

WHAT REFORM OF THE LEAGUE.

The imminent dangers. The League dying, but not dead. Not sufficient support from public opinion, because issues had not been sufficiently understood.

L. Why did the League fail in the Abyssinian conflict?  
Not because the USA refused to apply oil sanctions.  
But because England was forced to take France's support alone.  
rely on France alone.

The other Great Power, Russia, was not really used, ~~because of its~~  
The British Government split on this issue.

II. Secret weakness of British policy ever since 1933 resp, 1934. 1935

Russia's entrance into Europe. The Pacific situation.

III. Hitler's policy. Everything staked on the anti-Russian card.  
Sir John Simon's difficulty. Unlimited aims. Refusal to settle down.

IV. Collective security not dependent upon an inclusive League, but on an association of the Powers who are sincerely in favor of this principle, (no use linking up those who do not believe in it).

V. Regional idea quite sound. Military sanctions of limitroph powers.  
economic and financial of others.



Prof. Howard  
Urban

Hot Spots in Europe.

I. Optimist point out that what ~~w~~ has been called Hot Spots are rapidly cooling off: ~~FROM~~ Danzig, the Corridor, ~~Fiume, Vilna,~~ the Rhine ~~side~~ / Upper Sileasia, the Saar, almost Rhineland, Chillspots on the map. *by now.*

But pessimist point out that the ~~the~~ temperature has ~~been~~ only been levelled out. The Hot Spots are less hot than they were, but the WHOLE OF THE CONTINENT HAS A HIGHER TEMPERATURE NOW; No hot spots, but a warm Continent. -- moreover new spots are becoming hotter, witness AUSTRIA.

There seems to be no Vilna question between Lithuania and Poland but their relationships have not much improved. You hear of no Fiume between Italy and Jugoslavia, but the Adriatic question is there all the same. But let us KEEP TO GERMANY. The same applies to Danzig and the Corridor between Poland and Germany: only that their armistice has increased at the cost of their common understanding with Russia; Rapallo (one of the few chill Spots of the former situation) has gone, and there is a new hot continent all along the Russian frontier as against Poland and Germany.

But even as to Rhineland, Saar and the Franco-German situation: well the tension has increased enormously since ~~Germany~~ the time ~~when~~ the Rhineland question was in the front. Although all the hot spots have disappeared GERMANY IS NOT MEMBER OF THE LEAGUE ANY MORE AND HAS LEFT THE DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE;

between Germany and France

What does this ~~all~~ signify? Why has the liquidation of the hot spots not cooled down the continent but increased its temperature to a degree more dangerous than ever?

trying to forget

II. It means that the more these single things were settled by people ~~frantically~~ about them, or ~~negotiating~~ or agreeing that they will never agree about them or trying to settle it by compensating themselves at the cost of a third party, or simply by the course of time (Rhineland, the ~~the~~ the Saar), the more it became clear that it was not NOT THESE SINGLE PROVISIONS OF THE TREATIES at all that were at fault, but that THERE WAS SOMETHING WRONG WITH THE WHOLE THING; AND THAT this thing was a thing which was bound to become clearer as TIME PASSED;

THERE WERE ~~THE~~ THINGS THAT GOT BETTER AS TIME PASSED AND

There WERE THOSE THAT BECAME APPARENT AFTER A TIME;

TO PUT IT STRONGLY - It became apparent that there was No treaty System at all. That Versailles had been a ~~anonymous~~ hoax. That the crush



ing victory of the allies had been used to <sup>stage a piece</sup> a peace of mass suggestion of the most unprecedented kind. that is to see a ~~MEMORANDUM~~ System where there was nothing of the kind. Andersen's prince and his new clothes.

What do we mean by No Treaty system?

This : You cannot call a thing a system which no body can understand.

If you say: Now the world got on till now on the basis of force. We call that a system. We will just get on in the same manner as before. Well THIS IS A SYSTEM? ; You may not like it but ~~if~~ you cannot do anything that you understand it. It is the system of force and violence that has reigned in history for times immemorial.

