

Behind economics

Economics is too important to be left to the economists. It is no reflection upon the economist's expertise or integrity to suggest that his approach will reflect the non-economic values which make him the person he is. John Maynard Keynes famously remarked that: "Practical men, who believe themselves to be quite exempt from any intellectual influences, are usually the slaves of some defunct economist."

But extant economists are no less the slaves of outside influences. That was true of Keynes himself - a member of the 'Bloomsbury' set whose rejection of the Victorian virtues in their own behaviour was subtly but surely echoed in the abandonment of the classical liberal rules and restraints in economics with which 'Keynesianism' became synonymous.

So too my own views on economics flowed from personal experience of the world in which I grew up. My 'Bloomsbury' was Grantham¹ - Methodism, the grocer's shop, Rotary and all the serious, sober virtues cultivated and esteemed in that environment. Doubtless, there are a hundred ways of coming to convictions about economics, as there are to convictions about politics or religion. But for me, experience in life in the Roberts household was the decisive influence.

For the truth is that families and governments have a great deal more in common than most politicians and economists like to accept. Although the consequences of flouting fundamental rules are somewhat different for states than for households, they are still ruinous - indeed, more ruinous in the case of states because they have the power to bring whole nations down with them.

Nor was it only an understanding of what government could not do that my upbringing and early experience left with me. I also gained a sympathetic insight into what I would later come to think of as 'capitalism' or the 'free-enterprise system'. Whereas for my (usually somewhat older) contemporaries it was the alleged failure of that system in the Great Depression that convinced them that something better had to be found, for me the reality of business in our shop and in the bustling centre of Grantham demonstrated the opposite. For them capitalism was alien and harsh for me it was familiar and creative. I was able to see that it was satisfying customers that allowed my father to increase the number of people he employed. I knew that it was international trade which brought tea, coffee, sugar and spices to those who frequented our shop. And, more than that, I experienced that business, as can be seen in any marketplace anywhere, was a lively, human, social and sociable reality in fact, though serious it was also fun. There is no better course for understanding free-market economics than life in a corner shop. What I learned in Grantham ensured that abstract criticisms I would hear of capitalism came up against the reality of my own experience: I was thus inoculated against the conventional economic wisdom of post-war Britain.

Margaret Thatcher
The Path to Power (1995)

Andrew Jackson, Farewell Address, March 4, 1837

We have now lived almost fifty years under the Constitution framed by the sages and patriots of the Revolution.... Our Constitution is no longer a doubtful experiment, and at the end of nearly half a century we find that it has preserved unimpaired the liberties of the people, secured the rights of property, and that our country has improved and is flourishing beyond any former example in the history of nations.... These cheering and grateful prospects and these multiplied favors we owe, under Providence, to the adoption of the Federal Constitution. It is no longer a question whether this great country can remain happily united and flourish under our present form of government. Experience, the unerring test of all human undertakings, has shown the wisdom and foresight of those who formed it, and has proved that in the union of these States there is a sure foundation for the brightest hopes of freedom and for the happiness of the people. At every hazard and by every sacrifice this Union must be preserved.

The necessity of watching with jealous anxiety for the preservation of the Union was earnestly pressed upon his fellow-citizens by the Father of his Country in his Farewell Address. He has there told us that "while experience shall not have demonstrated its impracticability, there will always be reason to distrust the patriotism of those who in any quarter may endeavor to weaken its bands;" and he has cautioned us in the strongest terms against the formation of parties on geographical discriminations, as one of the means which might disturb our Union and to which designing men would be likely to resort.

The lessons contained in this invaluable legacy of Washington to his countrymen should be cherished in the heart of every citizen to the latest generation; and perhaps at no period of time could they be more usefully remembered than at the present moment; for ... amid this general prosperity and splendid success the dangers of which he warned us are becoming every day more evident, and the signs of evil are sufficiently apparent to awaken the deepest anxiety in the bosom of the patriot. We behold systematic efforts publicly made to sow the seeds of discord between different parts of the United States and to place party divisions directly upon geographical distinctions; to excite the *South* against the *North* and the *North* against the *South*, and to force into the controversy the most delicate and exciting topics—topics upon which it is impossible that a large portion of the Union can ever speak without strong emotion. Appeals, too, are constantly made to sectional interests in order to influence the election of the Chief Magistrate, as if it were desired that he should favor a particular quarter of the country instead of fulfilling the duties of his station with impartial justice to all; and the possible dissolution of the Union has at length become an ordinary and familiar subject of discussion. Has the warning voice of Washington been forgotten, or have designs already been formed to sever the Union? Let it not be supposed that I impute to all of those who have taken an active part in these unwise and unprofitable discussions a want of patriotism or of public virtue. The honorable feeling of State pride and local attachments finds a place in the bosoms of the most enlightened and pure. But while such men are conscious of their own integrity and honesty of purpose, they ought never to forget that the citizens of other States are their political brethren, and that however mistaken they may be in their views, the great body of them are equally honest and upright with themselves. Mutual suspicions and reproaches may in time create mutual hostility, and artful and designing men will always be found who are ready to foment these fatal divisions and to inflame the natural jealousies of different sections of the country. The history of the world is full of such examples, and especially the history of republics.

What have you to gain by division and dissension? Delude not yourselves with the belief that a breach once made may be afterwards repaired. If the Union is once severed, the line of separation will grow wider and wider, and the controversies which are now debated and settled in the halls of legislation will then be tried in fields of battle and determined by the sword. Neither should you deceive yourselves with the hope that the first line of separation would be the permanent one, and that nothing but harmony and concord would be found in the new associations formed upon the dissolution of this Union. Local interests would still be found there, and unchastened ambition. And if the recollection of common dangers, in which the people of these United States stood side by side against the common foe, the memory of victories won by their united valor, the prosperity and happiness they have enjoyed under the present Constitution, the proud name they bear as citizens of this great Republic—if all these recollections and proofs of common interest are not strong enough to bind us together as one people, what tie will hold united the new divisions of empire when these bonds have been broken and this Union dissevered? The first line of separation would not last for a single generation; new fragments would be

50 torn off, new leaders would spring up, and this great and glorious Republic would soon be broken into a multitude
of petty States, without commerce, without credit, jealous of one another, armed for mutual aggression, loaded
with taxes to pay armies and leaders, seeking aid against each other from foreign powers, insulted and trampled
upon by the nations of Europe, until, harassed with conflicts and humbled and debased in spirit, they would be
55 ready to submit to the absolute dominion of any military adventurer and to surrender their liberty for the sake of
repose. It is impossible to look on the consequences that would inevitably follow the destruction of this
Government and not feel indignant when we hear cold calculations about the value of the Union and have so
constantly before us a line of conduct so well calculated to weaken its ties.

There is too much at stake to allow pride or passion to influence your decision. Never for a moment believe that
the great body of the citizens of any State or States can deliberately intend to do wrong. They may, under the
60 influence of temporary excitement or misguided opinions, commit mistakes; they may be misled for a time by the
suggestions of self-interest; but in a community so enlightened and patriotic as the people of the United States
argument will soon make them sensible of their errors, and when convinced they will be ready to repair them. If
they have no higher or better motives to govern them, they will at least perceive that their own interest requires
them to be just to others, as they hope to receive justice at their hands.

65 But in order to maintain the Union unimpaired it is absolutely necessary that the laws passed by the constituted
authorities should be faithfully executed in every part of the country, and that every good citizen should at all
times stand ready to put down, with the combined force of the nation, every attempt at unlawful resistance, under
whatever pretext it may be made or whatever shape it may assume. Unconstitutional or oppressive laws may no
doubt be passed by Congress, either from erroneous views or the want of due consideration; if they are within the
70 reach of judicial authority, the remedy is easy and peaceful; and if, from the character of the law, it is an abuse of
power not within the control of the judiciary, then free discussion and calm appeals to reason and to the justice of
the people will not fail to redress the wrong. But until the law shall be declared void by the courts or repealed by
Congress no individual or combination of individuals can be justified in forcibly resisting its execution. It is
impossible that any government can continue to exist upon any other principles. It would cease to be a
75 government and be unworthy of the name if it had not the power to enforce the execution of its own laws within its
own sphere of action....

Below Stairs ; Domestic Service in Inter-War-England

The Times Weekend, 11/06/1998

1 In 1898, a respectable matron called Mrs Hunt lost most of her money on some dodgy speculation.
2 So she set herself up in business instead, supplying domestic servants to the gentry. In the days when
3 it took a battalion of lackeys to maintain a Victorian household, her enterprise proved profitable.
4 Surprising, perhaps, that 100 years later Mrs Hunt's Agency should still be going strong. Domestic
5 service has swept back into fashion in the 1990s two-salary household. It has become a growth
6 industry.

7 Naturally, the style has changed somewhat since that old-fashioned era when propriety stood as
8 stiffly as the footman at the door. "The war put an end to the old way of life", says Alice Fairley, 75,
9 who went on service at the age of 17. "Before the war we were nine below the stairs, with Mr Baxter
10 and his wife as the butler and cook, Jane as the lady's maid and Edward the valet. He had to iron the
11 newspaper in the morning and warm the sovereigns before they went into Sir's pocket. And then
12 there were the upper and under-housemaids, and the kitchen maid, who peeled the vegetables and
13 skinned the rabbits. I was a nanny then, and I had an under-nanny to help me."

