming old left views. The electoral setbacks the party suffered by so doing, however, necessarily stimulated a new orientation. As a consequence, political discussion in the UK in some ways has been more free thinking than in social democratic circles on the Continent. Ideas developed in Britain could have direct relevance to the Continental debates, as these have mostly unfolded against a different backdrop.

Anthonny
Giddens,
The Third
Way - The
Renewal of
Social Demo-
cracy, 1998
Preface
pp. vii - ix

Theresa May's first speech to the nation as prime minister – 13 July 2016

I have just been to Buckingham Palace where Her Majesty the Queen has asked me to form a new government and I accepted. Under David Cameron's leadership, the government stabilised the economy, reduced the budget deficit and helped more people into work than ever before. But, David's true legacy is not about the economy, but about social justice. From the
5 introduction of same-sex marriage, to taking people on low wages out of income tax altogether, David Cameron has led a One Nation government, and it is in that spirit that I also plan to lead. Because, not everybody knows this, but the full title of my party is the Conservative and Unionist Party, and that word Unionist is very important to me. It means that we believe in the Union, the precious, precious bond between England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland,
10 but it means something else that is just as important. It means we believe in a Union, not just between the nations of the United Kingdom, but between all of our citizens, whoever we are, and wherever we're from. That means fighting against the burning injustice that if you're born poor you will die, on average, nine years earlier than others. If you're black, you're treated more harshly by the criminal justice system than if you're white. If you're a white, working
15 class boy, you're less likely than anybody else in Britain to go to university. If you're at a state school, you're less likely to reach the top professions than if you're educated privately. If you're a woman, you will earn less than a man. If you suffer from mental health problems, there's not enough help to hand. If you're young, you'll find it harder than ever before to own your own home. But, the mission to make Britain a country that works for everyone means more than
20 fighting these injustices. If you're from an ordinary working-class family, life is much harder than many people in Westminster realise. You have a job, but you don't always have job security. You have your own home but you worry about paying the mortgage. You can just about manage, but you worry about the cost of living and getting your kids into a good school. If you're one of those families, if you're just managing, I want to address you directly. I know
25 you're working around the clock, I know you're doing your best and I know that sometimes life can be a struggle. The government I lead will be driven, not by the interests of the privileged few, but by yours. We will do everything we can to give you more control over your lives. When we take the big calls, we'll think not of the powerful, but you. When we pass new laws, we'll listen not to the mighty, but to you. When it comes to taxes, we'll prioritise not the
30 wealthy, but you. When it comes to opportunity, we won't entrench the advantages of the fortunate few, we will do everything we can to help anybody, whatever your background, to go as far as your talents will take you. We are living through an important moment in our country's history. Following the referendum we face a time of great national change and I know because we're Great Britain that we will rise to the challenge. As we leave the European Union, we will
35 forge a new, bold, positive role for ourselves in the world, and we will make Britain a country that works, not for the privileged few, but for every one of us. That will be the mission of the government I lead, and together, we will build a better Britain.