Senator Ted Kennedy (Massachusetts), "Light in Ulster," Congressional Records – Senate, 20 October 1971.

Mr President, I am pleased to join with Senator Abraham Ribicoff in introducing a Senate resolution calling for the immediate withdrawal of British troops from Northern Ireland and the establishment of a united Ireland. An identical resolution is being introduced today in the House of Representatives by Congressman Hugh Carey of Brooklyn.

We believe that the resolution states the only realistic means to end the killing in Northern Ireland and to bring peace to a land that has given so much to America, a land that has done so much to enrich the history of our own Nation, a land that is suffering so deeply today. The conscience of America cannot keep silent when men and women of Ireland are dying. Britain has lost its way, and the innocent people of Northern Ireland are the ones who now must suffer. The time has come for Americans of every faith and political persuasion to speak out. We owe ourselves and our sacred heritage no less.

Down through the centuries, the people of Ireland have been forced to wage a continuing and arduous struggle for freedom and equality. For generations, division and despair have scarred the countryside. The ancient right of self-determination has been denied. Often alone, often without notice from others throughout the world, brave men and women of Ireland have given their lives for the principles they hold dear. Millions have been driven from their homes, forced to leave the land they love obliged to seek a new life in nations where the yoke of repression could not reach.

Today, the Irish struggle again. But now, they are not alone. They have the support of free peoples in every corner of the world. Their cause is just, and the reforms they seek are basic to all democracies worthy of the name. The crisis now, however, is especially serious, because the hate and bitterness are taking a new and far more drastic turn. Ulster teeters on the brink of a civil war that threatens to engulf all of Ireland. The Government of Ulster rules by bayonet and bloodshed. The struggle today in the ghettos of Londonderry for liberty and the right of self-determination, for principles that should be the birthright of all peoples who call themselves free men.

In recent months, we have witnessed appalling outbreaks of civil strife in Northern Ireland, the worst in the entire half-century since Ireland was partitioned. The soaring toll of death and violence is uncontrolled. […] I have said many times in the past that the basic issue in Northern Ireland is human rights. Until the minority enjoys equal rights with the majority, peace cannot come to Northern Ireland. Equality is the only instrument to erase the hatreds nurtured by years of fear, repression and mistrust. Americans well know that injustice breeds bitterness, and that from this bitterness can come violence at almost any provocation. America has learned that the solution is not repression, the solution is not armed troops, the solution is not barbed wire detention camps. We have found a better way, a way of peace and reconciliation, and we believe that Northern Ireland can reach the same result.

The heart of the solution we offer today is the call for immediate withdrawal of British troops from Ulster and the establishment of a united Ireland. Without a firm commitment to troop withdrawal and unification, there can be no peace in Northern Ireland. The killing will go on, and the intolerable mounting violence will continue. […]

Ulster is becoming Britain's Vietnam. For Ulster is becoming Britain's Vietnam. Indeed, it is fair to say that Britain stands toward peace in Northern Ireland today where America stood in Southeast Asia in the early nineteen sixties. […] Surely, if Britain sees and understands the parallel, we can avoid a repetition of Vietnam in Ulster. The most hopeful sign I see is the growing volume of press reports that the mass of British people themselves see the issue more clearly than their government. A recent poll, taken in September, reveals that fully 59 per cent of the British public wants to end the killing by bringing British troops home from Ulster now.

Clement ATTLEE, "National Insurance Bill," House of Commons, *Parliamentary Debates*, 7 February 1946.

We now recognise that, to allow, through mass unemployment, or through sickness, great numbers of people to be ineffective as consumers is an economic loss to the country. We all now hold the view that we must maintain purchasing power and must have a proper distribution of purchasing power among the masses of the people. The old idea that this could only be done through wages and profits, and not by collective provisions of this sort, is now, I think, dying. We on this side have put forward that view for many years.

It is interesting to see how far, in quite a short time, we have travelled from the conception of the panic cutting-down of the purchasing power of the masses, which was employed as a means of dealing with the abundance crisis of 1931. We now realise that we have the backing of experienced administrators and of the economists that it is necessary, in this matter, to have a degree of planning. I would like, in this connection, to call attention to an interesting provision in Clause 3 of the Bill, whereby, subject to the specific approval of Parliament, the rates of contrbution may be varied upwards or downwards. This proposal appeared in the White Paper on Full Employment issued in 1944, and there we have the conception, which I can remember being put forward 30 years ago by Mr. Sidney Webb, that it was the duty of the State, by trying to increase purchasing power in times of threatened slump, to iron out the irregularities in our economy. The endeavour here is, to some extent, to try to vary the purchasing power in the pockets of the masses in accordance with the state of employment. […]

The question is asked – Can we afford it? Supposing the answer is "no". What does it mean? It really means that the sum of total goods produced and the services rendered by the people of this country is not sufficient to provide for all our people at all times, in sickness, in health, in youth and in age, the very modest standard of life that is represented by the sums of money set out in the second schedule to this Bill. I cannot believe that our national productivity is so slow, that our willingness to work is so feeble or that we can submit to the world that the masses of our people must be condemned to penury. […]

It is a method of distributing purchasing power, and the only validity for the claim that we cannot afford it must rest either on there not being enough in the pool, or on the claim that some sections of society have a priority to take out so much that the others must suffer want.

I am not prepared to admit to either of these propositions. Where I do entirely agree is, that we can only afford it if we are prepared to utilise to the full our resources in labour and materials, our skill, our scientific inventions, and our power of organisation. Therefore, this is only a part of Government policy. There is the complementary side, the reorganisation and reinvigoration of our economic life, and the increase of our overseas trade. We must secure and maintain a high level of national production. We must eliminate waste, both in production and distribution. But I entirely agree that the benefits of this Bill can only be secured if the people of this country recognise the obligation to work hard for them. […]

At the time when the Beveridge Report came out, I was talking to a young and energetic business man who said, "This is just what I want. I can now go in for experiments and adventure, because there is something to fall back on." One of the clogs on adventure and enterprise is the clinging to safety, the fear of any change because of what might happen. It is just the comprehensiveness of this scheme which I think will make it, not a cushion but a springboard. I hope the people of this country will work to secure everyone from want, in the same spirit as they worked to save all from defeat in the war.

Jack London, *The People of the Abyss*, Chapter 27, Grosset & Dunlap, New York, 1903.

But, it will be instantly admitted, Civilization has increased man's producing power. Five men can produce bread for a thousand. One man can produce cotton cloth for 250 people, woollens for 300, and boots and shoes for 1000. Yet it has been shown throughout the pages of this book that English folk by the millions do not receive enough food, clothes, and boots. Then arises the third and inexorable question: *If Civilization has increased the producing power of the average man, why has it not bettered the lot of the average man?*

There can be one answer Only - MISMANAGEMENT. Civilization has made possible all manner of creature comforts and heart's delights. In these the average Englishman does not participate. If he shall be forever unable to participate, then Civilization falls. There is no reason for the continued existence of an artifice so avowed a failure. But it is impossible that men should have reared this tremendous artifice in vain. It stuns the intellect. To acknowledge so crushing a defeat is to give the death-blow to striving and progress.

One other alternative, and one other only, presents itself. *Civilization must be compelled to better the lot of the average man*. This accepted, it becomes at once a question of business management. Things profitable must be continued; things unprofitable must be eliminated. Either the Empire is a profit to England or it is a loss. If it is a loss, it must be done away with. If it is a profit, it must be managed so that the average man comes in for a share of the profit.

If the struggle for commercial supremacy is profitable, continue it. If it is not, if it hurts the worker and makes his lot worse than the lot of a savage, then fling foreign markets and industrial empire overboard. For it is a patent fact that if 40,000,000 people, aided by Civilization, possess a greater individual producing power than the Innuit, then those 40,000,000 people should enjoy more creature comforts and heart's delights than the Innuits enjoy.

