

THE MAKING OF MODERN EUROPE

HIST 202-003

Candler Library 114
Fall 2006
MWF 2:00pm-2:50pm
Office Hours: W, 12:00pm-1:30pm
Th, 3:00pm-5:00pm

Mr. Scott A. Gavorsky
122 Trimble Hall
Phone: (404) 727-4027
sgavors@learnlink.emory.edu

This course is an introduction to European history from the mid-seventeenth to the late twentieth century. This period was incredibly vibrant, with many of the conflicts of these centuries continuing to resonate within contemporary European societies and, in some cases, far beyond. We will be examining some of the major themes and events of European political, economic, and social life over this period.

A major focus of this course will be the development of mass societies. Economic changes disrupted traditional lifestyles and forced large numbers of people into cities ill-prepared for them. Government officials in new bureaucracies became an increasingly common feature of everyday life, giving rise to debates of the rights of individuals in society. New means of communication—from letter-writing to newspapers to advertising—and spreading literacy opened new lands and new ideas to increasingly inquisitive populations. Forms of associational life from corporations to political movements to special interest societies utilized all these changes in promoting their goals to ever-larger groups of people—often with violent outcomes. As you study the readings, ask yourself both in what ways the ideas expressed by the authors are influenced by the development of mass societies and how various groups in society might interpret and act upon the ideas expressed.

The three main goals of this course are:

1. To introduce you to the major events and chronological sequence of modern European history.
2. To introduce you to the major issues and themes of this history, and the debates over them as seen through the eyes of the participants themselves and by historians seeking to understand the past. To this end, you will be reading a large number of primary and secondary works.
3. To introduce you to the basic techniques of the historical profession, especially those needed for analyzing both primary and secondary material. Some of these techniques will be useful to you in whatever major you are pursuing at Emory.

READINGS

All books are available at the Emory Bookstore.

TEXTS: Kagan, Ozment and Turner, *The Western Heritage, Volume II: Since 1648*, 9th ed.
Molière, *The Bourgeois Gentleman*
Marx, Karl and Friedrich Engels. *The Communist Manifesto*
Conklin, Alice and Ian Christopher Fletcher, *European Imperialism, 1830-1930*.
Levi, Primo. *Survival in Auschwitz*.
Turabian, Kate L. *A Manual for Writers of Term Papers, Theses, and Dissertations*. Sixth Edition.

BLACKBOARD: Most daily readings are available through the class Blackboard site; assume that any readings not listed above are available through Blackboard unless noted otherwise. You will want to print a copy out for reference during class discussions.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS

1) This course requires the fulfillment of all class assignments and participation in class activities. Key to fulfilling these requirements is regular class attendance and turning in assignments on time. **All overdue assignments will be penalized 1 letter grade per day (including weekends and holidays).** *In the case of an emergency—serious illness or death of family member—arrangements will be made after the student has obtained an excuse from the Dean's Office.*

2) **Remember that the Emory University Honor Code applies to all work undertaken in this course. Infractions of the Honor Code, especially cheating and plagiarism, will be handled with the greatest possible severity.** It is your responsibility to understand the provisions of the Code and comply with it: http://www.college.emory.edu/current/standards/honor_code.html.

All citations for this class will need to follow the Turabian (also known as the Chicago) format, given in Kate L. Turabian, *A Manual for Writers*, sixth edition.

3) For class discussions, you will need to come to class having read all assignments and prepared to discuss the issues they raise; bring the readings and your notes to class with you each day. The textbook readings will provide background information for the week's topics, assist you in establishing a basic chronology, and help place the additional readings in their historical context.

4) Pop quizzes will be given throughout the semester. These will be short quizzes drawn from the day's readings, and will be given at the beginning of class. **There will be no make-up quizzes.**

5) **This course does not fulfill the College Writing requirements.** Writing, however, is an important component of the course, and three written papers are required. These will be graded on both content (accuracy, argument and evidence) and writing (grammar, syntax, clarity, structure and style).

6) E-Mail Policy and Blackboard Conference: I will be checking e-mail several times a week, but not necessarily everyday. Please do not expect quick replies to all questions. **Note, however, I will not accept papers through e-mail or file attachment.** There will also be a Blackboard site where I will be posting items of interest to the entire class (including information on extra-credit opportunities). You will want to check Blackboard a few times over the course of a week.

7) Extra-Credit: Throughout the semester, there might be some talks of interest to our class. I will post these on the Blackboard site as extra credit opportunities. Generally, you will be asked to attend the talk and do a brief write-up. Events and instructions will be posted on Blackboard as appropriate.

GRADING

• CLASS PARTICIPATION/QUIZZES	20%	
• MAP TEST	5%	(Given 13 September 2006)
• SCAVENGER HUNT ASSIGNMENT	20%	(Due 4 October 2006)
• SHORT ESSAY	25%	(Due 3 November 2006)
• <u>FINAL PAPER</u>	30%	(Due 14 December 2006)
	100%	

WEEKLY CALENDAR

Friday, 1 Sep. Class Introduction

Week 1: Europe, the World, and Seventeenth Century Crises

Monday, 4 Sep. *NO CLASS: Labor Day Holiday*

Wednesday, 6 Sep. Kagan, Chapter 13, “European State Consolidation,” pgs. 416-451

Friday, 8 Sep. Hobbes, *Leviathan*, chaps. 13, 17-18
 Kagan, Chapter 14, “New Directions in Thought and Culture,” pgs.
 462-464 (info on Hobbes)
DISCUSS SCAVENGER HUNT PROJECT

NOTE: Friday, 8 September 2006 is last day for add/drop

Week 2: Reaction to Crises: Absolutism, Constitutionalism and the Examination of Society

Monday, 11 Sep. Locke, selections from *Second Treatise Concerning Government*
 Kagan, Chapter 14, pgs. 464-466 (info on Locke)

Wednesday, 13 Sept. **MAP TEST**
 Kagan, Chapter 15, “Society and Economy Under the Old
 Regime,” pgs. 480-513

Friday, 15 Sept. Kagan, Chapter 14, “New Directions in Thought and Culture,”
 pgs. 452-479

Week 3: Life in the Old Regime

Monday, 18 Sept. Molière, *The Bourgeois Gentleman*

Wednesday, 20 Sept. Molière, *The Bourgeois Gentleman*

Friday, 22 Sept. Kagan, Chapter 16, “The Transatlantic Economy, Trade Wars, and
 Colonial Rebellions,” pgs. 514-549
Last Day to Choose Topic for Scavenger Hunt

NOTE: Friday, 22 September 2006 at 4:00pm is the last day for L/G-S/U grade changes and withdrawals without penalty.