If you say : No we will not have that anymore .The time has come to discard this ghastly thing ,as we have discarded the ravage of pestilence and famine (the moon stage affair once upon a time,) our peral fever, and witchcraft, we will do away with this unchristian institution; we have done away with it inside nations , by establishing law and order on vast territories , WHY SHOULD WE NOT GO ON TO A NEW AREA OF PEACE? So we will have Law and Order rule in the world. We will disarm. and set up a brotherhood of nations of good will. Well this ISA SYSTEM . You might not like it like Mussolini or Hitler who actually think only with disgust of such a squeamish and feminine view of life. but even they would not deny that is a system

BUT IF YOU SAY : Let us have both. Or if you don't say so, BUT DO IT . --Then this is no system. It is just nothing. It is a state of affairs nobody can understand.

Now actually this happened. In the Versailles treaty // both // You know that there were two parties in Versailles. Well they were about this.

And here we must make clear .What is what in the Versailles treaty . This is of fundamental importance.:

A/ Well the territorial and reparation clauses were just the old World. But some of them were definitely good. Some unjust , like the Hungarian frontiers, although nothing like the Hungarians say. The minorityes were not ( and partly could not be) sufficiently safeguarded. But there was also the Disarmament of Germany , to which it will ~~come back~~ return at ~~presently~~ <sup>the present</sup>.

B/ There was the League and the Equality of Small and Big Nations and of Victors and Defeated in the League , And here was the Disarmament Promise of the victors, and finally the Disarmament of Germany as the first in installment of the General Disarmament.

Now what about this disarmament ? Where does it really belong to? <sup>to the victors or the defeated?</sup>

The Disarmament of the Victors was not part of the new World , but the most powerful



## Hot Spots in Europe. (Continued).

application of the principles of the Old.

- a/ Who asked for it? The Gnerelas, mnot Wilson
- b)/ TO what purpose? To safeguard themselves against a revache war  
(Not to begin Disarmament)
- c/ It was also a compensaiton for the Rhine frontier or the Partition of Germany.
- d/ Wilson could not oppose it, because he had acknowledged in the Tripartite Treaty promise that he must safeguard French security.

But there are two things to it:

1/ It was a measure of FORCE

2/ AS such it was an absurd measure. Germany could not never have been kept perpetually disarmed. PERPETUALLY; i.e. turned into angels. This never could have held. YOU can make a colony a mandate, a protectorate of a nation. NOT THE FENCHOF THE GERMANS!:: but you cannot ever keep a small native tribe perpetually disarmed without perpetual control acutal taking charge of the government of that country. So there here there was an inherent absurdity in the Treat. How could it be looked over?

*Carried over  
occupation  
without*

Let us go back to group

B/ The implications of the League were never taken seriously either. League meant: a voluntary association of nations. Now such an association must be based on equality of status. Why? Because if you have no equity, it is an apparatus of rule of the ~~more~~ fully enfranchised ones as against the less enfranchised ones. They would never stand that. Actually the League did not really exist yet, it would have stated to be only after the equality of status had been achieved. Of course equal rights to determine your own armaments is the very essence of international equality of status.

So the A) Force part was absurd.

the B/ Law and right and League was equally absurd. But together they were totally and irreducibly absurd. Moreover they were mutually totally incompatible which one and other.

NOWHERE THE DEUS EX MACHINA CAME IN. A thing that made both parts of the treaty reasonably reasonable and moreover mutually compatible. This was as the disarmament ~~and~~ promise of the victors. If that was held

- 1/ The unilateral disarmament of Germany would have gone
- 2/ The League would have become an ~~and~~ association of equals.
- 3/ The Second part would have become the basis of the whole.

No contradiction between the two parts any more.

But this promise was never quite serious. The one that kept it anyway, never promised it, : USA: And those who promised it, never ~~kept~~ kept it



## Hot Spots in Europe (Continued)

III. How did this extoarodianry situation arise?

The war won by two different means: Tanks and ~~Slogans~~ <sup>Slogans</sup>. Good tanks and true slogans. The one as effective as the other.

The Peace treaties had to mirror both for political reasons of the first order.