If the 400,000 English gentlemen, "of no occupation," according to their own statement in the Census of 1881, are unprofitable, do away with them. Set them to work ploughing game preserves and planting potatoes. If they are profitable, continue them by all means, but let it be seen to that the average Englishman shares somewhat in the profits they produce by working at no occupation.

In short, society must be reorganized, and a capable management put at the head. That the present management is incapable, there can be no discussion. It has drained the United Kingdom of its life-blood. It has enfeebled the stay-at-home folk till they are unable longer to struggle in the van of the competing nations. It has built up a West End and an East End as large as the Kingdom is large, in which one end is riotous and rotten, the other end sickly and underfed.

A vast empire is foundering on the hands of this incapable management. And by empire is meant the political machinery which holds together the English-speaking people of the world outside of the United States. Nor is this charged in a pessimistic spirit. Blood empire is greater than political empire, and the English of the New World and the Antipodes are strong and vigorous as ever. But the political empire under which they are nominally assembled is perishing. The political machine known as the British Empire is running down. In the hands of its management it is losing momentum every day. […]

Nor can one member of this managing class plead not guilty before the judgment bar of Man. The food this managing class eats, the wine it drinks, the shows it makes, and the fine clothes it wears, are challenged by eight million mouths which have never had enough to fill them, and by twice eight million bodies which have never been sufficiently clothed and housed.

There can be no mistake. Civilization has increased man's producing power an hundred fold, and through mismanagement the men of Civilization live worse than the beasts, and have less to eat and wear and protect them from the elements than the savage Innuit in a frigid climate who lives to-day as he lived in the stone age ten thousand years ago.

Anon., *Cursory remarks on the emancipation of slaves*, Liverpool, printed for the author by J. Nevett & Co, 1823

I should be sorry to impugn the motives of any body of men, or attribute to them selfish views rather than the pure feelings of philanthropy. But these theorists should at least shew the comparative state of freedom that exists among the natives of Hindostan and the negroes of our Colonies, before they set up the warwhoop of emancipation. Are the Ryots, who are the cultivators of the soil in India, free? Are their physical and moral enjoyments greater than those of negroes? Are they not slaves to one of the most diabolical superstitions that was ever invented by the mind of man to keep man in a state of slavery? These questions can only be answered in one way, which is this; that slavery is a perpetual entail on the cultivators of Sugar in India; for a Ryot, generation after generation, and so long as the religion of Brahma exists, remains a Ryot: and necessity in a tropical climate, arising from an excess of population, which compels the cultivators of the soil in India to work or starve, is a greater scourge then the driver's whip in the West Indies. What fine pathetic tales have been set forth to the public about the flogging of negroes in the West Indies; as if a negro was one of the most virtuous beings on earth, and could not commit a crime.

Did the writers of these pathetic tales never hear of the whipping in Newgate, of the tread mill, of the hulks, Botany Bay, and the perpetual use of the New Drop? Did these writers never hear of flogging being a summary mode of punishment on board of a British man of war, and that at the mere dictum of a captain, a sailor may be tied to the breech of a gun and receive a dozen lashes on his bare back from a cat-of-nine-tails? I wish some of these theorists were made to feel what I myself have felt, when I was dragged from the threshold of my own door, (after returning from a twelve months' voyage,) on board of a man of war, and taken to India without being permitted to see a member of my family: they would then find that slavery existed in their own country, and in no trifling degree, especially when they had undergone the dicipline [sic] of a man of war for a few years, and were compelled against their own free will, not only to work, but to fight : and I here solemnly declare, that I would rather be a slave to an indulgent master in the West Indies, than a sailor subject to impressment[1]. Of the three states of slavery, first, as it exists among the negroes in the West Indies; secondly, as arising from casts in India; thirdly, as arising from impressment in Great Britain; the lot of the negro is the best.

I really doubt if these theoretic gentlemen believe that negroes in a tropical climate when emancipated, (no matter what moral and religious instruction they may have received, as preparatory steps to their emancipation,) are likely to become industrious, and acquire property by the sweat of their brow; because experience proves to the contrary. In a negro, indolence is inherent; and a tropical climate its most genial atmosphere. What good effect has an European education ever had on those natives of Africa, who afterwards returned to their own country? Were they ever known to improve by precept and example the condition of their ignorant brethren? Far from it–for from the moment they landed on their native soil, they threw off their European dresses and habits, as acquirements that were rather a curse to them than a blessing, and relapsed into all their native habits and vices. It would be as vain for these theorists to enforce a code of laws on the inhabitants of the moon, (supposing the moon to be inhabited,) as to civilize the Africans, and render them sensible of the blessings, which Europeans enjoy from their industry, and superior civil and religious institutions: the climate they inhabit is wholly opposed to it.

[1] Forced conscription

"Prohibition on promoting homosexuality by teaching or by publishing material," ***House of Commons debates*****, 09 March 1988.**

Dr Cunnigham: Before I refer to the amendments in detail, I reiterate our view of the major issues that are involved in this clause. The clause affects all local government, all education services, and the arts and library services of our country. It has caused a storm of protest, and understandably so. Here we are dealing with fundamental issues of principle. It is not just a provision to ensure neutrality on homosexuality. Much more than that is at stake. Indeed, everyone's right to information and the arts, the rights of minorities, the way in which a free society is tolerant of diversity, the way in which a free society organises itself, the way in which minorities are protected' in a free and plural democratic society are at the heart of our objections to the provisions of clause 28.[2]

We are confronted here with issues of people's civil rights and individual freedoms. We are confronted here with the possibility of an extension of censorship, either deliberately or by default. That is why the Arts Council of Great Britain has been so active in opposing the provisions of the clause, arguing, as we do, the severe risk that prohibition on "promoting" homosexuality will prohibit almost any literary or artistic activity that has an element of homosexuality within it.

The provisions set a dangerous precedent. The clause represents a new and inherently dangerous direction for the law to take. It breaches an important principle of equality before the law, for minorities to seek to advance their own lawful interests, that could in future be extended to other people. […]

The proposals set a dangerous precedent, because they seek to control what is taught in the classroom, not directly through an education Act, but indirectly by restrictions on the provision of books or other materials that are not themselves prohibited by law. The proposals will encourage discrimination. It is impossible to accept any other construction when the civil rights of homosexuals are already under increased threat and hostility because of the appalling consequences of AIDS. […] The proposals provide an excuse to discriminate against gay and lesbian people. Just as the Sex Discrimination Act 1986 and the Race Relations Act 1976 make it less acceptable to discriminate against women and ethnic minorities, this clause will have the reverse effect and will make it more respectable to discriminate against gay and lesbian people.

These are major and fundamental reasons why further amendments to the clause are necessary. As it stands, it will be bad law, because it is dangerously imprecise in drafting and open to wide and varied, differing interpretation. […] I believe that they have done so for the basest and most contemptible political motives. I believe that they have done so because they seek some political gain from aiding and abetting bigotry and discrimination against gay and lesbian people. In the absence of any other explanation, that is bound to be the conclusion that people will reach, inside and outside the House. [Interruption.] […]

Mr. Tony Marlow (Northampton, North): What the hon. Member for Copeland (Dr. Cunningham) is saying is totally contemptible to democracy. He is saying that the Government should not pay the slightest bit of attention to popular feeling on this issue and that, in his opinion, the population at large is bigoted. I should like him to withdraw that.

Dr. Cunningham: I said no such thing. I was saying that the Government were bigoted and were seeking to encourage bigotry—which, unlike the hon. Member for Northampton, North (Mr. Marlow), I do not believe is a trait displayed by the majority of people in Britain. On the contrary, I think that the majority of people are decent and civilised in their approach to these matters, as we ought to be in any plural democratic society.