Week 4: The Enlightenment and Eighteenth Century Crises

- Monday, 25 Sept. MEET IN WOODRUFF LIBRARY 312
Library Research Lesson
Turn in (1) Primary Source and (1) Secondary Source for
Scavenger Hunt at beginning of class (quiz grade).
- Wednesday, 27 Sept. Kagan, Chapter 17, “The Age of Enlightenment,” pgs. 550-591
Kant, “What is Enlightenment?”
- Friday, 29 Sept. Rousseau, selections from *The Social Contract*

Week 5: The French Revolution

- Monday, 2 Oct. Kagan, Chapter 18, “The French Revolution,” pgs. 592-625
- Wednesday, 4 Oct. SCAVENGER HUNT DUE AT BEGINNING OF CLASS
Cahier des doléances of the Third Estate, Parish of Saint-Vaast
Peasant Grievances of the Parish of Montjoy-Vaufrey
Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen
- Friday, 6 Oct. Edmund Burke, selections from *Reflections on the Revolution in France*;
Robespierre, “On the Principles of Political Morality”
DISCUSS SHORT ESSAY PAPER

Week 6: Revolution and Reaction: New Ideologies

- Monday, 9 Oct. *NO CLASS: Fall Break*
- Wednesday, 11 Oct. Kagan, Chapter 19, “The Age of Napoleon,” pgs. 626-655
Kagan, Chapter 20, “The Conservative Order,” pgs. 656-688
- Friday, 13 Oct. *NO CLASS: Work on Short Essay*

Week 7: The Springtime of Peoples: Economies, Ideologies, and Revolutions

- Monday, 16 Oct. Kagan, Chapter 21, “Economic Advance and Social Unrest,” pgs. 688-722
“Poverty Knock” (song lyrics)
- Wednesday, 18 Oct. Adam Smith, selections from *The Wealth of Nations*
- Friday, 20 Oct. Marx and Engels, *The Communist Manifesto*

Week 8: Nationalism and Sciences of Populations and Differences

- Monday, 23 Oct. Kagan, Chapter 22, “The Age of Nation-States,” pgs. 730-759
Mazzini, “Duties to Country”
Last Day to Get Primary Source Approved for Short Essay Paper
- Wednesday, 25 Oct. Kagan, Chapter 24, “The Birth of Modern European Thought,”
pgs. 797-824
- Friday, 27 Oct. Pearson, selections from *National Life from the Standpoint of
Science*
Anne McClintock, “Advertising the Empire,” in Conklin and
Fletcher, pgs. 149-156

Week 9: The New Publics

- Monday, 30 Oct. Vanessa Schwartz, *Spectacular Realities*, chapter 2: “Public Visits
to the Morgue”
- Wednesday, 1 Nov. Kagan, Chapter 23, “The Building of European Supremacy,” pgs.
760-793
Kagan, Chapter 24, pgs. 794-796
- Friday, 3 Nov. **SHORT ESSAY DUE AT BEGINNING OF CLASS**
Discussion: Entertainment, Science, Empire and Publics

Week 10: Europe and the World: the New Imperialism

- Monday, 6 Nov. Kagan, Chapter 25, pages 826-838; 870-875
Conklin and Fletcher, “Introduction,” pgs. 1-9
Rosa Luxemburg, “Capitalism Depends on the Non-Capitalist
World”, in Conklin and Fletcher, pgs. 29-35
- Wednesday, 8 Nov. Rudyard Kipling, “The White Man’s Burden”
Conklin, “The French Republican Civilizing Mission,” both in
Conklin and Fletcher, pgs. 58-66
- Friday, 10 Nov. Julia Clancy-Smith, “Saint or Rebel? Resistance in French North
Africa,” in Conklin and Fletcher, pgs. 196-204
George Orwell, “Shooting an Elephant”
Discuss Final Paper Assignment

Week 11: The Great War and the Autumn of Peoples

- Monday, 13 Nov. Kagan, Chapter 25, “Imperialism, Alliances, and War,” pages 836-
869
Scheidemann, “The Hour We Yearned For”; Doregelès, “That
Fabulous Day”

Wednesday, 15 Nov. John Maynard Keynes, selections from *The Economic Consequences of the Peace*

Friday, 17 Nov. Arthur Koestler, selections from *The God That Failed*

Week 12: Interwar Crises and the Questioning of Belief

Monday, 20 Nov. Kagan, chapter 26, “Political Experiments of the 1920s,” pgs. 876-905

Wednesday, 22 Nov. Lenin, selections from *What is to Be Done?*
Mussolini, selections from *Fascist Doctrine*

Friday, 24 Nov. *NO CLASS: Thanksgiving Holiday*

Week 13: Totalitarianism, the Second World War, and Victims

Monday, 27 Nov. Kagan, chapter 27, “Europe and the Great Depression,” pgs. 906-938

Wednesday, 29 Nov. Hitler, selections from *Mein Kampf*: “Nation and Race”
Kagan, chapter 28, “World War II,” pgs. 938-948 and 960-967

Friday, 1 Dec. Levi, *Survival in Auschwitz*, 22-37 (“On the Bottom”); 77-100 (“This Side of Good and Evil”); 151-173 (“The Story of Ten Days”)

Week 14: The Post-War Order and the Cold War

Monday, 4 Dec. Kagan, Chapter 29, “The Cold War Era and the Emergence of a New Europe,” pgs. 978-1023

Wednesday, 6 Dec. Churchill, Fulton Speech
Khrushchev, selections from *Speech at the XXth Party Congress*

Friday, 8 Dec. Kagan, chapter 30, “The West at the Dawn of the Twenty-First Century,” pgs 1028-1031 and 1034-1035
Mikhail Gorbachev, selection from *Perestroika*
Vaclav Havel, selection from *Living in Truth*

Week 15: Brave New Worlds

Monday, 11 Dec. Kagan, Chapter 30, “The West at the Dawn of the 21st Century,” pgs. 1024-1052

FINAL PAPER DUE ON THURSDAY, 14 DECEMBER 2006, AT 11:00am IN BOX OUTSIDE OFFICE (end of final exam period for this class)

HISTORY 202-003: LIBRARY SCAVENGER HUNT

Due: Monday, 27 September 2004, at 2:50pm in box outside office door (Bowden 125)

There are four goals for this assignment:

- 1) To improve your familiarity with library research tools and practices;
- 2) To clarify the difference between primary and secondary sources;
- 3) To give you greater knowledge about one significant event or person drawn from the first part of the class;
- 4) To help us identify your writing strengths and weaknesses in advance of the longer papers due this semester.