With the breakdown of the Disarmament ~~MINIMUM~~ conference, the system broke down utterly.

We must understand that the old thing has gone. Germany is arming and ~~nobody~~ <sup>nobody</sup> is stopping her. That is quite natural. But danger is that the world is even in a worse position than she was before.

A new system must be ~~erected~~ <sup>erected</sup>. And is being erected.

IV; The Responsibilities . THREE PHASES; 19

1914. The Central Powers take the responsibility.

1919 The Victorious Powers take the responsibility for setting up a new system.

1933 ~~MINIMUM~~ Germany takes the responsibility of ~~MINIMUM~~ refusing to work on the basis of League and International Organisation. This has put Germany again into a position in which it is shouldering too much responsibility. If Germany had only decided to demonstrate that things could not go on as they had, to show up that there was no system and to refuse to go on playing the game of make-believe--it would have meant a useful and sound thing to do. BUT GE MANY HAS DONE MORE: It has set up a system which is beyond repair. It has set out on a course of non-cooperation, camouflaged by Machiavellistic ~~MINIMUM~~ promises of peace, but ~~MINIMUM~~ arming in a manner that leaves no doubt as to solution Germany sees to the world situation.

## V. What system can be built up now?

a/ Most regrettable never to build Something that can be called a system.

b/ Law and order at least for the peaceful assured.

c/ The outlawry of War intruded by an Anglo-American moral cooperation. All the great countries that are not directly

*Part I of II to be the basis*









1

The relationship between economic & political institutions in society

- (1) The separation of politics from economic government from industry since the Industrial Revolution.
- (2) The reasons of separate econ. unit?
  - (1) the difference of the needs
  - (2) the institutional set-up.
    - (a) motifs - distinct
    - (b) set of people in charge.
- (3) The original institutional units of society
  - (a) tribal society:  
Tribal raiders (exaggerated)  
cave
  - (b) feudal society:  
distribution: noble vs. peasant
  - (c) city-state
  - (d) mercantilism (regulatory system)

+ family  
+ magic  
+ ceremony (display)  
+ canal

manor }  
church }  
guilds }  
etc. }  
public }  
ecclesiastical }  
nobles }





4) Re separation - a ~~not~~ feature of  
our society.

5) Re economic crisis:  
{ unknown to present  
society  
to medieval etc  
(discourage)

6) Lebanon: Bron. Malinowski  
Crisis & sustan in large  
force

Thoreau:  
Economic of primitive communities

Firth:

Polygenetic Economics.

E. H. Carr:

20 year's crisis:

— o —



# Italy's Place in Europe

One of the most puzzling countries on the map:

Is it the oldest & the newest?

Is it the most civilized & the most crude?

What is its place in Europe?

*The cradle of the  
civilization*

① No connection with ancient Rome:

The dissolution of the Roman empire left desolate  
Europe poor, illiterate & helpless to with-  
stand the tide of Islam. Down from Rome

from IV<sup>th</sup> to IX<sup>th</sup> c. *What we  
call the future was, in then the Past.*

*reforms?  
700's  
dark thinking  
in Italy the most  
desolate of  
all.*

② No connection with the City states of the Renaissance:

*3000 dupi Venice, Florence, Milan  
304,000 factor*

*see route  
the overland route  
spoiled & taxed.*

XIII<sup>th</sup> - XVI<sup>th</sup> centuries. *and later workshop*

The Atlantic enters. *Venice still the political  
Economic disaster. People*

But: Banking: *capitalism*  
Statecraft: *secular states*  
Arts + letters: *the Renaissance  
humanism*

*Venice 500 years!*

Europe an Italian construct.

*materially delayed  
Italy starts later...*

③ Modern Italy hardly 100 years old: from first  
generation to now. 1789\* Poor, politically

*re-organized, backward, corrupt, disunited, debased.*

USA a model  
else  
nation;  
with more  
unity;  
industrial;  
& conservative.

{  
Slavery & the railway before us  
nationalism  
(1) Napoleonic  
(2) idealistic nationalism  
internationalist  
anti-clerical  
populism (liberal)  
Cavour.  
Garibaldi  
Lombard  
Lombard

[ Chapter of Industrial Revolution ]  
Politically: French Revolution  
Mazzini  
Garibaldi  
Cavour.