---

[2] Said amendment read: "(a) intentionally promote homosexuality or publish material with the intention of promoting homosexuality"

Caroline Lucas, *Maiden Speech*, House of Commons, 27 May 2010.

Mr Speaker,

I am most grateful to you for calling me during today's debate. The environment is a subject dear to my heart, as I'm sure you know, and I'll return to it in a moment.

I think anyone would find their first speech in this chamber daunting, given its history and traditions, and the many momentous events it has witnessed. But I have an additional responsibility, which is to speak not only as the new Member of Parliament for Brighton Pavilion, but also as the first representative of the Green Party to be elected to Westminster.

You have to go back several decades, to the election of the first Nationalist MPs in Scotland and Wales, to find the last maiden speech from a new national political party.

And perhaps a better comparison would be those first Socialist and Independent Labour MPs, over a century ago, whose arrival was seen as a sign of coming revolution.

When Keir Hardie made his maiden speech to this House, after winning the seat of West Ham South in 1892, there was an outcry. Because instead of frock coat and top hat, he wore a tweed suit and deerstalker. It's hard to decide which of these choices would seem more inappropriate today. But what Keir Hardie stood for now seems much more mainstream. Progressive taxation, votes for women, free schooling, pensions and abolition of the House of Lords. Though the last of these is an urgent task still before us, the rest are now seen as essential to our society. What was once radical, even revolutionary, becomes understood, accepted and even cherished.

In speaking today, I am helped by an admirable tradition – that in your first speech to this House, you should refer to your constituency and to your predecessor.

It is also a great pleasure to speak about Brighton itself. It is, I am sure, well-known to many Members, if only from Party conferences. […] Brighton has always had a tradition of independence – of doing things differently. It has an entrepreneurial spirit, making the best of things whatever the circumstances, and enjoying being ahead of the curve. We see this in the numbers of small businesses and freelancers within the constituency, and in the way in which diversity is not just tolerated, or respected, but positively welcomed and valued.[…]

Perhaps the most difficult task is to say a few words about the latest radical move that the people of Brighton have made – that is, to elect the first Green MP to Parliament. It has been a long journey.

The Green Party traces its origins back to 1973, and the issues highlighted in its first Manifesto for a Sustainable Society – including security of energy supply, tackling pollution, raising standards of welfare and striving for steady state economics – are even more urgent today. If our message had been heeded nearly 40 years ago, I like to think we would be much closer to the genuinely sustainable economy that we so urgently need, than we currently are today.

We fielded fifty candidates in the 1979 general election as the Ecology Party, and began to win seats on local councils. Representation in the European Parliament and the London Assembly followed. Now, after nearly four decades of the kind of work on doorsteps and in council chambers which I am sure honourable members are all too familiar, we have more candidates and more members, and now our first MP.

A long journey. Too long, I would say. Politics needs to renew itself, and allow new ideas and visions to emerge. Otherwise debate is the poorer, and more and more people will feel that they are not represented. So I hope that if, and when, other new political movements arise, they will not be excluded by the system of voting. Reform here, as in other areas, is long-overdue. The chance must not be squandered. Most crucially, the people themselves must be given a choice about the way their

representatives are elected. And in my view, that means more than a referendum on the Alternative Vote – it means the choice of a genuinely proportional electoral system. […]

I have worked on the causes and consequences of climate change for most of my working life, first with Oxfam – for the effects of climate change are already affecting millions of people in poorer countries around the world – and then for ten years in the European Parliament.

But if we are to overcome this threat, then it is we in this chamber who must take the lead.

Speech delivered by Nigel Farage, the Leader of UKIP, to the Party conference on 19th September 2013.

We are a nation that has always been open minded about immigration. But more people came to this country in one year, 2010 than came in the thousand years before it.

I'm not against immigration. Far from it. Migrants have qualities we all admire. Looking for a better life. They want to get on. I like that. We admire that.

So I'm speaking here as much as for the settled ethnic minorities as for those who have been here forever.

Half a million new arrivals a year!

It's just not sustainable.

Anyone who looks at it honestly knows it's not sustainable.

UKIP talks about it honestly. Directly. We've had a lot of stick for it. Normal, decent people have been bullied out of the debate.

Maybe that's why none of the London commentariat has noticed what's going on out there in Telford, and Aylesbury, and Kettering, and Buxton and Harrogate. It's a long way from London. But all over the country, I'm getting audiences of five hundred or six hundred a night to talk about this.

This debate has been filling theatres. And not with party members. On a show of hands 80 per cent are non-members.

But they're interested. They're engaged. They're concerned.

These people aren't disconnected from politics. They're disconnected from politicians.

And UKIP is the only party that isn't afraid to talk to them about it.

So who are we? Who is the typical UKIP voter? I'll tell you something about the typical UKIP voter – the typical UKIP voter doesn't exist.

When I look at the audiences in those theatres there is a range of British society from all parts of the spectrum. Workers, employers, self-employed. Big businessmen, corner shop owners. Well off, comfortably off, struggling. Young as well as old. Not ideologues. Some left, some right, mostly in the middle. Some activists, some haven't voted for twenty years.

One thing many have in common: they are fed up to the back teeth with the cardboard cut-out careerists in Westminster.

The spot-the-difference politicians.

Desperate to fight the middle ground, but can't even find it.

Focus groupies.

The triangulators.

The dog whistlers.

The politicians who daren't say what they really mean.

And that's why UKIP attracts this eclectic support.

Because when we believe something – we don't go "are you thinking what we're thinking". We say it out loud.

That's why UKIP is the most independent-minded body of men and women who have ever come together in the name of British politics.

Which presents occasional difficulties. We have some people with overactive Facebook accounts. And we have some who make public pronouncements that I would not always choose myself. […]

UKIP is a free-thinking, egalitarian party opposed to racism, sectarianism and extremism.

UKIP is dedicated to liberty, opportunity, equality under the law and the aspirations of the British people.

We will always act in the interests of Britain. Especially on immigration, employment, energy supply and fisheries.

We know that only by leaving the union can we regain control of our borders, our parliament, democracy and our ability to trade freely with the fastest-growing economies in the world.

And £55 million a day, incidentally, we get that back as well.

A referendum to allow the country to decide this matter will create the greatest opportunity for national renewal in our lifetime.

That's us.

Optimistic. Open to the world. The opposite of insular. Out there trading with countries that have growth rates of six, seven, ten per cent a year. Not hemmed in by the European Union – but open to the Commonwealth. Our real friends in the Commonwealth.

Because the fact is we just don't belong in the European Union.

Britain is different.

Our geography puts us apart. Our history puts us apart. Our institutions produced by that history put us apart. We think differently. We behave differently.

I'm not giving you the *Love, Actually* version of what makes Britain different. […]

I believe that leaving the Union and reclaiming our destiny will create the most exciting opportunity for national renewal in our lifetime.

At the most basic level we get back £55 million a day. It adds up. It's £20 billion a year. We could reduce the deficit. We could reduce corporation tax to 10 per cent. Give us the most competitive and attractive business taxes in the western world.

We get our money back.

We get our borders back.

We get our Parliament back.

We get our fisheries back.

We get our own seat in on the bodies that actually run the world.

David Lammy, Labour Member of Parliament for Tottenham, Speech in the House of Commons, 30 April 2018.

The Windrush story does not begin in 1948; the Windrush story begins in the 17th century, when British slave traders stole 12 million Africans from their homes, took them to the Caribbean and sold them into slavery to work on plantations. The wealth of this country was built on the backs of the ancestors of the Windrush generation. We are here today because you were there.