Choose one of the items below and track down information on it through resources in the library, as if you were planning on doing a research paper on the topic. Prepare a two-page essay that identifies the person or event and, most important, *that explains its historical significance*. Using the format in Turabian, prepare a two-page bibliography for your imaginary research paper (we will discuss this more in class). *The bibliography must divide the sources into primary and secondary sources*. You should seek out not only resources available at Emory, but also those owned at other institutions. *Note, however, that most websites are not valid as sources; any websites will need to be approved in advance by me.*

To select your item, reply to the Learnlink message for this assignment so that everyone else in the class can see your message. Only one person can do each item; all items are first come, first serve. Check the preceding messages to make sure that no one else has already picked the item you want. REPLY BY MONDAY, 20 SEPTEMBER 2004. I will update the main list as items are selected.

The project will consist of three major components, assembled in the following order:

- 1) A typed, 2-page essay explaining the item and describing its historical significance.
- 2) A bibliography that lists both primary and secondary sources. We will discuss the differences between these two kinds of sources in class. The bibliography should be organized as follows (with all entries in Turabian format):
8-10 Primary Sources (contemporary memoirs, correspondence of major actors in events, prints, newspaper articles). Include the library call numbers if we own the sources; indicate the location of those we do not own.
8-10 Secondary Sources (books—preferably monographs but not textbooks—and articles written by historians of the item selected). Include the library call numbers if we own the sources; indicate the location of those we do not own.
- 3) A copy of a filled-out electronic Interlibrary Loan (ILL) form for an item that Emory does not own. Print it out to turn in with your assignment, *but DO NOT submit it to the ILL department for processing*.

REMEMBER THAT THE EMORY HONOR CODE IS IN EFFECT

Note: For this particular assignment, students should feel free to talk with each other concerning possible sources for their particular topics.

LIST OF SCAVENGER HUNT TOPICS:

- 1) **Bethlem Royal Hospital, London**
- 2) **Algernon Sidney (1622-1683)**
- 3) ***The Complete English Tradesman (1725-1727)***
- 4) **Clapham Sect**
- 5) **Catharine Macauley (1731-1791)**
- 6) **Josiah Wedgwood (1730-1795)**
- 7) **Physiocrats**
- 8) **William Murray, first earl of Mansfield (1705-1793)**
- 9) **Excise Crisis of 1733**
- 10) **John Wilkes (1725-1797)**
- 11) **The Flour War of 1775**
- 12) **The Somerset Case (1772)**
- 13) **Robert Clive (1725-1774)**
- 14) **Arthur Young (1741-1820)**
- 15) **Filippo Michele Buonarroti (1761-1837)**
- 16) **Suzanne Necker**
- 17) **United Irishmen**
- 18) **Sir Robert Sibbald (1641-1718)**
- 19) **William Hogarth (1697-1764)**
- 20) **Gordon Riots**
- 21) **Asiento**
- 22) **Ephraim Chambers, *Cyclopaedia* (1728)**
- 23) **William Molyneux (1656-1698)**
- 24) **Seline Hastings, the Countess of Huntingdon (1707-1791)**
- 25) **Battle of Culloden (1745)**
- 26) ***Christianity Not Mysterious* (1696)**
- 27) **Lady Mary Wortley Montagu**
- 28) **Richard Steele (1672-1729)**
- 29) **Bubble Act of 1721**
- 30) ***The Horse-Hoing Husbandry* (1733)**

HIST 202-003: FINAL ANALYTICAL ESSAY ASSIGNMENT

Due: Thursday, 14 December 2006, at 12:00 am in box outside office door (Trimble 122)

You are to write an eight (8) to ten (10) page paper (not including notes, bibliography or title page) developing a *causal argument* on **ONE** of the two historical events described in the attached documents. The basic format should follow Turabian (clear, legibly-sized font, standard margins, all pages numbered, paper stapled). The paper should be organized as follows:

- 1) Typed 8-10 page essay (Do Not Exceed Ten (10) Pages!), including all of the following:
 - a) An introduction to the event, including a thesis statement of your argument;
 - b) The body, in which you develop your argument through engaging with the historical evidence (see below for more details). You should also make direct reference to the documents you use—in other words, you will need to use footnotes or endnotes;
 - c) Conclusion
- 2) A bibliography, divided into primary and secondary sources following the format outlined in Turabian.

Attached to these instructions is a packet containing a collection of 4 primary documents. These are broken down into two topics, each with two primary sources. **Choose ONE of these topics for your paper:**

Solidarity and Martial Law in Poland, 1980-1982

- 1) "The Twenty-One Demands" of the Inter-Factory Strike Committee of the Gdansk Shipyard.
- 2) "Colonel Wislicki Speaks" before employees of the official Polish TV and Radio station.

The British Referendum on the European Common Market in 1975

- 1) Margaret Thatcher, Speech to the Conservative Group for Europe, 16 April 1975.
- 2) National Referendum Campaign, *Why You Should Vote NO* pamphlet, 1974.

A copy of these sources will be available as a .PDF on the Blackboard site for your reference. I have included citation information for all of these sources, which you should put in your bibliography. To complete this assignment, you **MUST** have at least **ONE** other primary source and at least **TWO** secondary sources (not encyclopedias or textbooks) to adequately complete this paper. You will need to add these sources to your bibliography in the proper format.

You are expected to draw on the secondary sources you find, as well as class readings and discussions, to identify the significant ideas, events, or problems (I recommend everyone start by constructing a simple chronology of events) that appear in the attached documents. **Note that you need to use the attached documents as part of the evidence for your argument; I am expecting to see each of the primary documents cited in your paper.** To assist you further, I have put some relevant books on Reserve at the library (remember the Reference section as well) for each of the topics.