14 Apparently, the under-nanny was sacked after sucking the jam spoon and sticking it back into the
15 pot. The strictest hierarchies and disciplines were always maintained.

16 However, the rigidity slackened during the Second World war and was never re-established. "The
17 butler went off to be a policeman," says Miss Fairley.

18 "I stayed in the country with the two little boys, but I was more like the house-keeper by then. I will
19 always remember a certain gentleman who came to stay. He came down one morning and asked me
20 if I would iron his shoe-laces in those days some shoe-laces were made of silk. I Well, I drew myself to
21 my full height and said: "With all due respect, Sir, don't you realize there is a war on"."

22 With an old-fashioned loyalty, now familiar only from novels, Miss Fairley remained with her
23 employers until her retirement. She never married. "Who would I have met?" she asks. She now lives
24 alone in a South London flat with sepia photographs and a pair of lusterware lovebirds perched by an
25 old brass carriage clock, her last memento of 20 years in service.

26 But 15 years ago, she went to her former employer's funeral. "I met the old butler, Mr Roberts there
27 too. We stood together in a corner of the graveyard so as not to intrude on the family's grief."

28 The picture she paints is not just of devotion, but of a heartbreaking loneliness. Life behind the green
29 baize door in 'which every staff member knew his or her place and kept to it, could be very solitary'.

30 Helen Murphy remembers her first job as a housemaid in Aberdeenshire castle.

31 "I went there at the age of 16 in 1954," she says, "and stayed four years. I shared a room with the
32 kitchen maid overlooking the woods. She was my only companion. The cook was more than 60 years
33 old and Mr Perry, the butler lived with his family in the lodge. I had to be up at 5.30 am with my
34 white pinny starched to carry out the ashes from the grates, polish the brasses and fill the fire-

35 baskets with coal and peat." At the end of the day she would go up to her room with a hot water
36 bottle and a pot of tea. "It was very lonely," she says. "No one lived nearby. And on my half day off I
37 had to bicycle 18 miles home, and then all the way back again to be in before 10 pm."

38 But the system which depended on a sharp class divide has changed with the increasing
39 egalitarianism of the post-war years. The word servant in itself is no longer acceptable. Domestic
40 help is a quite different phenomenon now, except perhaps in the very grandest or the most brashly
41 pretentious – homes. Staff are employed not to do the tasks that the wealthy would once have
42 disdained, but to help out busy professional couples.

43

What Has Happened to The American Dream?

Eleanor Roosevelt was the First Lady longer than any other woman in American history, and since her retirement from the White House she has continued to work unsparingly in the public interest, first as an official member of our delegation at the United Nations, and more recently in her lectures and telecasts originating at Brandeis University. She has spoken on more than one hundred campuses in the past fifteen years, and the paper which follows reflects her interest and experience.

By Eleanor Roosevelt

...What I learned on these trips around the world has been much on my mind. Why, I wondered, were we not more successful in helping the young nations and those in transition to become established along democratic lines? Why was it that the Russians were doing so much better? The answer can be oversimplified, and an oversimplification is false and misleading. But part of the answer, and I think a major part, is that Russia has trained its young people to go out into the world, to carry their services and skills to backward and underdeveloped countries, to replace the missing doctors and teachers, the scientists and technicians; above all, to fill the vacant civil service jobs, prepared not only by training for the job itself, but by learning the language, by a complete briefing in the customs, habits, traditions, and trend of thought of the people, to understand them and deal with them. Where the young Russians go, of course, they take with them their Marxist training, thinking, and system.

And our young Americans? Are they being prepared to take their faith in democracy to the world along with their skills? Are they learning the language and the customs and the history of these new peoples? Do they understand how to deal with them, not according to their own ideas but according to the ideas of the people they must learn to know if they are to reach them at all? Have they acquired an ability to live and work among peoples of different religion and race and color, without arrogance and without prejudice?

Here, I believe, we have fallen down badly. In the last few years I have grasped at every opportunity to meet with the young, to talk with college students, to bring home as strongly as I can to even young children in the lower grades our responsibility for each other, our need to understand and respect each other. The future will be determined by the young, and there is no more essential task today, it seems to me, than to bring before them once more, in all its brightness, in all its splendor and beauty, the American dream, lest we let it fade, too concerned with ways of earning a living or impressing our neighbors or getting ahead or finding bigger and more potent ways of destroying the world and all that is in it.

No single individual, of course, and no single group has an exclusive claim to the American dream. But we have all, I think, a single vision of what it is, not merely as a hope and an aspiration, but as a way of life, which we can come ever closer to attaining in its ideal form if we keep shining and unsullied our purpose and our belief in its essential value.

That we have sometimes given our friends and our enemies abroad a shoddy impression of the dream cannot be denied, much as we would like to deny it. The Ugly American, impressive as it was, struck me as being exaggerated. True, one of the first American ambassadors I ever met in an Eastern country was appallingly like a character in the novel. There are doubtless many others, too many others, men who accept—and seek—the position of representative of their government abroad, with no real interest

35 or respect for the country they go to, and no real interest or respect for the image of their own country which they present to other people. Such men buy their positions by gifts of money to their party or seek them because of the glamorous social life they may lead in exotic places. "Oh, you must go there. You'll have a wonderful time. And the polo is topnotch."

They often do not know the language of the country; they are not familiar with its government or its officials; they are not interested in its customs, or its point of view.

40 The Russians, and I say it with shame, do much better. They are trained in the language, history, customs, and ways of life of a country before they go to it. They do not confine themselves to official entertaining but make a point of meeting and knowing and establishing friendly relations with people of all sorts, in every class of society, in every part of the country.

45 When we look at the picture of Russian greed in swallowing one satellite nation after another and contrast it with the picture of American generosity in giving food, clothing, supplies, technical and financial assistance, without the ulterior motive of acquiring new territory, it is stupid and tragic waste that the use of incompetent representatives should undo so much useful work, so great an expense, so much in the way of materials of every kind.

50 Of course, what the Russians have accomplished in training their young people for important posts in the underdeveloped countries—which, I must repeat, may affect the future course of these countries—has been done by compulsion. That's the rub. For what we must do is to achieve the same results on a voluntary basis. We do not say to our young people: "You must go here and take such a job." But we can show them that where we fail, the Russians will win, by default. We can show them the importance of acquiring the kind of training that will make them useful and honorable representatives
55 of their country wherever they may go abroad.

Perhaps the new frontier today is something more than the new revolution in textiles and methods and speed and goods. It is in the frontier of men's minds. But we cannot cast an enduring light on other men's minds unless the light in our own minds burns with a hard, unquenchable flame....

Emmeline Pankhurst, "Freedom or death"

Hartford, Connecticut, November 13 1913

I do not come here as an advocate, because whatever position the suffrage movement may occupy in the United States of America, in England it has passed beyond the realm of advocacy and it has entered into the sphere of practical politics. It has become the subject of revolution and civil war, and so tonight I am not here to advocate woman suffrage. American suffragists can do that very well for themselves. I am here as a soldier who has temporarily left the field of battle in order to explain—it seems strange it should have to be explained—what civil war is like when civil war is waged by women. I am not only here as a soldier temporarily absent from the field at battle; I am here—and that, I think, is the strangest part of my coming—I am here as a person who, according to the law courts of my country, it has been decided, is of no value to the community at all; and I am adjudged because of my life to be a dangerous person, under sentence of penal servitude in a convict prison.

It is not at all difficult if revolutionaries come to you from Russia, if they come to you from China, or from any other part of the world, if they are men. But since I am a woman it is necessary to explain why women have adopted revolutionary methods in order to win the rights of citizenship. We women, in trying to make our case clear, always have to make as part of our argument, and urge upon men in our audience the fact—a very simple fact—that women are human beings....

It is about eight years since the word militant was first used to describe what we were doing. It was not militant at all, except that it provoked militancy on the part of those who were opposed to it. When women asked questions in political meetings and failed to get answers, they were not doing anything militant. In Great Britain it is a custom, a time-honoured one, to ask questions of candidates for parliament and ask questions of members of the government. No man was ever put out of a public meeting for asking a question. The first people who were put out of a political meeting for asking questions, were women; they were brutally ill-used; they found themselves in jail before 24 hours had expired. We were called militant, and we were quite willing to accept the name. We were determined to press this question of the enfranchisement of women to the point where we were no longer to be ignored by the politicians.