④ Technical-liberal *trip revision, Lombard*  
Cavour: **BUILDING A NATION.**



# Germany & Italy

A similar course of history:

- (a) In the X - XIIth centuries the core of Europe.
  - Age of Roman Empire - neither of the three.
  - In the M. A both rise high, in power & wealth.
- (b) Age of discovery leaves them high & dry.
  - Backwaters
  - The Mediterranean - a lake
  - The Baltic - a lake.

(c) Thirty years war - ravaged, freed, southern  
250y of Middle Ages 350y in half

(d) small principalities late industrialization -  
awakened by the French Revolution

Steinhardenburg  
Rheinbund  
Wars of Liberation

- (a) Napoleon destroyed
- (b) new constitutional national spirit awakened
- Repealing of laws of 1813/14
- Resolutions of 1845-1848

(e) New state born of 1870 is  
military origin, new units, power;  
no colonies; democracy, universal suffrage & public education  
but all brought into existence by the State  
Both engaged in nation building by similar methods

## Italy - a great Power.

No: The eternal "Junior partner"

natural resources: No coal, iron  
 illiterate  
 long coast  
 80% per sq  
 80% per hectare  
 Jaunbran & German power in the East.  
 Helped by France, England & Prussia  
 1866  
 1871  
 1874  
 1882 (Triple Alliance)  
 1904

1896 Adowa and 11y of disaster  
1912 Italian war

(c) No Church People Conitabils  
Not like NAZI  
Nothing up to 1935  
(Not old & used but NEW & CRUDE.



The reconstruction of Europe.

The problem of Germany.

Last night's talk. Smith

Whether Germany should be treated leniently or not. A most important question. Nobody would deny that the treatment would have its consequences. But the result of the investigation is negative. Smith's arguments unsound.

I.e. whatever way Germany is treated, the problem proves still insoluble. The trouble is that (1) there is no going back on the ~~unpleasant~~ destruction caused because some of it was necessary

- a. independent sovereignties,      Napoleonic paral
- b. international gold standard      I am counter-rev
- c. ~~laissez-faire~~ capitalism      but not reactiona
- laissez-faire      ary.

(2) there is only a going forward. No ghost of a chance of being accepted whether we treat them leniently or the other way.

(3) we must know what we want the Germans to adjust to. No use saying that it is a 'decent' world unless we can say how it solves

- a. national minority issue
- b. the unemployment issue
- c. international cooperation especially economic.

Like feudal nobles ...

The old competition was that decency is enough.

Consequently, the settling of the German issue is self-delusion.

Closely interlinked: ..... political and economic order  
and the German problem.

Racial problems: { colonial  
racial union

{ independent sov. — unemployment  
economic — part (internat coop) —  
polit & economic

- (1) old order destroyed — polit economic internat
- (2) New order: close federation economically controlled planned economic union
- (3) comradal union colonial nation union

Koch's book case



Non-adjustable  
Interdependence



## Can British democracy survive?

Give the last ten minutes to the question whether it can survive or not.  
Can a libertarian, non-equalitarian democracy survive?

1. What is British democracy?

2. How has it become what it is?

3. What are the chances of it being able to change in the necessary way?

### I. What is British Democracy?

French and American.

**LIBERTY & EQUALITY.**

Can a libertarian, non-equalitarian democracy survive?

condition.

A method, not a ~~condition~~ of society.

The typical institutions absent: universal suffrage  
national education.

### II. How has it become what it is?

The history of Br. democracy is both the history of liberty and equality.  
But only liberty has a tradition.

#### A. The Crown and the Barons.

Hammer and Anvil of Br. Democracy.

a. Individual liberty, restriction of autocracy;

b. social equality.

Parliament wins.

#### B. Economic causes

aa Constitutionism developed at a time when the Industrial Revolution had not yet taken place.

bb The working class has no historical tradition, no class consciousness as playing a role, **prospectiveness**,

cc Weakness ~~of~~ of towns. Middle class no culture of its own. Men like Gresham were exceptions.