REMEMBER THAT THE EMORY HONOR CODE IS IN EFFECT

http://www.college.emory.edu/current/standards/honor_code.html

The Twenty-One Demands

of the striking workforces represented on the Inter-Factory Strike Committee of Gdansk Shipyard

The following are the Committee Demands:

1. Acceptance of free trade unions independent of the Communist Party and of enterprises, in accordance with convention No. 87 of the International Labour Organisation concerning the right to form free trade unions, which was ratified by the Communist Government of Poland.
2. A guarantee of the right to strike and of the security of strikers and those aiding them.
3. Compliance with the constitutional guarantee of freedom of speech, the press and publication, including freedom for independent publishers, and the availability of the mass media to representatives of all faiths.
4. (a) A return of former rights to:
 - People dismissed from work after the 1970 and 1976 strikes.
 - Students expelled from school because of their views.(b) The release of all political prisoners, among them Edmund Zdrozinski, Jan Kozlowski and Marek Kozlowski.
- (c) A halt in repression of the individual because of personal conviction.
5. Availability to the mass media of information about the formation of the Interfactory Strike Committee and publication of its demands.
6. The undertaking of actions aimed at bringing the country out of its crisis situation by the following means:
 - (a) Making public complete information about the social-economic situation.
 - (b) Enabling all sectors and social classes to take part in discussion of the reform programme.
7. Compensation of all workers taking part in the strike for the period of the strike, with vacation pay from the Central Council of Trade Unions.
8. An increase in the base pay of each worker by 2,000 zlotys (7£30) a month as compensation for the recent rise in prices.

220

9. Guaranteed automatic increases in pay on the basis of increases in prices and the decline in real income.
10. A full supply of food products for the domestic market, with exports limited to surpluses.
11. The abolition of 'commercial' prices and of other sales for hard currency in special shops.
12. The selection of management personnel on the basis of qualifications, not party membership. Privileges of the secret police, regular police and party apparatus are to be eliminated by equalizing family subsidies, abolishing special stores, etc.
13. The introduction of food coupons for meat and meat products (during the period in which control of the market situation is regained).
14. Reduction in the age for retirement for women to 50 and for men to 55, or after 30 years' employment in Poland for women and 35 years for men, regardless of age.
15. Conformity of old-age pensions and annuities with what has actually been paid in.
16. Improvements in the working conditions of the health service to insure full medical care for workers.
17. Assurances of a reasonable number of places in day-care centres and kindergartens for the children of working mothers.
18. Paid maternity leave for three years.
19. A decrease in the waiting period for apartments.
20. An increase in the commuter's allowance to 100 zlotys from 40 with a supplemental benefit on separation.
21. A day of rest on Saturday. Workers in the brigade system or round-the-clock jobs are to be compensated for the loss of free Saturdays with increased leave or other paid time off.

Solidarity and Martial Law-Primary Source # 1

"The Twenty-One Demands of the Striking Workforce Represented on the Inter-Factory Strike Committee of Gdansk Shipyard." In *The Promise of Solidarity: Inside the Polish Workers' Struggle*, Jean-Yves Potel, trans. Phil Markham, 219-20. New York: Praeger, 1982.

Solidarity and Martial Law-Primary Source # 2

"Colonel Wislicki Speaks." In *Poland Under Jaruzelski: A Comprehensive Sourcebook on Poland During and After Martial Law*, ed. Leopold Labedz, 27-32. New York: Charles Scribner and Sons, 1984.

Colonel Wislicki Speaks

With the imposition of martial law in Poland military commissars (a term never before used in Poland) were assigned to state institutions, universities, factories, and enterprises to oversee compliance with the state of war. The following is an extensive excerpt from a speech made by Colonel Wislicki, the military commissar assigned to the official Polish radio and TV, to that institution's employees, all of whom are Party members.

SOME comrades say that this Solidarity was a kind of paper tiger that was destroyed overnight on 13 December 1981—that it is no longer dangerous and has ceased to exist. Such certainty has led some of us to declare that in principle we have won and it is time to celebrate our victory—time to curtail or abolish the state of war, that everything is back to normal. This is the attitude of those comrades who have installed themselves in their official armchairs under large potted palms—those who not long ago felt that there was something to fear, and are now under the protection of the military. Such a view of the situation is quite wrong. What is more, it is very harmful, because the situation, dear comrades, is very complicated, extremely complicated, and it is difficult to predict how it will develop during the coming months. Should any one of you ask how long the state of war will last, I think the answer is quite easy, but the solution is quite difficult. The state of war in Poland will last until the Party is reborn. And I'm not thinking here about the Party's bureaucracy, for that will be reborn quickly—I'm thinking about the rank-and-file members in large enterprises. For there are only two ways out of the state of war: dictatorship or democracy. There is no third choice. If we are talking about democracy—that is, democracy in a socialist state—there must be a force around which this democracy will develop. In our situation, only the Party can be such a force. Political pluralism is out of the question. Any sort of opposition, more or less organized, is out of the question. The state of war cannot be lifted until the Party can take over the political direction of enterprises, which means that the state of war will continue for quite some time. It is not a question of months but of years.

(Commotion)

Yes, comrades, it is not pleasant, but it is the truth. I do realize that the question of the Party taking over enterprises is something that we speak about a great deal today. But the whole point in this political struggle is to make sure that this question is properly understood. I'm not talking about acceptance—we can't expect that from society. We are far from being accepted. So when answering the frequently asked question, "how

long will the state of war last? " we can reply: " it will last a long time, " and for that, at least, the army is ready.

In this context there are other problems linked with ideological influences on society.

Lately we have noticed a great upsurge in the activities of the anti-socialist element within the country. After the initial shock caused by the introduction of the state of war—I have to admit, incidentally, that its introduction was easier than we had expected—the organizational system was introduced so smoothly, and there were so few victims—many fewer than we expected when the idea of the state of war was born. It was a great shock for the ideological opponent, but at the same time we must admit that the outward expression of shock passes and the enemy is beginning to gather itself together.

I would like to make a few comments on this subject. The question of Solidarity is linked with the question of the trade-union movement, and for the time being no one has any idea what to do with the trade-union movement. One thing is clear: it cannot be a trade-union movement with regional structures. This we know, for sure. But what next? No one knows. The Prime Minister said in the Sejm that trade unions will be what the working class wants them to be. Personally, I would be more careful with this because I have serious doubts as to whether a trade union built according to the working class's wishes would be compatible with the proper functioning of the state.

(The audience shouts its agreement)

But what are we seeing now? We see that Solidarity, in, let us say, its underground state, is being better and better organized. Its organizations are beginning to function. I must say that I don't care much about the leaflets, but all sorts of bulletins that appear as periodicals, issue after issue, point towards a well-functioning organization. For example, in Warsaw, *War Weekly* is being published, with five issues already having appeared; that there is a group that publishes this weekly, and that it has a working system. As it so happens, there are many more such publications. Unfortunately, I don't have any data from the Ministry of Internal Affairs. What conclusions can we draw from the contents of these illegal publications? They want to convince the members of the Union that Solidarity exists and is organizing itself in the present situation.