You have two babies very hungry and wanting to be fed. One baby is a patient baby, and waits indefinitely until its mother is ready to feed it. The other baby is an impatient baby and cries lustily, screams and kicks and makes everybody unpleasant until it is fed. Well, we know perfectly well which baby is attended to first. That is the whole history of politics. You have to make more noise than anybody else, you have to make yourself more obtrusive than anybody else, you have to fill all the papers more than anybody else, in fact you have to be there all the time and see that they do not snow you under. When you have warfare things happen; people suffer; the noncombatants suffer as well as the combatants. And so it happens in civil war. When your forefathers threw the tea into Boston Harbour, a good many women had to go without their tea. It has always seemed to me an extraordinary thing that you did not follow it up by throwing the whiskey overboard; you sacrificed the women; and there is a good deal of warfare for which men take a great deal of glorification which has involved more practical sacrifice on women than it has on any man. It always has been so. The grievances of those who have got power, the influence of those who have got power commands a great deal of attention; but the wrongs and the grievances of those people who have no power at all are apt to be absolutely ignored. That is the history of humanity right from the beginning.

Well, in our civil war people have suffered, but you cannot make omelettes without breaking eggs; you cannot have civil war without damage to something. The great thing is to see that no more damage is done than is absolutely necessary, that you do just as much as will arouse enough feeling to bring about peace, to bring about an honourable peace for the combatants; and that is what we have been doing. We entirely prevented stockbrokers in London from telegraphing to stockbrokers in Glasgow and vice versa: for one whole day telegraphic communication was entirely stopped. I am not going to tell you how it was done. I am not going to tell you how the women got to the mains and cut the wires; but it was done. It was done, and it was proved to the authorities that weak women, suffrage women, as we are supposed to be, had enough ingenuity to create a situation of that kind. Now, I ask you, if women can do that, is there any limit to what we can do except the limit we put upon ourselves?

50 If you are dealing with an industrial revolution, if you get the men and women of one class rising up against the men and women of another class, you can locate the difficulty; if there is a great industrial strike, you know exactly where the violence is and how the warfare is going to be waged; but in our war against the government you can't locate it. We wear no mark; we belong to every class; we permeate every class of the community from the highest to the lowest; and so you see in the woman's civil war the dear men of my country are discovering it is absolutely impossible to deal with it: you cannot locate it, and you cannot stop it.

55 "Put them in prison," they said, "that will stop it." But it didn't stop it at all: instead of the women giving it up, more women did it, and more and more and more women did it until there were 300 women at a time, who had not broken a single law, only "made a nuisance of themselves" as the politicians say. Then they began to legislate. The British government has passed more stringent laws to deal with this agitation than it ever found necessary during all the history of political agitation in my country.... They have said to us, government rests upon force, the women haven't force, so they must submit. Well, we are showing them that government does not rest upon force
60 at all: it rests upon consent. As long as women consent to be unjustly governed, they can be, but directly women say: "We withhold our consent, we will not be governed any longer so long as that government is unjust." Not by the forces of civil war can you govern the very weakest woman. You can kill that woman, but she escapes you then; you cannot govern her. No power on earth can govern a human being, however feeble, who withholds his or her consent.

65 When they put us in prison at first, simply for taking petitions, we submitted; we allowed them to dress us in prison clothes; we allowed them to put us in solitary confinement; we allowed them to put us amongst the most degraded of criminals; we learned of some of the appalling evils of our so-called civilisation that we could not have learned in any other way. It was valuable experience, and we were glad to get it. I have seen men smile when they heard the words "hunger strike", and yet I think there are very few men today who would be prepared
70 to adopt a "hunger strike" for any cause. It is only people who feel an intolerable sense of oppression who would adopt a means of that kind. It means you refuse food until you are at death's door, and then the authorities have to choose between letting you die, and letting you go; and then they let the women go. Now, that went on so long that the government felt that they were unable to cope. It was [then] that, to the shame of the British government, they set the example to authorities all over the world of feeding sane, resisting human beings by force. There may
75 be doctors in this meeting: if so, they know it is one thing to feed by force an insane person; but it is quite another thing to feed a sane, resisting human being who resists with every nerve and with every fibre of her body the indignity and the outrage of forcible feeding. Now, that was done in England, and the government thought they had crushed us. But they found that it did not quell the agitation, that more and more women came in and even passed that terrible ordeal, and they were obliged to let them go.

80 Then came the legislation—the "Cat and Mouse Act". The home secretary said: "Give me the power to let these women go when they are at death's door, and leave them at liberty under license until they have recovered their health again and then bring them back." ... Well, they little know what women are. Women are very slow to rouse, but once they are aroused, once they are determined, nothing on earth and nothing in heaven will make women give way; it is impossible. And so this "Cat and Mouse Act" which is being used against women today has failed.
85 There are women lying at death's door, recovering enough strength to undergo operations who have not given in and won't give in, and who will be prepared, as soon as they get up from their sick beds, to go on as before. There are women who are being carried from their sick beds on stretchers into meetings. They are too weak to speak, but they go amongst their fellow workers just to show that their spirits are unquenched, and that their spirit is alive, and they mean to go on as long as life lasts.

90 Now, I want to say to you who think women cannot succeed, we have brought the government of England to this position, that it has to face this alternative: either women are to be killed or women are to have the vote. I ask American men in this meeting, what would you say if in your state you were faced with that alternative, that you must either kill them or give them their citizenship? Well, there is only one answer to that alternative, there is only one way out—you must give those women the vote. You won your freedom in America when you had the
95 revolution, by bloodshed, by sacrificing human life. You won the civil war by the sacrifice of human life when you decided to emancipate the negro. You have left it to women in your land, the men of all civilised countries have left it to women, to work out their own salvation. That is the way in which we women of England are doing. Human life for us is sacred, but we say if any life is to be sacrificed it shall be ours; we won't do it ourselves, but we will put the enemy in the position where they will have to choose between giving us freedom or giving us death....

Jeremy Bentham
An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation
Chapter I: Of the Principle of Utility (1789)

I. Mankind governed by pain and pleasure.

Nature has placed mankind under the governance of two sovereign masters, pain and pleasure. It is for them alone to point out what we ought to do, as well as to determine what we shall, do. On the one hand the standard of right and wrong, on the other the chain of causes and effects, are fastened to their throne. They govern us in all we do, in all we say, in all we think: every effort we can make to throw
5 off our subjection, will serve but to demonstrate and confirm it. In words a man may pretend to abjure their empire: but in reality he will remain subject to it all the while. The principle of utility recognizes this subjection, and assumes it for the foundation of that system, the object of which is to rear the fabric of felicity by the hands of reason and of law.

Systems which attempt to question it deal in sounds instead of sense, in caprice instead of reason, in
10 darkness instead of light. But enough of metaphor and declamation: it is not by such means that moral science is to be improved.

II. Principle of utility, what.

The principle of utility is the foundation of the present work: it will be proper
15 therefore at the outset to give an explicit and determinate account of what is meant by it. By the principle of utility is meant that principle which approves or disapproves of every action whatsoever, according to the tendency which it appears to have to augment or diminish the happiness of the party whose interest is in question: or, what is the same thing in other words, to promote or to oppose that happiness. I say of every action whatsoever; and therefore not only of every action of a private
20 individual, but of every measure of government.

III. Utility, what.

By utility is meant that property in any object, whereby it tends to produce benefit, advantage, pleasure, good, or happiness (all this in the present case comes to the same thing) or (what
25 comes again to the same thing) to prevent the happening of mischief, pain, evil, or unhappiness to the party whose interest is considered; if that party be the community in general, then the happiness of the community; if a particular individual, then the happiness of that individual.

IV. Interest of the community, what.

The interest of the community is one of the most general expressions that can occur in the phraseology
30 of morals: no wonder that the meaning of it is often lost. When it has a meaning, it is this. The community is a fictitious body, composed of the individual persons who are considered as constituting as it were its members. The interest of the community then is, what? – the sum of the interests of the several members who compose it.

V. It is in vain to talk of the interest of the community, without understanding what is the interest of
35 the individual. A thing is said to promote the interest, or to be for the interest, of an individual, when it tends to add to the sum total of his pleasures: or, what comes to the same thing, to diminish the sum total of his pains.

VI. An action conformable to the principle of utility, what.

An action then may be said to be conformable to the principle of utility, or, for shortness' sake, to
40 utility, (meaning with respect to the community at large) when the tendency it has to augment the happiness of the community is greater than any it has to diminish it.

VII. A measure of government conformable to the principle of utility, what.

A measure of government (which is but a particular kind of action, performed by a particular person or persons) may be said to be conformable to or dictated by the principle of utility, when in like manner the tendency which it has to augment the happiness of the community is greater than any which it has to diminish it.

50

VIII. *Laws or dictates of utility, what.*

When an action, or in particular a measure of government, is supposed by a man to be conformable to the principle of utility, it may be convenient, for the purposes of discourse, to imagine a kind of law or dictate, called a law or dictate of utility; and to speak of the action in question, as being conformable to such law or dictate.

55

IX. *A partisan of the principle of utility, who.*

A man may be said to be a partisan of the principle of utility, when the approbation or disapprobation he annexes to any action, or to any measure, is determined by and proportioned to the tendency which he conceives it to have to augment or to diminish the happiness of the community: or in other words, to its conformity or unconformity to the laws or dictates of utility.

60

X. *Ought, ought not, right and wrong, etc., how to be understood.*

Of an action that is conformable to the principle of utility one may always say either that it is one that ought to be done, or at least that it is not one that ought not to be done. One may say also, that it is right it should be done; at least that it is not wrong it should be done: that it is a right action; at least that it is not a wrong action. When thus interpreted, the words ought, and right and wrong, and others of that stamp, have a meaning: when otherwise, they have none.