My ancestors were British subjects, but they were not British subjects because they came to Britain. They were British subjects because Britain came to them, took them across the Atlantic, colonised them, sold them into slavery, profited from their labour and made them British subjects. That is why I am here, and it is why the Windrush generation are here. There is no British history without the history of the empire. As the late, great Stuart Hall put it: "I am the sugar at the bottom of the English cup of tea." […]

The Windrush children are imprisoned in this country—as we have seen of those who have been detained—centuries after their ancestors were shackled and taken across the ocean in slave ships. They are pensioners imprisoned in their own country. That is a disgrace, and it happened here because of a refusal to remember our history.

The former Home Secretary said that the Windrush generation should be considered British and should be able to get their British citizenship if they so choose. This is the point the Government simply do not understand: the Windrush generation are the British people. They are British citizens. They came here as citizens. That is the precise reason why this is such an injustice. Their British citizenship is, and has always been, theirs by right. It is not something that the Government can now choose to grant them. I remind the Government of chapter 56 of the British Nationality Act 1948, which says: "Every person who under this Act is a citizen of the United Kingdom and Colonies…shall by virtue of that citizenship have the status of a British subject."

The Bill uses "British nationality" by virtue of citizenship. I read that Bill again last week when looking over the case notes of my constituents caught up in the Windrush crisis. Patrick Henry is a British citizen who arrived in Britain in 1959. He is a teaching assistant. He told me, "I feel like a prisoner who has committed no crime," because he is being denied citizenship. Clive Smith, a British citizen who arrived here in 1964, showed the Home Office his school reports and was still threatened with deportation. Wilberforce Sullivan is a British citizen who paid taxes for 40 years. He was told in 2011 that he was no longer able to work. Dennis Laidley is a British citizen with tax records going back to the 1960s. He was denied a passport and was unable to visit his sick mother. Jeffrey Greaves, a British citizen who arrived here in 1964, was threatened with deportation by the Home Office. Huthley Sealey, a British citizen, is unable to claim benefits or access healthcare in this country. […]

There comes a time when the burden of living like a criminal in one's own country becomes too heavy to bear any longer. That is why in the last few weeks we have seen an outpouring of pain and grief that had built up over many years. Yet Ministers have tried to conflate the issue with illegal immigration. On Thursday, the former Home Secretary said she was personally committed to tackling illegal migration, to making it difficult for illegal migrants to live here and to removing people who are here illegally. [...]

Indeed, during her statement last Thursday, the former Home Secretary said "illegal" 23 times but did not even once say "citizen". This is not about illegal immigration. This is about British citizens, and frankly it is deeply offensive to conflate the Windrush generation with illegal immigrants to try

to distract from the Windrush crisis. This is about a hostile environment policy[3] that blurs the line between illegal immigrants and people who are here legally, and are even British citizens. This is about a hostile environment not just for illegal immigrants but for anybody who looks like they could be an immigrant. This is about a hostile environment that has turned employers, doctors, landlords and social workers into border guards. The hostile environment is not about illegal immigration.

[3] The "hostile environment policy" is the official name of the policy implemented between 2012 and 2018 by the Home Office so as to make staying in the UK as difficult as possible for people without indefinite leave to remain.

Miss Ellen Wilkinson, Labour MP for Jarrow, "Representation of the People (Equal Franchise) Bill," House of Commons debates, 29 March 1928.

While I am grateful to the last speaker for reminding the House that votes for women at 21 was a Socialist pledge at the last Election, I do not propose to deal with his arguments at any great length. It seems incredible that, in the year 1928, there can be found a gentleman who will produce such interesting relics as the arguments which the hon. Gentleman has put before us. The hon. and gallant Member for Enfield (Colonel Applin) seemed to be very worried about giving Englishwomen the vote, because the Mohammedan[4] subjects of the Crown would not like it; but, really, are British women to be kept down to the level of any backward races that happen to be under the British Crown? Mohammedans may not be backward culturally, but they are certainly backward, or were backward in their treatment of women, and we hope that the example set in this country will bring them along still more. The hon. and gallant Member also spoke of India, but I would remind him that India was governed with apparently great success by a woman ruler, namely, the late Queen Victoria, and, as a matter of fact, in every Province of India to-day, women already have the vote.

Then the hon. and gallant Member said that the younger women should not be given the vote because the men do the really hard work of this country. He instanced the men in the stokehold, and the men at the coal-face. That, I agree, is terribly hard work, but I would ask him to think of the women in Lancashire, who do 8½ hours' work every day in the factory, who do the whole of their housework, and rear their children as well. If we are going to judge by the hardness of the work that is done, a good many of the people who now sit in this House would not be here, because they would not have a vote at all. […]

When women have been given the opportunity, as they have been since the War, they have shown evidence that they can stand on equal terms with men, and can equal them in all the pursuits which they take up. A point that is rather lost sight of in this discussion is that this proposal would not merely enfranchise a further number of women of a certain age, but that it would give the vote to a very important new class, and that is the whole class of independent women workers. It is frequently forgotten that a woman of the age of 30 or over does not get the vote under the present law unless she has either a husband or furniture. Such a woman, whatever her age, however important her work, unless she has a husband or, as one gentleman rather ungallantly said, other furniture, she does not get a vote. […]

The importance of this is that we have a very large and increasing amount of legislation which covers the wages and the working conditions of women workers. Two million women are under the Trade Board Regulations, which we hope will be extended in the near future, and it is of the utmost importance that these independent wage-earning women should be represented in this House when so much of our legislation directly concerns them. There are not only the Trade Board Regulations, there is all the factory legislation and all the protective legislation of one kind and another that deals with women workers, and surely when all women to-day who are living in lodgings and have not a house or furniture of their own are disfranchised it is an utterly illogical position and this Measure has certainly not come too soon. I speak with the feeling that, as one hon. Member has said, this is the closing of a great drama.

[4] Archaic synonym for Muslims.

Charles Darwin, *A Naturalist's Voyage Round the World: The Voyage of the Beagle,* 1839.

On the 19th of August we finally left the shores of Brazil. I thank God, I shall never again visit a slave-country. To this day, if I hear a distant scream, it recalls with painful vividness my feelings, when passing a house near Pernambuco, I heard the most pitiable moans, and could not but suspect that some poor slave was being tortured, yet knew that I was as powerless as a child even to remonstrate. I suspected that these moans were from a tortured slave, for I was told that this was the case in another instance. Near Rio de Janeiro I lived opposite to an old lady, who kept screws to crush the fingers of her female slaves. I have stayed in a house where a young household mulatto, daily and hourly, was reviled, beaten, and persecuted enough to break the spirit of the lowest animal. I have seen a little boy, six or seven years old, struck thrice with a horse-whip (before I could interfere) on his naked head, for having handed me a glass of water not quite clean; I saw his father tremble at a mere glance from his master's eye. These latter cruelties were witnessed by me in a Spanish colony, in which it has always been said that slaves are better treated than by the Portuguese, English, or other European nations. I have seen at Rio de Janeiro a powerful negro afraid to ward off a blow directed, as he thought, at his face. I was present when a kind-hearted man was on the point of separating forever the men, women, and little children of a large number of families who had long lived together. I will not even allude to the many heart-sickening atrocities which I authentically heard of;--nor would I have mentioned the above revolting details, had I not met with several people, so blinded by the constitutional gaiety of the negro as to speak of slavery as a tolerable evil. Such people have generally visited at the houses of the upper classes, where the domestic slaves are usually well treated, and they have not, like myself, lived amongst the lower classes. Such inquirers will ask slaves about their condition; they forget that the slave must indeed be dull who does not calculate on the chance of his answer reaching his master's ears.