Next, the articles in these illegal publications warn against terrorist activities. Indeed, they forbid terrorist-type activities. In his interview for American TV, Zbigniew Bujak—and we'll come back to him in a minute—said that Solidarity members should organize small, independent groups in a wide resistance movement—passive, not active, resistance. According to him, this resistance can take different forms. First of all, work should be slowed down because if people do this in the right way, they avoid repression. Other forms include all kinds of open

letters to the government and to the Prime Minister—and such letters have started to appear. Another guideline is that, in extreme circumstances, strikes should be organized—but in a sporadic fashion, for it is known that if a strike is called, it will be broken one way or another. Let's say for example that some enterprise starts a strike. Then the riot police arrive to break the strike. Bujak and his comrades suggest that the strike should stop and work resume at that time. Then after the riot police leave, they can start the strike again. Some calls are for visible actions that will prove Solidarity is still around: turn off your lights at a given hour, light candles. We know that such actions are quite often successful.

Another directive is against any kind of cooperation. They call for the collection of evidence against " collaborators "—that's what they call them—so that they can get even with them when their time comes. They threaten members of Solidarity that if they cooperate in any way with the authorities they will be struck from the membership rolls when Solidarity . . . well . . . when it is reborn. Members of Solidarity are given instructions about what to do in order to hinder the functioning of military rule. These appeals are very frequent and they are signed by all sorts of leaders of underground Solidarity. They say, for example, that if a military commissar gives you an order, demand a detailed explanation and pretend you don't understand. If you think the order makes no sense whatsoever—obey at once. And so on. The situation is extremely complex. We're far from celebrating our victory. We may still face developments that we can't even conceive of at the moment. Everything is possible, comrades.

(Some in the audience call out: " *Comrade, what you are saying is terrifying.* ")

Comrades, I can't say everything is OK if it's not. Whichever way you look at it, the situation is bad. I will not repeat what you can read in the newspapers or hear from the Prime Minister. The fact that I have managed to shock some of you, comrades, means that I have achieved my aim. Because that's what I wanted to do.

(The audience demands an explanation)

The point is that we must be ready and determined because that is what gives us the strength to do our work. I'm not holding anything back—that's the situation.

(Someone asks: " *Why haven't they caught Bujak yet? What the hell is the MSW [the Ministry of Internal Affairs] up to?* ")

Where is Bujak and what in hell is the MSW up to? We have no information from comrades who are dealing with this. I don't know whether the MSW knows where Bujak and the others are. Maybe it does, maybe it doesn't. For the time being it's difficult to get at them. If

they are in a monastery, which is quite likely, or in a convent, it would be necessary to organize a company or a battalion to break up the whole place. I don't know if the internal and international repercussions would justify the effort to get Bujak.

(Another person asks: "*Should we negotiate with the Church then?*")

Oh, my dear friend, who can come to an understanding with the clergy? I have no proof, but I am quite certain—and I could even bet—that a great deal of all those publishing centres operate in churches and monasteries. Anyway, if we had any certainty, if we were sure, if we had some idea of what trade unions will be like in the future, what will happen to Solidarity, then we could act decisively in this or that direction. If we don't have any idea, how can we know if this son-of-a-bitch Bujak won't come in handy one day. You are sure that he won't. I'm not so sure at all. Personally, I don't know what sort of game the security apparatus is playing. I don't know whether or not Bujak is being used as bait for someone else.

(*"Comrade, what is happening to Kania?"*)

As far as Kania is concerned, there are suggestions—for example, from our Soviet comrades, who judge him very critically—not directly of course, but at meetings—you know what sort of meetings. That's why he isn't First Secretary anymore. Personally, I was very critical of his actions when he was First Secretary. But then, you see, Jaruzelski would also have to be criticized. These are complex problems. It won't be for another good few years, not before certain archives are available, that we will be in a position to answer the question as to whether or not the state of war was introduced at the right time. Perhaps too late, perhaps too early. Certainly not too early. But too late? Because all of us, as we sit here, demanded decisive action from the beginning. Only history will tell who was right—us or Jaruzelski.

(*"Comrade, why aren't the police arresting all those people who switch off their lights and light candles?"*)

It is not as easy as all that. First, this is a common occurrence and secondly, Jaruzelski stated that a state of war is in force in Poland but that no rights have been suspended. So what right have you to enter homes and ask people why they switch off the lights: they switch them off because they feel like it. They switch them off because they have the right to do so.

(Commotion. The audience shouts: "*What do you mean, they've got the right?*")

Well, comrades, they've got the right. After all, what act of law can you use against them? There is no legal basis. It would have been an illegal act, an act of repression. Take Swidnik, for example. People go for a walk

during the television news. They walk around peacefully, and what can you do about it? It is not an [illegal] gathering—no one delivers speeches, no one shouts slogans. They just walk around the main square, and what can you do about it? Send the riot police? You can't do that—that would be an escalation of terror. You talk about verifying people [ideological verification of state employees and workers]. We are verifying people wherever we can, and so what? We check a Solidarity member, saying that he doesn't work well. Or we verify him for political reasons. First—we have no right to check him because an amnesty has been declared—he might even have been a member of the KPN [Confederation of Independent Poland]. And when he comes to us and declares that he is giving up his membership, you can't tell him: "you've been a Solidarity member so you're fired!" The same applies to the academic community. To verify them? And what then? One has to think of the consequences. The verifications cause a great stir in those circles, and then I don't know whether such an academic, who is not with us but whom we control, wouldn't be more dangerous if he was chucked out of the university where he might organize without our control. . . . Well, I don't have an answer to that.

There are many such problems. Unfortunately there are no simple solutions. If there were, we wouldn't have got to the point that we have. You can't make the entire nation shut their mouths. There's no way it can be done.