65

Free speech can't exist unchained. US politics needs the tonic of order

If America is to speak in a way that heals, as Obama wishes, it needs the curbs and regulations that make freedom of expression real

Simon Jenkins

guardian.co.uk,

Thursday 13 January 2011 20.00 GMT

... Foreigners are always surprised by the US's capacity to speak right but somehow not do it. Washington must contain more wisdom and talent than anywhere on earth, yet it contrives the disaster zone that is American foreign policy. This is normally put down to such impediments as the US constitution, the silent majority, sheer bigness and freedom of speech. Today's culprit is freedom of speech, or at least the speech of the American right and its broadcast cheerleaders. Shock-jock radio presenters feed on biased television news to present a view of the world divided between goodies and baddies. The baddies are always on the brink of victory and must be confronted with virile aggression. Language that might not disturb a balanced mind can clearly stimulate and legitimise an unbalanced one. The vitriol and inaccuracy of the campaign against Obama's public health reforms last year were like those against abortion and homosexuality. To many Europeans, the echo across the Atlantic came from a people isolated from the outside world and unable to handle today's social and scientific progress. The debate was infused with nastiness and xenophobia, as if the US was a land composed of tribes bred only to hate the outside world, and often themselves. I was asked some time ago by a university-educated Texan, in the nicest possible way, what it was like to live in a country of "baby-killers" about to be "overrun by Muslim bad guys". I inquired where he had gained this bizarre impression of Europe, which he had never visited. It turned out his sole information about the world beyond America's shore came from Fox News. He was not stupid. But he and millions of people like him considered this source of news a sufficient window on the world. He genuinely thought American troops would soon have to save Europe from "the Arabs". Freedom of speech, like freedom of traffic, can only be defined by the curbs and regulations that make it real. The right wing seeks to curb WikiLeaks, and the left seeks to curb "hate speech". The right wants the freedom to finance unlimited political propaganda, and the left wants the freedom of unlimited access to state secrets.

There is nothing peculiarly American about this. ... Free speech is a Hobbesian jungle. It requires a marketplace where the trade in information, ideas and opinion has a framework of rules, including rules that maintain fair and open competition. Most will be voluntary, but others need enforcement. The US supreme court last year freed from control all political campaign gifts from corporations, on the grounds that this would be a breach of free speech. Ronald Dworkin's rebuttal of this "devastating decision for democracy" in the New York Review of Books pointed out that freedom of speech was hopeless if vulnerable to the bullying of wealth. Obama warned that it would "open the floodgates for special interests – including foreign corporations – to spend without limit in our elections". Yet Obama himself declined to champion the "fairness doctrine" that once governed broadcasting licences awarded by America's Federal Communications Commission, and governs them throughout Europe. The doctrine was rescinded in 1987 under pressure from the right, stimulating the growth of one-sided broadcasting outlets such as shock-jock radio stations and Fox News. While Jon Stewart and others have counter-punched from the left, it strains credulity to maintain that this polarisation has had no impact on the virulence – and immobility – of American public life.

Under Britain's 2003 Communications Act, Ofcom's rules on "due impartiality, due accuracy and undue prominence" are voluminous. So is the BBC code of practice on balance. Both require impartiality within news presentation rather than just between channels – or not at all, as in the US. Article 10 of the European convention on human rights ... subjects freedom of expression to "such formalities, conditions, restrictions or penalties as are prescribed by law and are necessary in a democratic society". This is defined as "the interests of national security, territorial integrity or public safety, for the prevention of disorder or crime, for the protection of health or morals, for the protection of the reputation or rights of others, for preventing the disclosure of information received in confidence". This is not freedom but authoritarianism, and mercifully seems to be a dead letter. When it comes to ... defamation or twittering [promoting anorexia], most Europeans would rely on self-discipline on the part of the media, and on the chaotic pluralism of the internet. Even so, they would argue for regulated airwaves, as they would for laws preventing libel, slander and incitement to illegality and racial hatred. Freedom can only flourish in a climate of discipline. ... It is the great paradox of democracy. Free speech cannot exist without chains.

George Fitzhugh, *Cannibals All ! Or, Slaves Without Masters*,

Richmond, VA: Morris, 1857, pp. 294-99.

CHAPTER XXI: NEGRO SLAVERY.

- ... To insist that a status of society, which has been almost universal, and which is expressly and continually justified by Holy Writ, is its natural, normal, and necessary status, under the ordinary circumstances, is on its face a plausible and probable proposition. To insist on less, is to yield our cause, and to give up our religion; for if white slavery be morally wrong, be a violation of natural rights, the Bible cannot be true. Human and divine authority do seem in the general to concur, in establishing the expediency of having masters and slaves of different races. ... In some respects, the wider the difference the better, as the slave will feel less mortified by his position. In other respects, it may be that too wide a difference hardens the hearts and brutalizes the feelings of both master and slave. The civilized man hates the savage, and the savage returns the hatred with interest. Hence, West India slavery, of newly caught negroes, is not a very humane, affectionate or civilizing institution. Virginia negroes have become moral and intelligent. They love their master and his family, and the attachment is reciprocated. Still, we like the idle, but intelligent house-servants, better than the hard-used, but stupid out-hands; and we like the mulatto better than the negro; yet the negro is generally more affectionate, contented and faithful.
- 15 The world at large looks on negro slavery as much the worst form of slavery; because it is only acquainted with West India slavery. Abolition never arose till negro slavery was instituted; and now abolition is only directed against negro slavery. There is no philanthropic crusade attempting to set free the white slaves of Eastern Europe and of Asia. The world, then, is prepared for the defence of slavery in the abstract—it is prejudiced only against negro slavery. These prejudices were in their origin well founded. The Slave Trade, the horrors of the Middle Passage, and West India slavery, were enough to rouse the most torpid philanthropy. But our Southern slavery has become a benign and protective institution, and our negroes are confessedly better off than any free laboring population in the world. How can we contend that white slavery is wrong, whilst all the great body of free laborers are starving; and slaves, white or black, throughout the world, are enjoying comfort?
- 25 We write in the cause of Truth and Humanity, and will not play the advocate for master or for slave. The aversion to negroes, the antipathy of race, is much greater at the North than at the South; and it is very probable that this antipathy to the person of the negro, is confounded with or generates hatred of the institution with which he is usually connected. Hatred to slavery is very generally little more than hatred of negroes.
- 30 There is one strong argument in favor of negro slavery over all other slavery: that he, being unfitted for the mechanic arts, for trade, and all skillful pursuits, leaves those pursuits to be carried on by the whites; and does not bring all industry into disrepute, as in Greece and Rome, where the slaves were not only the artists and mechanics, but also the merchants. Whilst, as a general and abstract question, negro slavery has no other claims over other forms of slavery, except that from inferiority, or rather peculiarity, of race, almost all negroes require masters, whilst only the children, the women, the very weak, poor, and ignorant, &c., among the whites, need some protective and governing relation of this kind; yet as a subject of temporary, but world-wide importance, negro slavery has become the most necessary of all human institutions.
- 40 ... If all South America, Mexico, the West Indies, and our Union south of Mason and Dixon's line, of the Ohio and Missouri, were slaveholding, slave products would be abundant and cheap in free society; and their market for their merchandise, manufactures, commerce, &c., illimitable. Free white laborers might live in comfort and luxury on light work, but for the exacting and greedy landlords, bosses and other capitalists.

Gloria Steinem, "Hillary in the Crossfire", *Ms. Magazine*, June-July 2000

Why would Hillary Rodham Clinton want to run for the Senate--from New York, Illinois, or anywhere? Imagine the scenario if she loses: all the right-wingers who sported "Impeach Hillary's husband" bumper stickers will claim victory, as will those behind the current TV ads that burlesque Hillary as the Statue of Liberty. If she wins, what happens? She gets to live in the free-floating hostility of Washington again, this time without the protection of the White House, working every day under such senior senators as Jesse Helms and Strom Thurmond.

Is this a lose-lose situation or what? As one of the most famous and admired women on the world stage, she had plenty of alternatives. For example, she could have raised a huge pot of foundation money and become an international force on the women's and children's issues that have always been close to her heart. Instead, she is now doing daily combat with New York's Mayor Rudolph Giuliani, one of the most vindictive and racially divisive politicians of our time, and also discovering a fact of life for any female candidate: there is no "right" way for a woman to seek power.

So why did she choose this path of maximum resistance? After months of listening to her as she campaigns around New York State, I think the answer is simple: she wanted to use the lessons she learned as the partner of a politician, and to do so in Washington, where she also witnessed the power that even one U.S. senator can have over the issues she cares about. Though her goals have been created by experience and interests that are different from her husband's--her work as a lawyer for the Watergate Committee, a top corporate lawyer, a children's rights advocate, a policy wonk on health care, and an international activist on women's issues--she wants to advance them by using her derived experience in campaigning, building coalitions, dealing with the press, cultivating a thick skin, making Washington work, and other time-honored secrets of getting and using elected power.