It is argued that self-interest will prevent excessive cruelty; as if self-interest protected our domestic animals, which are far less likely than degraded slaves to stir up the rage of their savage masters. It is an argument long since protested against with noble feeling, and strikingly exemplified, by the ever-illustrious Humboldt. It is often attempted to palliate slavery by comparing the state of slaves with our poorer countrymen: if the misery of our poor be caused not by the laws of nature, but by our institutions, great is our sin; but how this bears on slavery, I cannot see; as well might the use of the thumb-screw be defended in one land, by showing that men in another land suffered from some dreadful disease. Those who look tenderly at the slave owner, and with a cold heart at the slave, never seem to put themselves into the position of the latter;--what a cheerless prospect, with not even a hope of change! picture to yourself the chance, ever hanging over you, of your wife and your little children--those objects which nature urges even the slave to call his own--being torn from you and sold like beasts to the first bidder! And these deeds are done and palliated by men who profess to love their neighbours as themselves, who believe in God, and pray that His Will be done on earth! It makes one's blood boil, yet heart tremble, to think that we Englishmen and our American descendants, with their boastful cry of liberty, have been and are so guilty; but it is a consolation to reflect, that we at least have made a greater sacrifice than ever made by any nation, to expiate our sin. […]

Our Voyage having come to an end, I will take a short retrospect of the advantages and disadvantages, the pains and pleasures, of our circumnavigation of the world. If a person asked my advice, before undertaking a long voyage, my answer would depend upon his possessing a decided taste for some branch of knowledge, which could by this means be advanced. No doubt it is a high satisfaction to behold various countries and the many races of mankind, but the pleasures gained at the time do not counterbalance the evils.

THE DECISION OF THE SUPREME COURT IN THE SCHOOL CASES
DECLARATION OF CONSTITUTIONAL PRINCIPLES ("Southern Manifesto"), 1956.

Mr. [Walter F.] GEORGE. Mr. President, […] I now wish to present to the Senate a statement on behalf of 19 Senators, representing 11 States, and 77 House Members, representing a considerable number of States likewise.

DECLARATION OF CONSTITUTIONAL PRINCIPLES.

The unwarranted decision of the Supreme Court in the public school cases is now bearing the fruit always produced when men substitute naked power for established law. The Founding Fathers gave us a Constitution of checks and balances because they realized the inescapable lesson of history that no man or group of men can be safely entrusted with unlimited power. They framed this Constitution with its provisions for change by amendment in order to secure the fundamentals of government against the dangers of temporary popular passion or the personal predilections of public officeholders.

We regard the decisions of the Supreme Court in the school cases as a clear abuse of judicial power. It climaxes a trend in the Federal Judiciary undertaking to legislate, in derogation of the authority of Congress, and to encroach upon the reserved rights of the States and the people. The original Constitution does not mention education.

Neither does the 14th Amendment nor any other amendment. The debates preceding the submission of the 14th Amendment clearly show that there was no intent that it should affect the system of education maintained by the States. The very Congress which proposed the amendment subsequently provided for segregated schools in the District of Columbia. When the amendment was adopted in 1868, there were 37 States of the Union. Every one of the 26 States that had any substantial racial differences among its people, either approved the operation of segregated schools already in existence or subsequently established such schools by action of the same law-making body which considered the 14th Amendment.

As admitted by the Supreme Court in the public school case (Brown v. Board of Education), the doctrine of separate but equal schools "apparently originated in Roberts v. City of Boston (1849), upholding school segregation against attack as being violative of a State constitutional guarantee of equality." This constitutional doctrine began in the North, not in the South, and it was followed not only in Massachusetts, but in Connecticut, New York, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, New Jersey, Ohio, Pennsylvania and other northern states until they, exercising their rights as states through the constitutional processes of local self-government, changed their school systems.

In the case of Plessy v. Ferguson in 1896 the Supreme Court expressly declared that under the 14th Amendment no person was denied any of his rights if the States provided separate but equal facilities. This decision has been followed in many other cases. It is 1 40 45 50 55 60 notable that the Supreme Court, speaking through Chief Justice Taft, a former President of the United States, unanimously declared in 1927 in Lum v. Rice that the "separate but equal" principle is "within the discretion of the State in regulating its public schools and does not conflict with the 14th Amendment." This interpretation, restated time and again, became a part of the life of the people of many of the States and confirmed their habits, traditions, and way of life. It is founded on elemental humanity and commonsense, for parents should not be deprived by Government of the right to direct the lives and education of their own children. Though there has been no constitutional amendment or act of Congress changing this established legal principle almost a century old, the Supreme Court of the United States, with no legal basis for such action, undertook to exercise their naked judicial power and substituted their personal political and social ideas for the established law

of the land. This unwarranted exercise of power by the Court, contrary to the Constitution, is creating chaos and confusion in the States principally affected.

It is destroying the amicable relations between the white and Negro races that have been created through 90 years of patient effort by the good people of both races. It has planted hatred and suspicion where there has been heretofore friendship and understanding. Without regard to the consent of the governed, outside mediators are threatening immediate and revolutionary changes in our public schools systems. If done, this is certain to destroy the system of public education in some of the States.

From Congressional Record, 84th Congress Second Session. Vol. 102, part 4 (March 12, 1956), Washington, D.C.: Governmental Printing Office, 1956, pp. 4459-4460.

"Mother Jones Writes Plea to Roosevelt," North American, New York, July 30, 1903.

The Hon. Theodore Roosevelt, President, USA.

Your Excellency—

Twice before have I written to you in requesting an audience that I might lay my mission before you and have your advice on a matter which bears upon the welfare of the whole nation. I speak for the emancipation from mills and factories of the hundreds of thousands of young children who are yielding up their lives for the commercial supremacy of the nation. Failing to receive a reply to either of the letters, I yesterday, sent to Oyster Bay, taking with me three of these children that they might plead with you personally.

Secretary Barnes informed us that before we might hope for an interview, we must first lay the whole matter before you in a letter. He assured me of its delivery to you personally, and also that it would receive your attention.

I have espoused the cause of the laboring class in general and of suffering childhood in particular. For what affects the child must ultimately affect the adult. It was for them that our march of principle was begun. We sought to bring the attention of the public upon these little ones, so that ultimately sentiment would be aroused and the children freed from the workshops and sent to school. I know of no question of today that demands graver attention from those who have at heart the perpetuation of this Republic.

The child of today is the man or woman of tomorrow: the one the citizen and the other the mother of still future citizens. I ask Mr. President, what kind of citizen will be the child who toils twelve hours a day in an unsanitary atmosphere stunted mentally and physically, and surrounded with immoral influence? Denied education, he cannot assume the true duties of citizenship, and enfeebled physically and mentally, he falls a ready victim to the perverting influences which the present economic conditions have created.

I grant you, Mr. President, that there are State laws which should regulate these matters, but results have proven that they are inadequate. In my little band are three boys, the oldest 11 years old, who have worked in mills a year or more without interference from the authorities. All efforts to bring about reform have failed.

I have been moved to this crusade, Mr. President, because of actual experience in the mills. I have seen little children without the first rudiments of education and no prospect of acquiring any. I have seen other children with hands, finders, and other parts of their tiny bodies mutilated because of their childish ignorance of machinery. I feel that no nation can be truly great while such conditions exist without attempted remedy. It is to be hoped that our crusade will stir up a general sentiment on behalf of enslaved childhood, and secure the enforcement of the present laws. But that is not sufficient. As this is not alone a question of the separate States, but of the whole Republic, we come to you as the chief representative of the nation.

I believe that Federal laws should be passed governing this evil and including a penalty for the violation. Surely, Mr. President, if this is practicable—and I believe you will agree that it is—you can advise me of the necessary steps to pursue I have with me three boys who have walked a hundred miles, serving as living proof of what I say. You can see and talk with them, Mr. President, if you are interested. If you decide to see these children, I will bring them before you at any time you may set. Secretary Barnes has assured me of an early reply and this should be sent care of the Ashland Hotel, New York City.

Very truly yours,

Mother Jones

John O'Sullivan, "Annexation", United States Magazine and Democratic Review, 17, no. 1 (July-August 1845), pp. 5-10.