Another topic, comrades, you wanted me to discuss is the issue of the Church. So, I think the Church is a time-bomb. To me it is clear that the Church's activity is, all in all, decidedly anti-state at this point. It is decidedly aimed against the current system in our country. But in the Church hierarchy there are differences of opinion. The most, shall we say, docile, is Glomp, who supports some dialogue with the government and who, on the whole, has accepted the necessity of introducing the state of war, considering it to be in accordance with the law. But Glomp doesn't accept all the consequences resulting from martial law: internments, the suspension of Solidarity, etc. He declares that the Church may guarantee that Solidarity will function as a trade union and not as a political organization. Macharski represents a more radical attitude though not an extremist one. As far as . . . er . . . what's his name . . . Gulbinowicz is concerned . . . he represents the very extreme in the Church. Those extremists include the older generation of the Episcopate, and it wasn't by chance that it was these three who went to see the Pope. Most probably they were chosen to represent all factions within the Church in order to work out a common stand. As far as the activities of the, say, rank-and-file clergy are concerned, more often than not they are decidedly anti-state.

Perhaps I should say a few words about a pastoral letter, dated 19 January 1982, which was to be read in all churches. It was an exceptionally perfidious letter calling, without mincing words, for armed resistance. Well, perhaps not directly, but there were statements which

could be interpreted in such a way. For example, and I quote from memory, "The yoke, violence, could lead to retaliation and even to bloodshed." The authorities did their best to ensure that this letter would not be read out. In some parishes it was, and in others not. As I told you, those rank-and-file priests are decidedly anti-state and their activities are against the state. This is evident in sermons. On Christmas Eve, during midnight mass, three priests were arrested and two interned—because of what they were saying. All the cribs in the churches now have a uniquely political character. Religious symbols are pushed aside and the symbols of martyrdom have appeared—symbols of the Home Army—emblems of *Fighting Poland* [used during the Second World War by the underground army], banners spattered with blood, and so forth. Just as during Hitler's occupation. I repeat: I don't know if this time-bomb will explode. But we must be vigilant, because they are very cunning.

And at the end I should say a few words about us—about television. Right now—it's a bloody mess. There are four decision-making centres and each of them has something to say. And so, there are decisions from the Central Committee, from the government, from CROW [the Military Council of National Salvation], and from the Political Department of the Army. And the Commissar finds himself between the devil and the deep blue sea, not one devil but three.

("Comrade, there is one more point. How should we fight the propaganda from the Western radio stations?")

Comrades, there is a plan as to how to deal with these subversive broadcasts. It needs special equipment. We are going to organize broadcasts for eight hours a day on a wavelength close to that of Radio Free Europe. From our Soviet comrades we will receive the range of RFE wavelengths, and we plan to organize a somewhat subversive programme. Anybody who wants to listen to RFE will look for that frequency, but he won't be able to tell whether he is listening to RFE or to our subversive programme. This will have to be done skilfully and intelligently.

(The audience bursts out laughing. Overwhelming applause.)

1975 Britain Common Market Referendum—Primary Source #1

Thatcher, Margaret. Speech to the Conservative Group for Europe. Delivered at St. Ermin's Hotel, Westminster, 16 April 1975. Thatcher Archive CCOPR 314/75. Available online at <http://www.margaretthatcher.org/speeches/displaydocument.asp?docid=102675>.

This speech was given before the Conservative Group for Europe at its inaugural session.

I welcome this opportunity to launch the Conservative campaign to keep Britain in Europe.

It is not surprising that I, as Leader of the Conservative Party, should wish to give my wholehearted support to this campaign, for the Conservative Party has been pursuing the European vision almost as long as we have existed as a Party.

It was Disraeli who said: "I assume also that no great power would shrink from its responsibilities ... if that country from a perverse interpretation of its insular geographical position, turns an indifferent ear to the feelings and fortunes of continental Europe, such a course would, I believe, only end in it becoming an object of general plunder.

"So long as the power and advice of England are felt in the Councils of Europe, peace I believe will be maintained, and maintained for a long period."

And, of course, that is right. We are inextricably part of Europe. Neither Mr. Foot nor Mr. Benn nor anyone else will ever be able to take us "out of Europe", for Europe is where we are and where we have always been.

It is a fact that there has been peace in Europe for the last quarter of a century, and for that alone I am grateful; that my children have not been embroiled in a European conflict as were the children of the previous two generations.

Nor do I think that we should take this peace too much for granted, for it has been secured by the conscious and concerted effort of nations to work together.

We are part of Europe. It was Churchill who, at the Congress of Europe in 1948, said: "The movement for European unity must be a positive force, deriving its strength from our sense of common spiritual values. "It is a dynamic expression of democratic faith, based upon moral conceptions and inspired by a sense of mission ..."

And as Harold Macmillan, who made Britain's first application to join the Community, said: "We are European, geographically and culturally and we cannot, even if we would, disassociate ourselves from Europe".

That vision of Europe took a leap into reality on the 1st of January 1972 when, Mr. Chairman [Edward Heath], due to your endeavours, enthusiasm and dedication Britain joined the European Community.

- The Community gives us peace and security in a free society, a peace and security denied to the past two generations.
- The Community gives us access to secure sources of food supplies. This is vital to us, a country which has to import half of what we need.
- The Community does more trade and gives more aid than any group in the world.
- The Community gives us the opportunity to represent the Commonwealth in Europe. The Commonwealth want us to stay in and has said so. The Community wants us.

Conservatives must give a clear lead and play a vigorous part in the campaign to keep Britain in Europe to honour the treaties which you, sir, signed in Britain's name.

We must do this, even though we dislike referenda. We must support the [Harold Wilson] Prime Minister in this, even though we fight the Government on other issues.

We must play our full part in ensuring that Conservative supporters say "Yes to Europe".

In particular, there is a duty on Conservative Members of Parliament who believe in and voted for Britain's continuing membership of the Community to play a leading role in their own constituencies during the campaign.

Members must give a lead both by their words and by their example.

I note that a few left-wing politicians have been talking as if this campaign is about whether we should JOIN the European Community.

It is not. We have been members for two and a half years.

It is a question of whether we should leave.

But for Britain to leave would mean denouncing a Treaty.

Britain does not break Treaties.

It would be bad for Britain, bad for our relations with the rest of the world and bad for any future treaty on trade we may need to make.

As Harold Macmillan said recently: "We used to stand for good faith. That is the greatest strength of our commerce overseas. And we are now being asked to tear up a Treaty into which we solemnly entered".

The choice is clear.

We can play a role in developing Europe, or we can turn our backs on the Community.

By turning our backs we would forfeit our right to influence what happens in the Community.

But what happens in the Community will inevitably affect us.

The European Community is a powerful group of nations.

With Britain as a member, it is more powerful; without Britain it will still be powerful.