**Tons the victims of peace.**

dd **Rural culture:** industrialisation of the countryside.

Even the Industrial Revolution rural in the first half.

ee The working ~~man~~ class congregated in the cultural vacuum of the new towns.

#### C Religious reasons: Anabaptism did not make headway.

The Independents not Levellers.

The Agreement of the People excluded from the vote the wage earner.



2.

3. What are the chances of its being able to change in the necessary direction?

Is a move towards more equality possible?

a. The totalitarian states . proceed to a reconditioning of the population

aa uniformity ~~un~~essential  
bb regimentation ~~un~~essential.

b. ~~reconditioning~~  
reform of the educational system maybe the first step.  
radical measures will have to be taken .



Can British Democracy survive?

Answer:

Br. Democracy can survive, if

- a the working classes of this country are prepared ~~to make a full contribution to the political life of this country i.e. to take their full share in the leadership and responsibility;~~ and able to make a full contribution to the political life of this country i.e. to take their full share in the leadership and responsibility;
- b if the extension of democracy to ~~the industrial system~~ society as a whole including the ~~industrial system~~ can be brought about in time;
- c if a national system of education can be developed - ~~an~~ an education which the parents can pass on to their children

All that we can do is to ~~improve~~ <sup>improve</sup> increase the intellectual armoury of the working classes, so that they may ~~see~~ <sup>understand</sup> their position in society clearer as well as the tasks which may lie ahead.

— . —



British Democracy.

Social and Historical Background of the Br. W. Dem.

What is Br. Democracy and what are the chances of its survival?

British democracy - a system of government built upon the idea of liberty.

It consists in a method of discussion and leadership which is designed to secure two ends:

- "to get things done" and to get them done with the least possible interference with the liberty of individuals or groups of individuals.
- a Protection of dissenting minorities, whether regional racial or religious
- b Limiting the power of governments and consequently, restricting the functions of the State -- are essential to such a system.

This is very different from Continental democracy which is an aim of government and consists mainly in equality -- the opposite of an aristocracy. (Universal suffrage and effective educational equality - are its characteristic institutions.)

~~American Democracy is both more equal and more free than these two but is much weaker in getting things done than either.~~

Liberty and Equality.

Now, how is it possible that equality is not a feature of English Democracy - although serfdom was abolished in this country at least 300 years before it was in France and some Continental countries?

The answer is that in reality Br. constitutional history is both a history of liberty and equality, but the constitution as it stands was formulated by the forces which stood for liberty, not for equality. English liberty has a long history, English equality has not.

The history of liberty and equality in this country.

The perpetual conflict between King and baron was the chief political factor in the development of political democracy in this country.

- Its results were twofold:
- a. Establishing individual liberty on a constitutional basis by limiting the power of the King and his central administration;
  - b. Raising the social and political status of the common people & thus allowing them to participate in the privileges secured for themselves.

In this struggle parliament was victorious. Consequently the King had a bad press. The history of liberty was written, the history of equality was not.

Tudor despotism may have been despotic, but it was so towards the powerful lords; the King's rule was not arbitrary personal rule, but that of his administration;

- c) his courts were the powerful instruments of social equality in this country
  - d) Tudor legislation was the instrument of social welfare in the country (against enclosures; Poor law etc.)
- Statute of Apprentices b. Canalising the new forces.

Answer: the stability of democracy etc. what purpose?

Taken off 2

Welfare policy

a. Preventing unemployment b. Preventing the effect of job sudden change



upholding a class society, but

e. The Tudor and Stuart despotism was certainly less of a class rule than that of parliament. For in parliament, "interests" were represented - interests which had no tradition, and of considering the whole ~~others~~ but their own interests of

f. together with the Crown, feudalism also had a bad press, for it was not feudalism which was vicious but the the squirearchy. It was rural but entirely in unison with ~~the~~ commercial and trading ~~wealth~~ wealth.