Texas is now ours. Already, before these words are written, her Convention has undoubtedly ratified the acceptance, by her Congress, of our proffered invitation into the Union; and made the requisite changes in her already republican form of constitution to adapt it to its future federal relations. Her star and her stripe may already be said to have taken their place in the glorious blazon of our common nationality; and the sweep of our eagle's wing already includes within its circuit the wide extent of her fair and fertile land. She is no longer to us a mere geographical space–a certain combination of coast, plain, mountain, valley, forest and stream. She is no longer to us a mere country on the map. She comes within the dear and sacred designation of Our Country; no longer a 'pays,' she is a part of 'la patrie;' and that which is at once a sentiment and a virtue, Patriotism, already begins to thrill for her too within the national heart.

It is time then that all should cease to treat her as alien, and even adverse–cease to denounce and vilify all and everything connected with her accession–cease to thwart and oppose the remaining steps for its consummation; or where such efforts are felt to be unavailing, at least to embitter the hour of reception by all the most ungracious frowns of aversion and words of unwelcome. There has been enough of all this. It has had its fitting day during the period when, in common with every other possible question of practical policy that can arise, it unfortunately became one of the leading topics of party division, of presidential electioneering. But that period has passed, and with it let its prejudices and its passions, its discords and its denunciations, pass away too. The next session of Congress will see the representatives of the new young State in their places in both our halls of national legislation, side by side with those of the old Thirteen. Let their reception into 'the family' be frank, kindly, and cheerful, as befits such an occasion, as comports not less with our own self-respect than patriotic duty towards them. I'll betide those foul birds that delight to file their own nest, and disgust the ear with perpetual discord of ill-omened croak.

Why, were other reasoning wanting, in favor of now elevating this question of the reception of Texas into the Union, out of the lower region of our past party dissensions, up to its proper level of a high and broad nationality, it surely is to be found, found abundantly, in the manner in which other nations have undertaken to intrude themselves into it, between us and the proper parties to the case, in a spirit of hostile interference against us, for the avowed object of thwarting our policy and hampering our power, limiting our greatness and checking the fulfillment of our manifest destiny to overspread the continent allotted by Providence for the free development of our yearly multiplying millions. This we have seen done by England, our old rival and enemy; and by France, strangely coupled with her against us, under the influence of the Anglicism strongly tinging the policy of her present prime minister, Guizot […]

It is wholly untrue, and unjust to ourselves, the pretense that the Annexation has been a measure of spoliation, unrightful and unrighteous–of military conquest under forms of peace and law–of territorial aggrandizement at the expense of justice, and justice due by a double sanctity to the weak. This view of the question is wholly unfounded, and has been before so amply refuted in these pages, as well as in a thousand other modes, that we shall not again dwell upon it. The independence of Texas was complete and absolute. It was an independence, not only in fact, but of right. No obligation of duty towards Mexico tended in the least degree to restrain our right to effect the desired recovery of the fair province once our own–whatever motives of policy might have prompted a more deferential consideration of her feelings and her pride, as involved in the question. If Texas

became peopled with an American population; it was by no contrivance of our government, but on the express invitation of that of Mexico herself; accompanied with such guaranties of State independence, and the maintenance of a federal system analogous to our own, as constituted a compact fully justifying the strongest measures of redress on the part of those afterwards deceived in this guaranty, and sought to be enslaved under the yoke imposed by its violation. She was released, rightfully and absolutely released, from all Mexican allegiance, or duty of cohesion to the Mexican political body, by the acts and fault of Mexico herself, and Mexico alone. There never was a clearer case.

Bennett Champ Clark, "Detour Around War: A Proposal for a New American Policy," *Harper's Monthly*, December 1935, pp. 1-9.

At the present the desire to keep the United States from becoming involved in any war between foreign nations seems practically unanimous among the rank and file of American citizens; but it must be remembered there was an almost equally strong demand to keep us out of the last war. In August, 1914, few could have conceived that America would be dragged into a European conflict in which we had no original part and the ramifications of which we did not even understand. Even as late as November, 1916, President Wilson was reelected because he "kept us out of war." Yet five months later we were fighting to "save the world for democracy" in the "war to end war."

In the light of that experience, and in the red glow of war fires burning in the old countries, it is high time we gave some thought to the hard, practical question of just how we propose to stay out of present and future international conflicts. No one who has made an honest attempt to face the issue will assert that there is an easy answer. But if we have learned anything at all, we know the inevitable and tragic end to a policy of drifting and trusting to luck. We know that however strong is the will of the American people to refrain from mixing in other people's quarrels, that will can be made effective only if we have a sound, definite policy from the beginning.

Such a policy must be built upon a program to safeguard our neutrality. No lesson of the World War is more clear than that such a policy cannot be improvised after war breaks out. It must be determined in advance, before it is too late to apply reason. I contend with all possible earnestness that if we want to avoid being drawn into this war now forming, or any other future war, we must formulate a definite, workable policy of neutral relations with belligerent nations. […] "But, think of the profits!" cry our theorists. "America will never give up her lucrative trade in munitions and necessities of life when war starts!". . . Just who profited from the last war? Labor got some of the crumbs in the form of high wages and steady jobs. But where is labor to-day with its fourteen million unemployed? Agriculture received high prices for its products during the period of the War and has been paying the price of that brief inflation in the worst and longest agricultural depression in all history. Industry made billions in furnishing the necessities of war to the belligerents and then suffered terrific re-action like the dope addict's morning after. War and depression – ugly, misshapen inseparable twins – must be considered together. Each is a catapult for the other. The present world-wide depression is a direct result of the World War. Every war in modern history has been followed by a major depression.

Therefore I say, let the man seeking profits from war or the war-torn countries do so at his own risk. […] The profiteers and others who oppose any rational neutrality shout: "You would sacrifice our national honor!" Some declare we are about to haul down the American flag, and in a future war the belligerents will trample on our rights and treat us with contempt. Some of these arguments are trundled out by our naval bureaucracy. The admirals, I am told, objected strenuously when the State Department suggested a new policy of neutrality somewhat along these lines.

I deny with every fiber of my being that our national honor demands that we must sacrifice the flower of our youth to safeguard the profits of a privileged few. I deny that it is necessary to turn back the hands of civilization to maintain our national honor. I repudiate any such definition of honor. Is it not time for every lover of our country to do the same thing?

Frances Willard, "Address before the Second Biennial Convention of the World's Woman's Christian Temperance Union", 1893

Beloved Comrades of the White Ribbon Army,

When we began the delicate, difficult, and dangerous operation of dissecting out the alcohol nerve from the body politic, we did not realize the intricacy of the undertaking nor the distances that must be traversed by the scalpel of investigation and research. In about seventy days from now, twenty years will have elapsed since the call of battle sounded its bugle note among the homes and hearts of Hillsboro', Ohio. We have all been refreshing our knowledge of those days by reading the "Crusade Sketches" of its heroic leader, Mrs. Eliza J. Thompson, "the mother of us all," and we know that but one thought, sentiment and purpose animated those saintly "Praying Bands" whose name will never die out from human history. "Brothers, we beg you not to drink and not to sell!" This was the one wailing note of these moral Paganinis, playing on one string. It caught the universal ear and set the key of that mighty orchestra, organized with so much toil and hardship, in which the tender and exalted strain of he Crusade violin still soars aloft, but up borne now by the clanging cornets of science, the deep trombones of legislation, and the thunderous drums of politics and parties. The "Do Everything Policy" was not of our choosing but is an evolution as inevitable as any traced by the naturalist or described by the historian. Woman's genius for details, and her patient steadfastness in following the enemies of those she loves "through every lane of life," have led her to antagonize the alcohol habit and the liquor traffic just where they are, wherever that may be. If she does this, since they are everywhere, her policy will be "Do Everything."