We can play a leading role in Europe, but if that leadership is not forthcoming Europe will develop without Britain.

Britain, if she denounced a treaty, cannot then complain if Europe develops in conflict with Britain's interests.

It's up to us to tell our people what is at risk in this referendum. We have no reason to feel complacent. We must tell them of the advantages of Britain's membership, not simply in general terms, but how it has helped their area in particular.

Every region has received some help and the amounts vary from the large to the very small. For example: Training and retraining some 153,000 unemployed persons, in assisted areas, including schemes for young persons under 25 years, women over 35 wishing to return to work and men over 50 + £34,269,000. Training and retraining 24,500 unemployed in Northern Ireland = £7,752,000. Grants to British Steel Corporation for research into the monitoring of effluent from steelworks = £122,366. Loan for the construction of a new North Sea oil fired power station at Peterhead = £10,400,000. The National Coal Board has received loans of £19 million for the modernisation of collieries. Even a grant for the expansion and re-equipment of a Stilton cheese factory at Mastington in Derbyshire—there seems to be no danger of us losing sovereignty over Stilton.

In two years we have received grants and loans totalling £290 million from the Community. What better evidence is there that the European Community is actively helping us here in the four corners of Britain with our problems. There is bound to have been some tangible benefit in your area.

Whether it be a £7 million loan for building a second Dartford tunnel under the Thames, or £27,500 flood prevention embankments on the river Lurgg in Hereford. Let us make sure that the electors know of these benefits and where they come from.

During the coming weeks we are going to hear a number of myths and scares from some anti-marketeers. It is a myth that our membership of the European Community is to blame for the sharp deterioration in Britain's trade balance with the Community nations.

The truth is that some goods would have cost us much more if we had not been in the Community.

Food, for example, made up more than 50 per cent of our deficit. This is because as food prices for certain items such as cereals, started to rocket on world markets we switched to cheaper European supplies.

Oil, 11 per cent of our deficit with the Community; because we are short of refining capacity in Britain we have to import oil products from the Community. We would have had to have done so whether we were in the Community or not.

Similar considerations apply to chemicals and plastics, iron and steel.

It is a myth that the Community is simply a bureaucracy with no concern for the individual.

The entire staff of the Commission is about 7,000—smaller than that of the Scottish Office.

It is a myth that our membership of the Community will suffocate national tradition and culture.

Are the Germans any less German for being in the Community, or the French any less French? Of course they are not!

It seems to me to display an amazing lack of self-confidence in Britain on the part of some people, that they think that, whereas no other nation in the Community has lost its national character, Britain in some way will. These points and others must be answered—on the public platform—on the doorstep.

When referendum day comes there may be some who do not want to vote. But no one can opt out of this decision. It is a decision that will affect us all. It is a decision that will affect future generations.

It is a decision in which all should participate to secure our future in a free society.

We must act to defend our children's future as those generations before us acted to protect ours.

For hundreds of years the peoples of Britain have been writing history. Do we want future generations to continue to write history or are they simply going to have to read it.

If we fail, they will read how we broke faith with both the present and the past.

If we fail and the British people vote 'No' to the European Community, they will read how there was a defeat for co-operation between nations, and how there was a victory for the tribunes of the Left.

They will read how extremism won over commonsense. For it is purely common sense to belong to a community working together in peace on economic and political issues that concern us all.

It is purely commonsense to have access to secure sources of food supplies, when as a nation we have to import half our food.

It is surely commonsense to belong to the Community that is the largest trading and aiding unit in the world, and play our part in that Community.

It is surely commonsense for Britain to continue to play a part in the Council of Europe.

It is purely commonsense that we should now listen also to the Commonwealth—those Nations who twice this century, have come to Britain's aid to defend democracy in Europe.

Not one of them now want us to leave. The Commonwealth wants us to stay in. Britain has made a vital contribution to the past. She has a contribution to make to the future. It will be bigger in Europe than alone.

Europe. The decision is now for the British people. The Government will accept their verdict.

'Referendum on the European Community (Common Market): Why You Should Vote NO'

This is a statement by the National Referendum Campaign NOT by HM Government.

Renegotiation. The present Government, though it tried, has on its own admission failed to achieve the 'fundamental renegotiation' it promised at the last two general elections. All it has gained are a few concessions for Britain, some of them only temporary. The real choice before the British peoples has been scarcely altered by renegotiation.

What did the pro-Marketees say? Before we joined the Common Market the Government forecast that we should enjoy:

- A rapid rise in our living standards
- A trade surplus with the Common Market
- Better productivity
- Higher investment
- More employment
- Faster industrial growth

In every case the opposite is now happening, according to the Government's figures. Can we rely upon the pro-Marketees' prophecies this time?

The anti-Marketees' forecasts have turned out to be all too correct. When you are considering the pro-Marketees' arguments, you should remember this.

Remember also that before the referendum in Norway, the pro-Marketees predicted, if Norway came out, just the same imaginary evils as our own pro-Marketees are predicting now. The Norwegian people voted NO. And none of these evil results occurred.

Our legal right to come out. It was agreed during the debates which took us into the Common Market that the British Parliament had the absolute right to repeal the European Communities Act and take us out. There is nothing in the Treaty of Rome which says a country cannot come out.

The right to rule ourselves

The fundamental question is whether or not we remain free to rule ourselves in our own way.

For the British people, membership of the Common Market has already been a bad bargain. What is worse, it sets out by stages to merge Britain with France, Germany, Italy and other countries into a single nation. This will take away from us the right to rule ourselves which we have enjoyed for centuries.

The Common Market increasingly does this by making our laws and by deciding our policies on food, prices, trade and employment -- all matters which affect the lives of us all.

Already, under the Treaty of Rome, policies are being decided, rules made, laws enacted and taxes raised, not by our own Parliament elected by the British people, but by the Common Market -- often by the unelected Commissioners in Brussels.

As this system tightens -- and it will -- our right, by our votes, to change policies and laws in Britain will steadily dwindle. Unlike British laws, those of the Common Market which will take precedence over our own laws -- can only be changed if all the other members of the Common Market agree.

Your vote affects the future of your country.

This is wholly contrary to the wishes of ordinary people who everywhere want more, not less, control over their own lives.

Those who want Britain in the Common Market are defeatists; they see no independent future for our country.

Your vote will affect the future of your country for generations to come.

We say: Let's rule ourselves, while trading and remaining friendly with other nations. We say: No rule from Brussels. We say: Vote NO.