Barons, like the

The following points ~~will~~ <sup>can</sup> emerge concerning

The lack of equalisation Tradition English liberty is, primarily, constitutional

Libertarian!!  
liberty not linked  
with any form of  
equality

a. English liberty is not an offspring of liberalism. It is an inheritance of the ~~fundamental~~ feudal idea (cf the Magna Charta) of contractual relationship between the lord and his ~~tenants~~ tenants - in chief. In spite of William the Conqueror's great ~~success~~ initial success, this principle could not be eliminated ~~as the~~ as the principle of constitutionalism.

The liberties i.e. privileges are the substance of B. liberty.  
Tyranny or despotism is not a feudal characteristic. The feudal characteristic is the functional limitation of powers. The church over the hurchman, the lord over the vassal as his vassal, over his tenant as his tenant i.e. within the limits of custom. The great feature of feudalism is liberty - contractually ordered liberty -- at its best. At its worst it is anarchy and chaos -- not tyranny. Its greatest weakness was lack of effective central authority. (England had achieved both).

The absence of central

b. English liberty was not won by the <sup>industrial</sup> ~~middle~~ middle class <sup>rural middle classes</sup> in conjunction with the working class, but by the ~~commercial and financial middle class~~ commercial and financial middle class ~~jointly with the landed gentry~~. In consequence ~~sociality~~ <sup>equality</sup> did not become a feature of the new liberty. **The Industrial revolution had not yet been** ~~happened~~ <sup>happened</sup>. There was no industrial working class - in fact the retainers ~~had~~ had to be forced to serve in Cromwell's army.

Summed up in British Democracy  
Constitutionalism

c. Constitutionalism is the ~~real~~ meaning of British democracy. Constitutionalism came in England earlier than in other countries, because the expansion of trade caused an increase in state expenditure which the Crown could not meet, ~~any more~~. Thus the attempt to meeting it led to arbitrary extension of powers. ~~But that this was presented had for~~ two reasons <sup>by the middle class</sup> ~~contrary to the interests of the whole~~

the new important taxes had to be rationalised in order to ~~be~~ <sup>be</sup> ~~carry~~ (cf. monopoly struggle)



~~new~~ public loans could not be ~~utilised~~ <sup>at all</sup> without an intimate knowledge <sup>on the part of</sup> the trading community of the ~~main~~ <sup>pains</sup> pains of the government and of safeguards for the ~~productive~~ <sup>correct</sup> use of the funds.

Thus

The main reason for the lack of equality lies in the ~~main~~ <sup>main</sup> conditions of the period in which the constitution was established and consequently

- a. the forces which brought it in;
- b. the kind of national interests which it was designed to serve.

The common people of the country may have even sympathised with the King. Certainly on the continent they did (Vendee). Altogether the ~~reverse~~ <sup>reverse</sup> is ~~certainly~~ <sup>certainly</sup> true i.e. ~~in the reverse case i.e.~~ <sup>in the reverse case i.e.</sup> ~~opposite~~ <sup>opposite</sup>

- d. equalitarian democracy on the Continent and the type of class consciousness of the working classes ~~was~~ <sup>is</sup> mainly due to the fact that
  - aa the constitution was brought about after the Industrial Revolution i.e. partly ~~with~~ <sup>to some degree</sup> with the help of the working classes;
  - bb that in consequence the workers have ~~a~~ <sup>historical</sup> historical tradition and consciousness which ~~constitutes~~ <sup>constitutes</sup> them ~~into~~ a class.

II. The economic background of the Br. democracy.

*the industrial revolution plays no role in it relevant*

It is quite simple Great Britain has ~~an~~ <sup>retained a feudal</sup> ~~an~~ <sup>an</sup> ~~unbroken~~ <sup>unbroken</sup> rural past. The undisturbed "countryside" is ~~true~~ <sup>true</sup> in more than one sense.

The Industrial Revolution <sup>came</sup> ~~came~~ <sup>very late</sup> indeed. The great development of industries happened long before the Industrial Revolution in the woollen industry. The only country perhaps in the world, where industrialisation was not urban. This explains the rural atmosphere of England. For the wealth was due

to commerce and trade-- the ever expanding world market. Since Elisabeth time it has never ceased to expand-- until recently.