A one-sided movement makes one-sided advocates. Virtues, like hounds, hunt in packs. Total abstinence is not the crucial virtue in life that excuses financial crookedness, defamation of character, or habits of impurity. The fact that one's father was, and one's self is, a bright and shining light in the total abstinence galaxy, does not give one a vantage ground for high-handed behavior toward those who have not been trained to the special virtue that forms the central idea of the Temperance Movement. We have known persons who, because they had "never touched a drop of liquor," set themselves up as if they belonged to a royal line, but whose tongues were as biting as alcohol itself, and whose narrowness had no competitor save a straight line. An all-round movement can only be carried forward by all-round advocates; a scientific age requires the study of every subject in its correlations. It was once supposed that light, heat, and electricity were wholly separate entities; it is now believed and practically proved that they are but different modes of motion. Standing in the valley we look up and think we see an isolated mountain; climbing to its top we see that it is but one member of a range of mountains many of them of well-nigh equal altitude.

Some bright women who have opposed the "Do-Everything Policy" used as their favorite illustration a flowing river, and expatiated on the ruin that would follow if that river (which represents their do-one-thing policy) were diverted into many channels, but it should be remembered that the most useful of all rivers is the Nile, and that the agricultural economy of Egypt consists in the effort to spread its waters upon as many fields as possible. It is not for the river's sake that it flows through the country but for the sake of the fertility it can bring upon adjoining fields, and this is pre-eminently true of the Temperance Reform. […] Let us not be disconcerted, but stand bravely by that blessed trinity of movements, Prohibition, Woman's Liberation and Labor's uplift. Everything is not in the Temperance Reform, but the Temperance Reform should be in everything.

Letter to President Hoover from Philo D. Burke, Liaison Officer, B. E. F.; July 29, 1932, National Archives and Records Administration, Hoover Museum Digital Archives.

Mr. Hoover,

The day of all days in the history of the United States finally arrived yesterday when the President of the United States ordered our soldiers to attack the flag of our country, the symbol of our freedom – the freedom our forefathers gave up their lives to give us. The flag we love and will ever follow, in the hands of the veterans, the most loyal soldiers of the United States, has been attacked at the orders of Andy Mellon's President. 1 Had this cowardly attack occurred in any other country in the world, our government would have justly risen up in protest and, Mr. Hoover, I am not so sure that the people of this fair land of ours will not raise their voices in protest when they understand the truth of yesterday's events.

We, the people of the richest land in the world, have been asleep at the polls too long. During the days before our prosperity was snatched from us by the thieving pack of wolves now in control of our land, we were too busy to care who looked after our affairs of state. Now that the ex-servicemen who came to the seat of our government to peacefully lobby for their just dues and better conditions for the common people of the country have been turned upon by the men at the head of our government I feel safe in predicting that the act of Mellon's President will surely prove to be a boomerang. The people of the United States certainly will not stand by and see these boys who offered their lives and went through a hell known as "no man's land" to protect this country blasted out of their peaceful, dingy shanties, which they so diligently erected for themselves and families while they were awaiting relief from the land they have served. It is true the President had the power to misdirect our soldiers; the power to have a paid "RED" throw the first missile; the power to have these soldiers and police murder, beat and gas innocent men, women and children; the power to have these soldiers and police burn not only the meager huts and hovels that these patriotic men had constructed for themselves and their families, and also the power to have hundreds of American flags that were lowered to half-mast in honor of their murdered buddy, burned like so many pieces of rags.

He had the power, Mr. Hoover, to follow all this with unsheathed sabers, fixed bayonets, rifles, machine guns, tanks, gas bombs and arson. All directed against these defenseless, unfortunate ex-heroes of our country. During the war these same boys were equipped with gas masks to protect themselves that they might fight to protect the people and the wealth of the nation. They have not stopped fighting for American people and American principals, even though Mellon's President has turned our soldiers against them in their time of need.

Did the President who is a great food administrator and engineer offer these boys or their wives and little children food, shelter or gas masks during their stay in Washington or before the disgraceful and cowardly eviction took place? Most of these people lost their homes through the greed and lust of the few in power.

Now these same few drive them out of their crude huts and hovels they had erected for shelter. They were cowardly acts, unpardonable sins, Mr. Hoover; don't forget that, for I am sure the people of the country will be with you in remembering these depredations.

I don't expect that this letter will ever reach your eye, nor do I expect it to be published in the press of our land, but I am giving the press a copy of it and, at the same time, I am dedicating the rest of my life to help put this country back into the hands of the people. I am counting on plenty of help, not as a leader but as a follower.

Since I am a disabled war veteran of the world war and a loyal patriotic citizen of the United States, I stand unafraid of our President and his tactics; his powers and cheap politicians that humble

themselves to him, but will loyally support each and every true American who opposes him and the conditions that have been forced upon the people of our country during his administration. I am asking the press to check delivery and receipt of this letter.

Just so you will not mistake me for a “RED” or escaped convict, I am Philo D. Burke, Liaison Officer, B. E. F., Co. C, 350th Inf. 88th Div., A. E. F. 3228922 — C-469986, Official Pilot’s.

Fredrick Douglass, "What to the Slave Is the 4th of July?", speech to the Ladies' Antislavery Society of Rochester, New York, July 5 th , 1852

Fellow citizens! I will not enlarge further on your national inconsistencies. The existence of slavery in this country brands your republicanism as a sham, your humanity as a base pretense, and your Christianity as a lie. It destroys your moral power abroad; it corrupts your politicians at home. It saps the foundation of religion; it makes your name a hissing, and a bye-word to a mocking earth. It is the antagonistic force in your government, the only thing that seriously disturbs and endangers your Union. It fetters your progress; it is the enemy of improvement, the deadly foe of education; it fosters pride; it breeds insolence; it promotes vice; it shelters crime; it is a curse to the earth that supports it; and yet, you cling to it, as if it were the sheet anchor of all your hopes. Oh! be warned! be warned! a horrible reptile is coiled up in your nation's bosom; the venomous creature is nursing at the tender breast of your youthful republic; for the love of God, tear away, and fling from you the hideous monster, and let the weight of twenty million 5 crush and destroy it forever!

But it is answered in reply to all this, that precisely what I have now denounced is, in fact, guaranteed and sanctioned by the Constitution of the United States; that the right to hold and to hunt slaves is a part of that Constitution framed by the illustrious Fathers of this Republic. But I differ from those who charge this baseness on the framers of the Constitution of the United States. It is a slander upon their memory, at least, so I believe. Fellow citizens! there is no matter in respect to which the people of the North have allowed themselves to be so ruinously imposed upon, as that of the proslavery character of the Constitution. In that instrument I hold there is neither warrant, license, nor sanction of the hateful thing; but, interpreted as it ought to be interpreted, the Constitution is a glorious liberty document. Read its Preamble, consider its purposes. Is slavery among them? Is it at the gateway? or is it in the temple? It is neither. While I do not intend to argue this question on the present occasion, let me ask, if it be not somewhat singular that, if the Constitution were intended to be, by its framers and adopters, a slaveholding instrument, why neither slavery, slaveholding, nor slave can anywhere be found in it. What would be thought of an instrument, drawn up, legally drawn up, for the purpose of entitling the city of Rochester to a track of land, in which no mention of land was made?

Now, take the Constitution according to its plain reading, and I defy the presentation of a single proslavery clause in it. On the other hand it will be found to contain principles and purposes, entirely hostile to the existence of slavery. Allow me to say, in conclusion, notwithstanding the dark picture I have this day presented of the state of the nation, I do not despair of this country. There are forces in operation, which must inevitably work the downfall of slavery. "The arm of the Lord is not shortened," and the doom of slavery is certain. I, therefore, leave off where I began, with hope. While drawing encouragement from the Declaration of Independence, the great principles it contains, and the genius of American institutions, my spirit is also cheered by the obvious tendencies of the age. Nations do not now stand in the same relation to each other that they did ages ago. No nation can now shut itself up from the surrounding world, and trot round in the same old path of its fathers without interference. The time was when such could be done. Long established customs of hurtful character could formerly fence themselves in, and do their evil work with social impunity. Knowledge was then confined and enjoyed by the privileged few, and the multitude walked on in mental darkness.