This bridging of worlds is a new possibility. Eleanor Roosevelt was an intimate lobbyist with her husband, but not a practitioner of elected power. As for such beneficiaries of derived power as Senator Margaret Chase Smith and Representative Lindy Boggs, they waited for husbands to die before taking over their Congressional seats, thus obeying the rule that in a patriarchy, it's only widows who are honored in authority. Perhaps these differences are part of the reason that Hillary Clinton is accused of exploiting her wifely position--even by some feminists. They ask, "Why doesn't she stick to her own professional experience? Isn't she setting feminism back by exploiting the power she gained as a wife?"

But those questions betray a double standard. They also ignore the wisdom gained in traditionally female roles. The fact is, the Bush boys would be nowhere without the derived power of their father's presidency; John Glenn used the male-only privilege of being an astronaut to become a U.S. senator; and John McCain went from prisoner of war to the Senate and almost to the White House. Those experiences were far less relevant to the political job at hand than Hillary's eight years in Washington, yet they were highly valued. Meanwhile, such largely female experiences as parenting, teaching, community organizing, and living on welfare have been undervalued as political training grounds. This double standard wouldn't last if it hadn't been internalized by women ourselves. That's one of the reasons for a disheartening fact: female registered voters in New York State are almost equally divided between Hillary Clinton and Rudolph Giuliani. Of course, women are not immune to the law-and-order, wealth-protecting Republican platform, especially because Republican leadership in New York is slightly less bad on gender-gap issues. (For example, the governor and New York City's mayor both oppose the criminalization of abortion.)

Still another reason for some women voter's hesitancy is the anger they feel toward Hillary for remaining married to an unfaithful husband, especially women who themselves have been hurt by faithless men. And then there are the women who have been exposed only to the right-wing image of Hillary.

For all those who don't support her, the bottom-line question is: would you support a male candidate with the same issue positions? If the answer is yes, it's worth rooting out the double standard. Because Hillary Clinton's success as the first crossover candidate would be a landmark for a larger issue: making partnered and other female experience a source of talent, honor, and credit.

Henry David Thoreau, Civil Disobedience - Part 1 (1849)

I HEARTILY ACCEPT the motto, — "That government is best which governs least"; and I should like to see it acted up to more rapidly and systematically. Carried out, it finally amounts to this, which also I believe, — "That government is best which governs not at all"; and when men are prepared for it, that will be the kind of government which they will have. Government is at best but an expedient; but most governments are usually, and all governments are sometimes, inexpedient. The objections which have been brought against a standing army, and they are many and weighty, and deserve to prevail, may also at last be brought against a standing government. The standing army is only an arm of the standing government. The government itself, which is only the mode which the people have chosen to execute their will, is equally liable to be abused and perverted before the people can act through it. Witness the present Mexican war, the work of comparatively a few individuals using the standing government as their tool; for, in the outset, the people would not have consented to this measure.

[2] This American government — what is it but a tradition, though a recent one, endeavoring to transmit itself unimpaired to posterity, but each instant losing some of its integrity? It has not the vitality and force of a single living man; for a single man can bend it to his will. It is a sort of wooden gun to the people themselves. But it is not the less necessary for this; for the people must have some complicated machinery or other, and hear its din, to satisfy that idea of government which they have. Governments show thus how successfully men can be imposed on, even impose on themselves, for their own advantage. It is excellent, we must all allow. Yet this government never of itself furthered any enterprise, but by the alacrity with which it got out of its way. *It* does not keep the country free. *It* does not settle the West. *It* does not educate. The character inherent in the American people has done all that has been accomplished; and it would have done somewhat more, if the government had not sometimes got in its way....

[3] But, to speak practically and as a citizen, unlike those who call themselves no-government men, I ask for, not at once no government, but *at once* a better government. Let every man make known what kind of government would command his respect, and that will be one step toward obtaining it.

[4] After all, the practical reason why, when the power is once in the hands of the people, a majority are permitted, and for a long period continue, to rule, is not because they are most likely to be in the right, nor because this seems fairest to the minority, but because they are physically the strongest. But a government in which the majority rule in all cases cannot be based on justice, even as far as men understand it. Can there not be a government in which majorities do not virtually decide right and wrong, but conscience? — in which majorities decide only those questions to which the rule of expediency is applicable? Must the citizen ever for a moment, or in the least degree, resign his conscience to the legislator? Why has every man a conscience, then? I think that we should be men first, and subjects afterward. It is not desirable to cultivate a respect for the law, so much as for the right. The only obligation which I have a right to assume is to do at any time what I think right. It is truly enough said that a corporation has no conscience; but a corporation of conscientious men is a corporation *with* a conscience. Law never made men a whit more just; and, by means of their respect for it, even the well-disposed are daily made the agents of injustice. A common and natural result of an undue respect for law is, that you may see a file of soldiers, colonel, captain, corporal, privates, powder-monkeys, and all, marching in admirable order over hill and dale to the wars, against their wills, ay, against their common sense and consciences, which makes it very steep marching indeed, and produces a palpitation of the heart. They have no doubt that it is a damnable business in which they are concerned; they are all peaceably inclined. Now, what are they? Men at all? or small movable forts and magazines, at the service of some unscrupulous man in power? ...

[7] How does it become a man to behave toward this American government to-day? I answer, that he cannot without disgrace be associated with it. I cannot for an instant recognize that political organization as *my* government which is the *slave's* government also.

50 [8] All men recognize the right of revolution; that is, the right to refuse allegiance to, and to resist,
the government, when its tyranny or its inefficiency are great and unendurable. But almost all say that
such is not the case now. But such was the case, they think, in the Revolution of '75. If one were to tell
me that this was a bad government because it taxed certain foreign commodities brought to its ports, it
is most probable that I should not make an ado about it, for I can do without them. All machines have
55 their friction; and possibly this does enough good to counterbalance the evil. At any rate, it is a great
evil to make a stir about it. But when the friction comes to have its machine, and oppression and
robbery are organized, I say, let us not have such a machine any longer. In other words, when a sixth
of the population of a nation which has undertaken to be the refuge of liberty are slaves, and a whole
country is unjustly overrun and conquered by a foreign army, and subjected to military law, I think
60 that it is not too soon for honest men to rebel and revolutionize. What makes this duty the more urgent
is the fact that the country so overrun is not our own, but ours is the invading army.

[9] Paley, a common authority with many on moral questions, in his chapter on the "Duty of
Submission to Civil Government," resolves all civil obligation into expediency; and he proceeds to say
that "so long as the interest of the whole society requires it, that is, so long as the established
65 government cannot be resisted or changed without public inconveniency, it is the will of God that the
established government be obeyed, and no longer" — "This principle being admitted, the justice of
every particular case of resistance is reduced to a computation of the quantity of the danger and
grievance on the one side, and of the probability and expense of redressing it on the other." Of this, he
says, every man shall judge for himself. But Paley appears never to have contemplated those cases to
70 which the rule of expediency does not apply, in which a people, as well as an individual, must do
justice, cost what it may. If I have unjustly wrested a plank from a drowning man, I must restore it to
him though I drown myself. This, according to Paley, would be inconvenient. But he that would save
his life, in such a case, shall lose it. This people must cease to hold slaves, and to make war on
Mexico, though it cost them their existence as a people.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
323 U.S. 214

Korematsu v. United States

**CERTIORARI TO THE CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH
CIRCUIT**

No. 22 Argued: October 11, 12, 1944 --- Decided: December 18, 1944

MR. JUSTICE BLACK delivered the opinion of the Court.

The petitioner, an American citizen of Japanese descent, was convicted in a federal district court for remaining in San Leandro, California, a "Military Area," contrary to Civilian Exclusion Order No. 34 of the Commanding General of the Western Command, U.S. Army, which directed that, after May 9, 1942, all persons of Japanese ancestry should be excluded from that area. No question was raised as to petitioner's loyalty to the United States.
5 The Circuit Court of Appeals affirmed, and the importance of the constitutional question involved caused us to grant certiorari.

It should be noted, to begin with, that all legal restrictions which curtail the civil rights of a single racial group are immediately suspect. That is not to say that all such restrictions are unconstitutional. It is to say that courts must subject them to the most rigid scrutiny. Pressing public necessity may sometimes justify the existence of such
10 restrictions; racial antagonism never can.

In the instant case, prosecution of the petitioner was begun by information charging violation of an Act of Congress, of March 21, 1942, 56 Stat. 173, which provides that "whoever shall enter, remain in, leave, or commit any act in any military area or military zone prescribed, under the authority of an Executive order of the President ... shall, if it appears that he knew or should have known of the existence and extent of the restrictions or order
15 and that his act was in violation thereof, be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction shall be liable to a fine of not to exceed \$5,000 or to imprisonment for not more than one year, or both, for each offense."

Exclusion Order No. 34, which the petitioner knowingly and admittedly violated, was one of a number of military orders and proclamations, all of which were substantially based upon Executive Order No. 9066, 7 Fed.Reg. 1407. That order, issued after we were at war with Japan, declared that "the successful prosecution of the war requires every possible protection against espionage and against sabotage to national defense material, national
20 defense premises, and national defense utilities. . . ."