Two poles of Br. economic development : a the ~~feudal~~ <sup>feudal</sup> rural background b the ever expanding world market.

From times:

- 1. Black Death + (W) ~~adoms~~ 1360
- 2. ~~enormous~~ (1750) 1570
- 3. ~~Spencer~~ 1820 is

- 2/ the capacity ~~for~~ <sup>for</sup> overcoming the social catastrophies ~~which~~ <sup>which</sup> ~~more~~ <sup>more</sup> than others was visited by;
- 3/ the retention of ~~feudal~~ <sup>feudal</sup> forms of life (of land tenure) ; the genteel atmosphere of the countryside.

4/ finally, the fitting in of industrial developments imperfectly, <sup>TOWNS</sup>

5) the ~~weakness~~ <sup>weakness</sup> of the working class. <sup>comparative</sup> <sup>most</sup> <sup>Early</sup> Capitalism



**The moral and religious factor.**

The religious factor in the Constitutional struggle was between the more conservative forms of Church insisting on unity of ritual and the ~~more personal and live~~ religion of the Reformation which stood for unity of doctrine - the great symbol of ~~the~~ <sup>awakening</sup> personal religion. But the presbyterian Parliament was far from being liberal or tolerant - ~~it~~ was less so than some of the latitudinarian Church people). And as for toleration - Cromwell was shatter on the rock of intolerance. (Although far from being socially or in religion a radical, he stood ~~for the~~ in a prophetic way for tolerance, perhaps the first dictator in history who was involved in ~~the~~ the tragedy of spreading liberty at the point of the sword.). A successor of Dshingiss Chan, and perhaps a forerunner of Stalin.)

*instances  
Diogenes  
Cure*

The meaning of Br. individualism thus was limiting the powers of ~~the~~; not allowing it to absorb the jurisdiction of local government; the sphere of voluntary organisation;

Not unlimited competition, but limitation of the sphere of state intervention became the feature of Br. individualism. This was not very fortunate

b in education (where state intervention always meant into ~~rap~~ in England - pathetic summary into Encyclopedia Britannica)

a liberal individualism could later pose as liberty; id est, the freedom of the individual was understood as freedom from all restraint including the restraint which voluntary organisation, etc?? had ~~achieved~~ achieved in the Middle Ages.

*Spontaneous checks in - [Lowe]*

**Educational conclusions.**

The military safety and the economic security ~~in~~ which ~~the~~ ~~development~~ made such a development possible may not obtain in the future. British democracy may be put to the test.

Its strength lies in the great measure of liberty it has given and the education in citizenship which it has provided in this way.

*voluntary  
activity*

Its weakness lies in the lack of equalitarian consciousness ~~in a~~ *at a time*

*lies*



when all the important countries in the world are unifying their cultural systems on the biggest scale -- not in the sense of uniformity but in the sense of bringing the working classes into the <sup>same</sup> ~~one~~ cultural and educational level with the ~~the~~ other classes of the population. (Let us make no mistake about it that this has nothing to do with uniformity. This is a genuine democratisation of culture).

- The British working class <sup>has</sup> had not the advantage of
- a having had a historical rôle, a historical responsibility, a class consciousness based on its contribution to national life;
  - b the lack of an urban type of civilisation-- your industrial towns were not the continuation of the medieval township as in Germany France or Italy-- but an agglomeration of horrors due to the unforeseen needs of the industrial system especially in the ~~North~~ Midlands and North;
  - c the lack of a cultural continuity with the yeoman, the medieval craftsman, the farmer;
  - d the lack of a national education; instead you have various education and each of them forms a class; it is no use providing for the opportunity for various classes, as long as the education itself separates the nations instead of unifying it. [*and needs of the working class persons*]

Recently I chanced to talk with a north country worker who is now living in London. ~~He said a phrase which struck in my mind~~ He said a phrase which struck in my mind: We need an education which the parents can pass on to their children. This ~~may~~ may sound absurd, but I think that what he was trying to express a great truth.

And that <sup>truth</sup> may contain the secret of the survival of British democracy.

.....