George Wallace, 'Campaign speech at Madison Square Garden, NYC', October 24 th ,1968

Now what are some of the things we are going to do when we become president? We are going to turn back to you, the people of the states, the right to control our domestic institutions. Today you cannot even go to the school systems of the large cities of our country without fear. This is a sad day when in the greatest city in the world, there is fear not only in Madison Square Garden, but in every school building in the state of New York, and especially in the City of New York. Why has the leadership of both national parties kowtowed to this group of anarchists that makes it unsafe for your child and for your family? I don't understand it. But I can assure you of this—that there's not ten cents worth of difference with what the national parties say other than our party. Recently they say most of the same things we say. I remember six years ago when this anarchy movement started, Mr. Nixon said: "It's a great movement," and Mr. Humphrey said: "It's a great movement." Now when they try to speak and are heckled down, they stand up and say: "We've got to have some law and order in this country." They ought to give you law and order back for nothing, because they have helped to take it away from you, along with the Supreme Court of our country that's made up of Republicans and Democrats.

It's costing the taxpayers of New York and the other states in the union almost a half billion dollars to supervise the schools, hospitals, seniority and apprenticeship lists of labor unions, and businesses. Every year on the federal level we have passed a law that would jail you without a trial by jury about the sale of your own property. Mr. Nixon and Mr. Humphrey, both three or four weeks ago, called for the passage of a bill on the federal level that would require you to sell or lease your own property to whomsoever they thought you ought to lease it to. I say that when Mr. Nixon and Mr. Humphrey succumb to the blackmail of a few anarchists in the streets who said we're going to destroy this country if you do not destroy that adage that a man's home is his castle, they are not fit to lead the American people during the next four years in our country. When I become your president, I am going to ask that Congress repeal this so-called open occupancy law and we're going to, within the law, turn back to the people of every state their public school system. Not one dime of your federal money is going to be used to bus anybody any place that you don't want them to be bussed in New York or any other state.

Yes, the theoreticians and the pseudo-intellectuals have just about destroyed not only local government but the school systems of our country. That's all right. Let the police handle it. So let us talk about law and order. We don't have to talk about it much up here. You understand what I'm talking about in, of course, the City of New York, but let's talk about it. You had better be thankful for the police and the firemen of this country. If it were not for them, you couldn't even ride in the streets, much less walk in the streets, of our large cities. […]

My friends, let me say this. We can win this election […][D]on't worry what the newspapers say about us. Everything I've said tonight is logical and reasonable and constitutional. Not a single thing have I said tonight that anybody can argue logically with, and that's the reason they call us extremists and want to say we're Fascists. They cannot argue with the logic of the position we take here in Madison Square Garden tonight. They want to say, well, they're evil folks. I want to tell these newspapers something. These large newspapers that think they know more than the average citizen on the street of New York haven't always been right. I remember the time the New York Times said that Mao tse-Tung was a good man, and he turned out to be a Communist. I remember when they said that Ben Bella was a good man, and he turned out to be a Communist. When old Castro was in the hills of Cuba, the New York Times said he was the Robin Hood of the Caribbean, and they introduced him on national television as the George Washington of Cuba. They were mistaken about Castro.

Phyllis Schlafly, "'Equal Rights" for Women: Wrong Then, Wrong Now," Los Angeles Times, April 8, 2007.

Nearly twenty-five years after the defeat of the Equal Rights Amendment, feminists and their political supporters, who now control Congress, are back at it. Last month, the constitutional measure, now dubbed the Women's Equality Amendment, was reintroduced in the Senate and House, and its prospects, according to one advocate, "are better now than they have been in a very, very long time." But ERA Retro is doomed.

The amendment, which was born around the time that women were given the right to vote, was first introduced in Congress in 1923. For nearly fifty years, all subsequent Congresses had the good judgment to leave it buried in committee.

In 1971, the women's liberation movement burst on the scene and became the darling of the media. Its leaders demanded a gender-neutral society in which men and women would be treated exactly the same, no matter how reasonable it might be to respect differences between them. The amendment, which states that "equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any state on account of sex," was the chosen vehicle to achieve this goal.

A radical feminist organization called the National Organization for Women stormed the halls of Congress and forced a vote on the Equal Rights Amendment. Only twenty-four members in the House, and eight in the Senate, voted against it. On March 22, 1972, Congress sent the amendment to the states, which had seven years to ratify it. The Equal Rights Amendment had a righteous name and incredible momentum. Who would oppose equal rights for women and men? Support was bipartisan, with Sen. Edward M. Kennedy (D-MA) and then Alabama governor George Wallace among its endorsers. Three presidents—Richard Nixon, Gerald Ford, and Jimmy Carter—signed on. Within the first year, thirty of the thirty-eight states needed for ratification passed it, many without holding a hearing on the legislation. The Equal Rights Amendment was actively supported by most of the pushy women's organizations, a consortium of thirty-three women's magazines, numerous Hollywood celebrities, and virtually all the media. The opposition was totally outmanned. We had no Rush Limbaughs, no Fox News, no "no-spin zone" to challenge the need for the amendment. We had no Internet, no e-mail, no fax machines to help rally an opposition.

But the Equal Rights Amendment was rejected. We kicked off our Stop ERA campaign, launched in February 1972, with an article I wrote: "What's Wrong with Equal Rights for Women?" Over the next ten years, nearly one hundred issues of my Phyllis Schlafly Report were devoted to exposing the bad effects of the amendment. . . .

Throughout the 1970s, we presented legislators with our arguments. I testified at forty-one state hearings. Meanwhile, the pro-amendment crowd could not show how the ERA would confer any benefit on women, not even in employment, because employment laws were already gender-neutral.

In 1977, ERA advocates realized that they were approaching the seven-year time limit three states short of the thirty-eight needed for ratification, so they persuaded Congress to give them $5 million to stage a conference, called International Women's Year, in Houston. The conference featured virtually every known feminist leader and received massive media coverage. But it backfired. When conference delegates voted for taxpayer funding of abortions and the entire gay rights agenda, Americans discovered the ERA's hidden agenda.

A couple of months later, a reporter asked the governor of Missouri if he was for the ERA. "Do you mean the old ERA or the new ERA?" he replied. "I was for equal pay for equal work, but after those women went down to Houston and got tangled up with the abortionists and the lesbians, I can tell you ERA will never pass in the Show-Me State." With the expiration clock ticking—March 22,

1979—and ratification uncertain, feminists appealed to Carter and Congress for a time extension and won. The ratification deadline was extended to June 30, 1982.

The American people were so turned off by the extension that no additional state ever passed the ERA. In Idaho v. Freeman, a federal court ruled that the time extension was unconstitutional and that states could constitutionally withdraw their previous support. Five did.

The Supreme Court subsequently ruled that the lawsuit was "moot" because the ERA had not been ratified by either the original deadline or the extension. ERA supporters repeatedly tried to revive the amendment, reintroducing it in Congress in 1983. But the House rejected it. They then tried to persuade individual states to pass the ERA as state constitutional amendments. They got nowhere.

The current plan to revive the amendment is so outrageously dishonest—for instance, backers say both previous time limits can be ignored, that prior court rulings are irrelevant, and that the previous state ratifications are still valid—that it's a wonder anybody could argue it with a straight face. No matter its new name, the same text that has been voted down, again and again, will again be rejected by the American people.