One of the series of orders and proclamations, a curfew order, which, like the exclusion order here, was promulgated pursuant to Executive Order 9066, subjected all persons of Japanese ancestry in prescribed West Coast military areas to remain in their residences from 8 p.m. to 6 a.m. As is the case with the exclusion order
25 here, that prior curfew order was designed as a "protection against espionage and against sabotage." In *Hirabayashi v. United States*, 320 U.S. 81, we sustained a conviction obtained for violation of the curfew order. The *Hirabayashi* conviction and this one thus rest on the same 1942 Congressional Act and the same basic executive and military orders, all of which orders were aimed at the twin dangers of espionage and sabotage....

Like curfew, exclusion of those of Japanese origin was deemed necessary because of the presence of an
30 unascertained number of disloyal members of the group, most of whom we have no doubt were loyal to this country. It was because we could not reject the finding of the military authorities that it was impossible to bring about an immediate segregation of the disloyal from the loyal that we sustained the validity of the curfew order as applying to the whole group. In the instant case, temporary exclusion of the entire group was rested by the
35 military on the same ground. The judgment that exclusion of the whole group was, for the same reason, a military imperative answers the contention that the exclusion was in the nature of group punishment based on antagonism to those of Japanese origin. That there were members of the group who retained loyalties to Japan

has been confirmed by investigations made subsequent to the exclusion. Approximately five thousand American citizens of Japanese ancestry refused to swear unqualified allegiance to the United States and to renounce allegiance to the Japanese Emperor, and several thousand evacuees requested repatriation to Japan.

40 We uphold the exclusion order as of the time it was made and when the petitioner violated it. *Cf. Chastleton Corporation v. Sinclair*, 264 U.S. 543, 547; *Block v. Hirsh*, 256 U.S. 135, 155. In doing so, we are not unmindful of the hardships imposed by it upon a large group of American citizens. *Cf. Ex parte Kawato*, 317 U.S. 69, 73. But hardships are part of war, and war is an aggregation of hardships. All citizens alike, both in and out of uniform, feel the impact of war in greater or lesser measure. Citizenship has its responsibilities, as well as its privileges, and, in time of war, the burden is always heavier. Compulsory exclusion of large groups of citizens from their homes, except under circumstances of direst emergency and peril, is inconsistent with our basic governmental institutions. But when, under conditions of modern warfare, our shores are threatened by hostile forces, the power to protect must be commensurate with the threatened danger....

50 We are thus being asked to pass at this time upon the whole subsequent detention program in both assembly and relocation centers, although the only issues framed at the trial related to petitioner's remaining in the prohibited area in violation of the exclusion order. Had petitioner here left the prohibited area and gone to an assembly center, we cannot say, either as a matter of fact or law, that his presence in that center would have resulted in his detention in a relocation center. Some who did report to the assembly center were not sent to relocation centers, but were released upon condition that they remain outside the prohibited zone until the military orders were modified or lifted. This illustrates that they pose different problems, and may be governed by different principles. The lawfulness of one does not necessarily determine the lawfulness of the others. ...

60 It is said that we are dealing here with the case of imprisonment of a citizen in a concentration camp solely because of his ancestry, without evidence or inquiry concerning his loyalty and good disposition towards the United States. Our task would be simple, our duty clear, were this a case involving the imprisonment of a loyal citizen in a concentration camp because of racial prejudice. Regardless of the true nature of the assembly and relocation centers -- and we deem it unjustifiable to call them concentration camps, with all the ugly connotations that term implies -- we are dealing specifically with nothing but an exclusion order. To cast this case into outlines of racial prejudice, without reference to the real military dangers which were presented, merely confuses the issue. Korematsu was not excluded from the Military Area because of hostility to him or his race. He was excluded because we are at war with the Japanese Empire, because the properly constituted military authorities feared an invasion of our West Coast and felt constrained to take proper security measures, because they decided that the military urgency of the situation demanded that all citizens of Japanese ancestry be segregated from the West Coast temporarily, and, finally, because Congress, reposing its confidence in this time of war in our military leaders—as inevitably it must—determined that they should have the power to do just this. There was evidence of disloyalty on the part of some, the military authorities considered that the need for action was great, and time was short. We cannot—by availing ourselves of the calm perspective of hindsight—now say that, at that time, these actions were unjustified.

Affirmed.

Let The Sun Shine

The breakthrough in Belfast presages a new dawn for a troubled island

By Fergal Keane

TIME, 20/04/1998

1 Never have I been so glad to be wrong until the very last moment I doubted that a deal could be
2 reached. Shaped by my island's bloody history and steeped in native pessimism, I could not believe
3 that an accommodation between Orange and Green was possible. And so when friends from abroad
4 asked what I thought of the peace process, I would caution them against hope ; there was too much
5 blood from the past for this to end in smiles, I said. How wrong I was, how wonderfully wrong.

6 I come from an Irish generation for whom the Troubles were the defining political experience of our
7 lives. Certainly as a southern Catholic I did not have to experience the daily round of bombings and
8 killings. That was happening up the road, a distant menacing rumble that occasionally exploded into
9 our lives. But like everybody else who grew up on the island _ Catholic, Protestant and non believer _
10 I felt the burden of our history. Ireland is simply too small a place to be able to escape completely the
11 poisonous breath of the past.

12 From my earliest days I was taught that the English were our oppressors, that our nation was
13 incomplete while the six counties of Ulster remained under the Union flag. My parents too had
14 learned this tune and their parents before them. Grandparents on both sides of my family had taken
15 part in the war of independence against the British. The prevailing political ethos told us that an
16 Ireland divided could never be at peace. As for the Ulster Protestants they were supposed to be my
17 fellow countrymen – I regarded them as obdurate and bigoted. I could never see their point of view.

18 Up north the children of Protestant Ulster were learning another tune. They were taught to fear us
19 and regard us as foreigners. We were portrayed as citizens of a priest-ridden and backward country.
20 To them a United Ireland meant domination by Papists and the loss of their Protestant faith and
21 identity. The Catholics alongside whom they lived were to be despised and kept from power.
22 Discrimination and exclusion were the order of the day. The Ulster Catholics were the enemy within,
23 the fifth columnists waiting to open the city gates for their bretheren from the south.

24 And then, in the mid-'90s, I went to live in Belfast. My work took me into Catholic and Protestant
25 ghettos, to the funerals of I.R.A. men and of police officers, to the marches of hardline loyalists and
26 die-hard republicans. My eyes were opened to a reality that those who live outside Ulster can never
27 really understand.

28 The Nobel prize winning poet Seamus Heaney coined the chilling phrase "each neighborly murder" to
29 describe the nature of Ulster's killing. For this was a war fought out between people who passed
30 each other in the street every day, families who had lived alongside each other for generations. This
31 was not killing by remote control but up close and very personal. Here compromise was the dirtiest
32 word. It meant betrayal and on both sides the traitor was the most despicable creature.

33 It was the funerals which put an end to any simplistic ideas I might have had about Irish unity. I soon
34 realized that the people of the South had not the remotest sense of what their fellow islanders were
35 suffering. The pain and suspicion and fear went just across the border from us but Ulster might as
36 well have been another planet. After nearly three decades of violence I sensed that the two parts of
37 the island were psychologically further apart than ever before. And so, devoid of hope, I left Ulster
38 and went to South Africa to observe the country's remarkable transition to democracy.

39 While Mandela and De Klerk swept towards a new dispensation, the news from home was
40 depressingly familiar: shootings, bombings, bigotry. Watching the South African leaders in action I
41 despaired of their counterparts in Ireland. But living far away I did not realize that great changes
42 were taking place in Ulster. For the first time in recent Irish history, the leaders of Sinn Fein and the
43 I.R.A. were telling their supporters that negotiation might offer a way forward. On the Protestant
44 side there was a growing acceptance of the need for an agreed solution. The politics of siege would
45 no longer suffice. The ordinary people had never seemed so weary of conflict, more desiring of a
46 settlement.

47 Now that the deal has been done, we know that there are dangerous lines ahead. The forces of
48 bigotry and fear will do their best to destroy our new found sense of hope. They cannot be allowed
49 to succeed. The main political leaders have all shown exemplary courage. It is now up to the people –
50 north and south – to support them and create an Ireland where our children free from the tribal
51 hatreds of the past. The poet Louis McNeice, an Ulster Protestant, once wrote of the long struggle:
52 "There will be sunlight later Today I can see the first glorious rays.

Four decades later, scholars re-examine 'Moynihan Report'

By Ken Gewertz, Harvard News Office

Thursday, October 4, 2007

Before he was a United States senator from New York, before he was ambassador to India, before he taught government at Harvard, Daniel Patrick Moynihan (1927-2003) served as assistant secretary of labor under Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, and it was in that capacity that he issued a report in March 1965 titled "The Negro Family: The Case for National Action." Originally intended as an internal memorandum providing support for Johnson's War on Poverty, the report asserted that a disturbing proportion of African-American families suffered from instability and breakdown, that this condition resulted in a cycle of joblessness and poverty, and that the root of the problem was the psychological and social damage caused by slavery.