Your food, Your jobs, Our trade

We cannot afford to remain in the Common Market because:

It must mean still higher food prices. Before we joined, we could buy our food at the lowest cost from the most efficient producers in the world. Since we joined, we are no longer allowed to buy all our food where it suits us best. Inside the Common Market, taxes are imposed on food imported from outside countries. For instance, we now have to pay a tax of over £300 a ton on butter imported from outside the Market and over £350 a ton on cheese.

Our food is still cheaper than in the rest of the Common Market. But if we stay in, we will be forced by Common Market rules to bring

our food prices up to Common Market levels. All of us, young and old alike, will have to pay. For example, the price of butter has to be almost doubled by 1978 if we stay in.

Food destroyed – or sold to Russia. If the vote is Yes, your food must cost you more. Not merely do the Common Market authorities tax food imports or shut them out, but they also buy up home-produced food (through Intervention Boards) purely to keep the prices up. Then they store it in warehouses, thus creating mountains of beef, butter, grain, etc. Some of this food is deliberately made unfit for human consumption or even destroyed, and some is sold to countries like Russia, at prices well below what the housewife in the Common Market has to pay.

The Common Market has already stored up a beef mountain of over 300,000 tons, and all beef imports from outside have been banned.

Food price increases due to the Market. If we come out of the Market, we could buy beef, veal, mutton, lamb, butter, cheese and other foods more cheaply than if we stay in. World food prices outside the Market are now falling.

There is no doubt that the rise in food prices in Britain in the last three years has been partly due to joining the Common Market. For example, between 1971 and 1974, food prices rose in Britain and Ireland (which joined) by over 40%. In Norway and Sweden (which stayed out) they rose only by about 20%.

Your jobs at risk. If we stay in the Common Market, a British Government can no longer prevent the drift of industry southwards and increasingly to the Continent. This is already happening.

If it went on, it would be particularly damaging to Scotland, Wales, Northern Ireland and much of the North and West of England, which have suffered so much from unemployment already.

If we stay in the Common Market, our Government must increasingly abandon to them control over this drift of industry and employment.

Their threat to iron, steel and our oil. Far-reaching powers of interference in the control of British industry, particularly iron and steel, are possessed by the Market authorities.

Interference with the oil around our shores has already been threatened by the Brussels Commission.

Huge trade deficit with the Common Market. The Common Market pattern of trade was never designed to suit Britain. According to our Department of Trade, our trade deficit with the Common Market was

running, in the early months of 1975, at nearly £2,600 million a year – a staggering figure, compared with a very small deficit in 1970 when we were free to trade in accordance with our own policies.

What they said was wrong. Yet before entry, the pro-Marketees said that the 'effect upon our balance of trade would be positive and substantial'. If you don't want this dangerous trade deficit to continue, vote NO.

Taxes to keep prices up. The Common Market's dear food policy is designed to prop up inefficient farmers on the Continent by keeping food prices high. If we stay in the Market, the British housewife will not only be paying more for her food but the British taxpayer will soon be paying many hundreds of millions of pounds a year to the Brussels budget, largely to subsidize Continental farmers. We are already paying into the Budget much more than we get out. This is entirely unreasonable and we cannot afford it.

Agriculture. It would be far better for us if we had our own national agricultural policy suited to our own country, as we had before we joined. We could then guarantee prices for our farmers, and, at the same time, allow consumers to buy much more cheaply.

In the Common Market, the British taxpayer is paying as much to keep food prices up as we used to pay under our own policy to keep them down.

The Market also have their eyes on British fishing grounds because they have over-fished their own waters.

Commonwealth links. Our Commonwealth links are bound to be weakened much further if we stay in the Common Market. We are being forced to tax imported Commonwealth goods. And as we lose our national independence, we shall cease, in practice, to be a member of the Commonwealth.

Britain a mere province of the Common Market? The real aim of the Market is, of course, to become one single country in which Britain would be reduced to a mere province. The plan is to have a Common Market Parliament by 1978 or shortly thereafter. Laws would be passed by that Parliament which would be binding on our country. No Parliament elected by the British people could change those laws.

This may be acceptable to some Continental countries. In recent times, they have been ruled by dictators, or defeated or occupied. They are more used to abandoning their political institutions than we are.

Unless you want to be ruled more and more by a Continental

Parliament in which Britain would be in a small minority, you should vote NO.

What is the alternative?

A far better course is open to us. If we withdraw from the Market, we could and should remain members of the wider Free Trade Area which now exists between the Common Market and the countries of the European Free Trade Association (EFTA) – Norway, Sweden, Finland, Austria, Switzerland, Portugal and Iceland.

These countries are now to enjoy free entry for their industrial exports into the Common Market without having to carry the burden of the Market's dear food policy or suffer rule from Brussels.

Britain already enjoys industrial free trade with these countries. If we withdrew from the Common Market, we should remain members of the wider group and enjoy, as the EFTA countries do, free or low tariff entry into the Common Market countries without the burden of dear food or the loss of the British people's democratic rights.

The Common Market countries would be most unlikely to oppose this arrangement, since this would neither be sensible nor in their own interests. They may well demand a free trade area with us. But even if they did not do so, their tariffs on British exports would be very low.

Scare-mongering of the pro-Marketeers. It is scare-mongering to pretend that withdrawal from the Common Market would mean heavy unemployment or loss of trade. In a very few years we shall enjoy in North Sea oil a precious asset possessed by none of the Common Market countries. Our freedom to use this oil, and our vast coal reserves, unhampered by any threatened Brussels restrictions, will strengthen our national economy powerfully.

For peace, stability and independence

Some say that the Common Market is a strong united group of countries, working closely together, and that membership would give us protection against an unfriendly world.

There is no truth in this assertion.

The defence of Britain and Western Europe depends not on the Common Market at all, but on the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), which includes other countries like the United States, Canada, and Norway, which are not members of the Common Market.

Any attempt to substitute the Common Market for NATO as a defence shield would be highly dangerous for Britain. Most anti-

Marketeers rightly believe that we should remain members of NATO, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, EFTA, and the Council of Europe, as well as of the UN and its agencies.

In all these, we can work actively together as good internationalists, while preserving our own democratic rights.

The choice is yours.

It will be your decision that counts.

Remember: you may never have the chance to decide this great issue again.

If you want a rich and secure future for the British peoples, a free and democratic society, living in friendship with all nations – but governing ourselves,

VOTE NO