Soon after being issued, the report was leaked to the press and immediately became the object of violent controversy. Critics accused Moynihan of attacking the black family, stigmatizing black men, and marginalizing black women. One such response to what came to be called "The Moynihan Report" was the book "Blaming the Victim" (1970) by William Ryan (who coined this still-popular phrase). On the other hand, prominent black leaders like Roy Wilkins, Whitney Young, and Martin Luther King Jr. endorsed Moynihan's findings.

This past week (Sept. 27-29), more than four decades after the report's publication, Harvard's Department of Sociology, the W.E.B. Du Bois Institute for African and African American Research, and the American Academy of Political and Social Science held a conference of social scientists and policy analysts to re-examine Moynihan's work. Kicking off the event were presentations by two prominent social scientists who have spent their careers grappling with many of the same issues that Moynihan dealt with in his report: James Q. Wilson, the Ronald Reagan Professor of Public Policy at Pepperdine University, and William Julius Wilson, the Lewis P. and Linda L. Geyser University Professor at Harvard.

James Q. Wilson spoke first. The author or co-author of 15 books on politics, crime, marriage, and morality, Wilson was the Shattuck Professor of Government at Harvard from 1961 to 1987, and in that capacity he recruited Moynihan to teach at Harvard. Wilson began by pointing out the contrast between the Moynihan Report's stormy reception in 1965 and strong positive response to Moynihan's Godkin Lectures at Harvard in 1985, in which he made virtually the same arguments.

The change, Wilson said, resulted largely from a disturbing statistic: in 1965, one-quarter of black children were born out of wedlock; 20 years later, one-quarter of white children were born out of wedlock. "Whites realized that this was a national problem," Wilson said. Although no one knew for certain in 1965 what effect growing up in a single-parent family had on children, today as the result of longitudinal studies, we know the experience harms children, Wilson said. "And we know it harms boys more than girls."

Later, in response to a question, Wilson explained succinctly why marriage was important. "Marriage was invented to control men. Men like sex, but they don't like taking care of children, unless they're born in their own family. Getting men to take responsibility for women and the children they father is one of the most difficult tasks society faces." Wilson said that Moynihan's emphasis on the importance of marriage was reinforced by personal experience. Moynihan grew up poor in a single-parent family and as a boy shined shoes on the streets of New York. "He never deviated from the view that the family was the core of culture," Wilson said.

And yet, during all his years as a policy expert, an academic, and a lawmaker, Moynihan never came up with an effective program by which government could encourage marriage and the development of stable families. "Someone once asked him what government could do about the problem," James Q. Wilson said. "Moynihan replied, 'If you think government can restore marriage, you know more about government than I do.' And no one knew more about government than Pat Moynihan."

William Julius Wilson, the recipient of numerous honors and awards, has written extensively on urban poverty and the plight of the black underclass. He called Moynihan's report "a prophetic document," even though its major points had been anticipated in the work of several black social scientists.

45 Why then was the report controversial? One reason was its style, Wilson said. Having no idea that the document would reach beyond the small group of government officials for whom it was intended, Moynihan wrote in bold, direct language calculated to convey the urgency of the problem. Many of the report's statements about the dissolution of the black family were quoted frequently in the press without the historical context that was an integral part of Moynihan's argument.

50 "By the time many critics came to read the report, they could not see it with fresh eyes because they had been exposed to the press coverage," Wilson said.

The timing of the report also had a lot to do with its controversial reception. Around the time the report was issued, riots had erupted in black neighborhoods of several cities, and the report was seen as an attempt to blame the violence on shortcomings among blacks rather than on injustices in American society.

55 The report also collided with the growing black power movement, which emphasized "racial pride and black affirmation" and denied the existence of pathology. "Self-destructive behavior was seen as creative and resilient, a way of adapting to a hostile society," William Julius Wilson said.

The movement had the effect of stifling serious studies of urban problems during the 1970s because scholars avoided any study that could be construed as racism or blaming the victim, Wilson added.

60 Beginning in the 1980s, scholars once again began to study problems of the black underclass, and much of that work has been an attempt to enlarge on and refine Moynihan's insight that the problems of low-income African Americans have cultural and historical roots. "The problem is not simply taking account of culture, but of capturing the complexity and multidimensionality of culture. I think that Daniel Patrick Moynihan was trying to move us in that direction," Wilson said.

Robin Cook's chicken tikka masala speech

Extracts from a speech by the foreign secretary to the Social Market Foundation in London

guardian.co.uk, Thursday 19 April 2001 17.03 BST

Tonight I want to celebrate Britishness. As Foreign Secretary I see every day the importance of our relations with foreign countries to the strength of our economy, to the security of our nation, to the safety of our people against organised crime, even to the health of our environment. A globalised world demands more foreign contacts than even Britain has experienced in the past.

5 I also know that we are likely to make our way more successfully in the world if we are secure in our British identity, and confident about its future. That security and confidence is important for the inner strength it gives us in our conduct of business with others. I want to argue the case why we can be confident about the strength and the future of British identity.

10 Sadly, it has become fashionable for some to argue that British identity is under siege, perhaps even in a state of terminal decline. The threat is said to come in three forms.

First, the arrival of immigrants who, allegedly, do not share our cultural values and who fail to support the England cricket team. Few dare to state this case explicitly, but it is the unmistakable subliminal message.

15 Second, our continued membership of the European Union, which is said to be absorbing member states into 'a country called Europe'.

Third, the devolution of power to Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland, which is seen as a step to the break-up of the UK.

20 This evening, I want to set out the reasons for being optimistic about the future of Britain and Britishness. Indeed, I want to go further and argue that in each of the areas where the pessimists identify a threat, we should instead see developments that will strengthen and renew British identity.

Multicultural Britain

The first element in the debate about the future of Britishness is the changing ethnic composition of the British people themselves. The British are not a race, but a gathering of countless different races and communities, the vast majority of which were not indigenous to these islands.

25 In the pre-industrial era, when transport and communications were often easier by sea than by land, Britain was unusually open to external influence; first through foreign invasion, then, after Britain achieved naval supremacy, through commerce and imperial expansion. It is not their purity that makes the British unique, but the sheer pluralism of their ancestry.

30 London was first established as the capital of a Celtic Britain by Romans from Italy. They were in turn driven out by Saxons and Angles from Germany. The great cathedrals of this land were built mostly by Norman Bishops, but the religion practised in them was secured by the succession of a Dutch Prince. Outside our Parliament, Richard the Lionheart proudly sits astride his steed. A symbol of British courage and defiance. Yet he spoke French much of his life and depended on the Jewish community of England to put up the ransom that freed him from prison.

35 The idea that Britain was a 'pure' Anglo-Saxon society before the arrival of communities from the Caribbean, Asia and Africa is fantasy. But if this view of British identity is false to our past, it is false to our future too. The global era has produced population movements of a breadth and richness without parallel in history.

40 Today's London is a perfect hub of the globe. It is home to over 30 ethnic communities of at least 10,000 residents each. In this city tonight, over 300 languages will be spoken by families over their evening meal at home.

This pluralism is not a burden we must reluctantly accept. It is an immense asset that contributes to the cultural and economic vitality of our nation.

45 Legitimate immigration is the necessary and unavoidable result of economic success, which generates
a demand for labour faster than can be met by the birth-rate of a modern developed country. Every
country needs firm but fair immigration laws. There is no more evil business than trafficking in human
beings and nothing corrodes social cohesion worse than a furtive underground of illegal migrants
beyond legal protection against exploitation. But we must also create an open and inclusive society
50 that welcomes incomers for their contribution to our growth and prosperity. Our measures to attract
specialists in information technology is a good example.

Our cultural diversity is one of the reasons why Britain continues to be the preferred location for
multinational companies setting up in Europe. The national airline of a major European country has
recently relocated its booking operation to London precisely because of the linguistic variety of the
staff whom it can recruit here.

55 And it isn't just our economy that has been enriched by the arrival of new communities. Our lifestyles
and cultural horizons have also been broadened in the process. This point is perhaps more readily
understood by young Britons, who are more open to new influences and more likely to have been
educated in a multi-ethnic environment. But it reaches into every aspect of our national life.

60 Chicken Tikka Massala is now a true British national dish, not only because it is the most popular, but
because it is a perfect illustration of the way Britain absorbs and adapts external influences. Chicken
Tikka is an Indian dish. The Massala sauce was added to satisfy the desire of British people to have
their meat served in gravy.

Coming to terms with multiculturalism as a positive force for our economy and society will have
significant implications for our understanding of Britishness.

65 The modern notion of national identity cannot be based on race and ethnicity, but must be based on
shared ideals and aspirations. Some of the most successful countries in the modern world, such as the
United States and Canada, are immigrant societies. Their experience shows how cultural diversity,
allied to a shared concept of equal citizenship, can be a source of enormous strength. We should draw
inspiration from their experience.

Recession creating 'sense of victimhood' among white working class
Absence of community groups commonly found in areas with high minority ethnic
populations blamed

- - John Stevens
 - Guardian.co.uk
 - 22/01/2010
-

1 White working-class communities are struggling to deal with the recession because of a lack
2 of civil society, a leading charity claims. According to a new report by the Barrow Cadbury
3 Trust, an absence of the community groups commonly found in areas with high minority
4 ethnic populations is giving white communities "nothing but a shared sense of victimhood".
5 The study of deprived districts in Birmingham found that predominantly white council wards,
6 which have traditionally been seen as "privet-hedged middling suburbs", lacked community
7 structures such as churches, mosques and youth groups that have helped ease the impact of
8 economic decline in wards with high minority ethnic populations.

9 The charity said there was a critical need to rethink how the city tackles deprivation and how
10 it can boost employment opportunities, especially with the prospect of more job losses,
11 following Kraft's takeover of Cadbury, which was founded in Birmingham and still has a
12 factory there.

13 Phoebe Griffiths, research and partnerships manager at the trust, said: "All ethnic groups have
14 been affected by Birmingham's economic decline, but the closure of factories and plants has
15 been particularly bad for the white workers who made up most of their workforce.

16 "Working-class jobs that offered status, reasonable wages, and a sense of pride and
17 community have been substituted, if at all, by poor quality service jobs in local food outlets,
18 supermarkets and commission-based sales work."

19 The study found informal groups based at mosques, temples and churches, as well as youth
20 clubs and groups for women and pensioners helped to improve social cohesion and mutual
21 support among high minority ethnic populations in inner city areas. However in outer city
22 areas, researchers found that the white population felt less in control of their communities as
23 there were fewer such local groups.

24 But the trust said that its findings should not be used as another excuse to pit communities
25 against each other. Without investment in community groups, it was easy for extremist groups
26 to step into the gap, providing local activities and exploiting feelings of isolation.

27 "The BNP have become canny operators in local communities, reaching out to people through
28 simple acts such as clearing rubbish or holding fetes," Griffiths said.

29 The report warns eye-catching regeneration initiatives in the city have failed to produce major
30 adjustments in the relative position and hierarchy of neighbourhoods. The charity found that
31 poverty is still concentrated in the same areas, with 13 of the 40 council wards remaining
32 seriously deprived. The study claims Birmingham was suffering from economic decline even
33 before the recession. It says that between 2001 and 2008 as wages rose across the country, the
34 average wage in Birmingham fell by 3.5%.

35 Tom Aldred, an analyst at thinktank Centre for Cities, said that like other cities such as
36 Newcastle and Sunderland, which have historically relied on a small number of large
37 employers, Birmingham lacks entrepreneurial activity.

38 "The centre of the city has been physically transformed, but if you look at the economic data
39 it has not been economically transformed. It has struggled to attract private sector jobs
40 growth," he added.

41 "It has a strong university sector and needs to make better use of it to create new jobs and
42 industries."

43 Birmingham City Centre said that it acknowledged the challenges but was committed to
44 reducing the inequality gaps in the city.

45 A spokesman said: "Over the past 20 years the city council and its partners have through ...
46 regeneration programmes and initiatives made a positive impact in many areas."

47 He added: "Our employment and skills strategy targets support those neighbourhoods, which
48 have experienced persistent and high levels of unemployment and worklessness. This includes
49 many inner city neighbourhoods, but also those neighbourhoods in many of the outer areas of
50 the city, which have been previously ignored by regeneration initiatives."

51

The Federalist No. 10

The Utility of the Union as a Safeguard Against Domestic Faction and Insurrection (continued)

Daily Advertiser, Thursday, November 22, 1787

[James Madison]

AMONG the numerous advantages promised by a well constructed Union, none deserves to be more accurately developed than its tendency to break and control the violence of faction. The friend of popular governments never finds himself so much alarmed for their character and fate, as when he contemplates their propensity to this dangerous vice. ... By a faction, I understand a number of
5 citizens, whether amounting to a majority or a minority of the whole, who are united and actuated by some common impulse of passion, or of interest, adverse to the rights of other citizens, or to the permanent and aggregate interests of the community....

The latent causes of faction are thus sown in the nature of man; and we see them everywhere brought into different degrees of activity, according to the different circumstances of civil society. A zeal for
10 different opinions concerning religion, concerning government, and many other points, as well of speculation as of practice; an attachment to different leaders ambitiously contending for pre-eminence and power; or to persons of other descriptions whose fortunes have been interesting to the human passions, have, in turn, divided mankind into parties, inflamed them with mutual animosity, and rendered them much more disposed to vex and oppress each other than to co-operate for their common
15 good. So strong is this propensity of mankind to fall into mutual animosities, that where no substantial occasion presents itself, the most frivolous and fanciful distinctions have been sufficient to kindle their unfriendly passions and excite their most violent conflicts. But the most common and durable source of factions has been the various and unequal distribution of property. Those who hold and those who are without property have ever formed distinct interests in society. Those who are creditors, and those
20 who are debtors, fall under a like discrimination. A landed interest, a manufacturing interest, a mercantile interest, a moneyed interest, with many lesser interests, grow up of necessity in civilized nations, and divide them into different classes, actuated by different sentiments and views. The regulation of these various and interfering interests forms the principal task of modern legislation, and involves the spirit of party and faction in the necessary and ordinary operations of the government.

No man is allowed to be a judge in his own cause, because his interest would certainly bias his judgment, and, not improbably, corrupt his integrity. With equal, nay with greater reason, a body of men are unfit to be both judges and parties at the same time; yet what are many of the most important acts of legislation, but so many judicial determinations, not indeed concerning the rights of single persons, but concerning the rights of large bodies of citizens? And what are the different classes of
30 legislators but advocates and parties to the causes which they determine? Is a law proposed concerning private debts? It is a question to which the creditors are parties on one side and the debtors on the other. Justice ought to hold the balance between them. Yet the parties are, and must be, themselves the judges; and the most numerous party, or, in other words, the most powerful faction must be expected to prevail. ...

It is in vain to say that enlightened statesmen will be able to adjust these clashing interests, and render them all subservient to the public good. Enlightened statesmen will not always be at the helm. Nor, in many cases, can such an adjustment be made at all without taking into view indirect and remote considerations, which will rarely prevail over the immediate interest which one party may find in disregarding the rights of another or the good of the whole. The inference to which we are brought is,
40 that the *causes* of faction cannot be removed, and that relief is only to be sought in the means of controlling its *effects*.

Thomas Jefferson

Notes on the State of Virginia, 1785

Query No. 18: "Manners"

The particular customs and manners that may happen to be received in that state?

It is difficult to determine on the standard by which the manners of a nation may be tried, whether *catholic*, or *particular*. It is more difficult for a native to bring to that standard the manners of his own nation, familiarized to him by habit.

5 There must doubtless be an unhappy influence on the manners of our people produced by the
existence of slavery among us. The whole commerce between master and slave is a perpetual
exercise of the most boisterous passions, the most unremitting despotism on the one part, and
degrading submissions on the other. Our children see this, and learn to imitate it; for man is
an imitative animal. This quality is the germ of all education in him. From his cradle to his
10 grave he is learning to do what he sees others do. If a parent could find no motive either in his
philanthropy or his self-love, for restraining the intemperance of passion towards his slave, it
should always be a sufficient one that his child is present. But generally it is not sufficient.
The parent storms, the child looks on, catches the lineaments of wrath, puts on the same airs
in the circle of smaller slaves, gives a loose to his worst of passions, and thus nursed,
educated, and daily exercised in tyranny, cannot but be stamped by it with odious
15 peculiarities. The man must be a prodigy who can retain his manners and morals undepraved
by such circumstances.

And with what execration should the statesman be loaded, who permitting one half the
citizens thus to trample on the rights of the other, transforms those into despots, and these into
enemies, destroys the morals of the one part, and the amor patriae of the other. For if a slave
20 can have a country in this world, it must be any other in preference to that in which he is born
to live and labour for another: in which he must lock up the faculties of his nature, contribute
as far as depends on his individual endeavours to the evanishment of the human race, or entail
his own miserable condition on the endless generations proceeding from him. With the morals
of the people, their industry also is destroyed. For in a warm climate, no man will labour for
25 himself who can make another labour for him. This is so true, that of the proprietors of slaves
a very small proportion indeed are ever seen to labour.

And can the liberties of a nation be thought secure when we have removed their only firm
basis, a conviction in the minds of the people that these liberties are of the gift of God? That
they are not to be violated but with his wrath? Indeed I tremble for my country when reflect
30 that God is just: that his justice cannot sleep for ever: that considering numbers, nature and
natural means only, a revolution of the wheel of fortune, an exchange of situation, is among
possible events: that it may become probable by supernatural interference! The Almighty has
no attribute which can take side with us in such a contest. – But it is impossible to be
temperate and to pursue this subject through the various considerations of policy, of morals,
35 of history natural and civil. We must be contented to hope they will force their way into every
one's mind. I think a change already perceptible, since the origin of the present revolution.
The spirit of the master is abating, that of the slave rising from the dust, his condition
mollifying, the way I hope preparing, under the auspices of heaven, for a total emancipation,
and that this is disposed, in the order of events, to be with the consent of the masters, rather
40 than by their extirpation.