WELFARE STATE VS. WARFARE STATE

[a]MILAN KATUNINEC

 Department of Political Sciences, Faculty of Philosophy, Universitas Tyrnaviensis in Trnava, Hornopotočná 23, 918 43Trnava, Slovak Republic

email: [a]mkatunin@truni.sk

Abstract: The presented study pays attention to potential risks of extremism for democracy in Europe. In this context it follows the military success of Nazi Germany in the summer of 1940 alongside the conceptions of the ´New Order´ in Europe, which pressured British policy-makers to focus greater attention to social issues. The study also sheds light on the activities of institutions which provided opportunities for notable individuals from across the political spectrum to discuss problems of social policy. Under the leadership of William Beveridge, a social system was developed which was primarily funded from the state budget. The Beveridge Report was presented as a key instrument of radical social security reforms, which gained quite wide wide admiration in post-war western Europe.

Keywords: Beveridge, Europe, Great Britain, Nazi Germany, New Order, Welfare state.

1 Introduction

The primary junction of all contemporary interpretations of the wrecking of democracy in the interwar period of some European countries is multicausality. Also due to the fact that many countries now face multiple crises, we must not underestimate the fact that, in the wake of the Great Depression of the 1930s, modern mass society allowed the Nazis to attract voters from across the social spectrum. In times when socio-economic subjects were at the forefront, traditional political parties moved ineptly over the political terrain. In addition to the worsening social and economic situation, these standard parties were also burdened by the long-term accumulation of causes for which they were held accountable by their antagonists. Hitler's success is often used as an example of how some countries can lose their freedom from within in a democratic way. The German Nazis realized that the political and social climate in the country had also helped them to achieve this success. In the conflict between democracy and totalitarianism, it is often forgotten that the German Nazis tried to take advantage of the fact that German social policy had enjoyed great international prestige since the time of Bismarck's social reforms. The military success of Nazi Germany in the summer of 1940 pressured British policymakers to focus intensively on the welfare state. Many prominent experts from several scientific fields participated in various social reforms, and a number of their social proposals such as the health care system named after William Beveridge served as the basis for the post-World War II welfare state.

2 Material and methods

The proposed study seeks to contribute, through the knowledge of our recent past, to the development of critical thinking in the coming generation, which is growing in a complicated world of huge possibilities as well as threats. The main aim of the study is to highlight the potential risks of the growing popularity of extremism for democracy in Europe as well as the importance of social issues in a democratic society. Historical experience with the ascendance of totalitarian regimes to power very clearly shows how easily "power can rise up from the ground" on a wave of political crisis, growing dissatisfaction and the inability or unwillingness of democratic politicians to solve existing social problems. An important aim of this study is also to point out the activities of the United Kingdom focused on the analysis of various crucial economic aspects concerning the post-war period. The research design of this study is characterized by empirical data and background information vested in available primary and secondary sources. Secondary sources in my research are predominantly books and studies of internationally recognized authors. Primary sources are represented by archival materials, which are fundamental for research in the field of historical and political sciences, integral to social sciences, in comprehending the actions and evolution of political actors. In the study a historical, comparative and analytical research method is used. I also tried to combine chronological and thematic approaches.

2.1 Results and discussion

Although the United Kingdom (UK) is no longer a member of the European Union and British Euroscepticism is not just a phenomenon of recent times, a lot of inspiration and ideas for integration and the welfare state on our continent have emerged in this country. The purpose of this study is to highlight the potential risks for democracy in Europe by focusing on the Nazi conceptions of the "New Order of Europe" (Neuordnung Europas). The study also pays attention to some social and economic activities in Great Britain, which gained quite wide admiration in post-war western Europe, as well as to some proposals on European post-war integration. Many discussions are currently led on the crisis of democracy in the interwar period. What is usually not mentioned, however, is that various influential politicians leading democratic parties acted with certain arrogance even when the political and social situation became critical, as if nothing could go wrong. In the research, we tried to take into account the fact that in a time of socio-economic crisis, democratic states must not underestimate the risk of possible decline in public trust. From the historical experience we know that the Great Depression of the 1930s was used by the Nazi propaganda, which tried to conceal the real goals of Hitler's imperial policy behind the New Order of Europe. This goals were based on pseudo-scientific theories of race, the supremacy of the Aryan race, ethnic discrimination.

During the 1930s, Britain followed a policy of appeasement. The war with Germany pressed British policy-makers to focus more attention on European integration and social issues, which played an important role in the post-war development of Europe. In the interwar period various European intellectuals promoted the idea that cooperation transcending borders can become means to strengthen democracy and peace.[1] At the time of the Munich Agreement, the Federal Union was launched in Britain.[2] It set up the Federal Union Research Institute, chaired by William Beveridge. The institute had specialized sections in which various aspects of post-war European integration were discussed and analyzed.

In June 1941, the British government appointed Beveridge to head in inquiry into Social Insurance and Allied Services. The Minister without Portfolio Arthur Greenwood[3] announced in the House of Commons that under the leadership of Beveridge, a survey was to be conducted, "taking into account representations received from responsible organizations and persons concerned with the problems involved" (Social Insurance and Allied Services, 1942). Representatives of several Christian churches in Britain also took part in the struggle with Nazi German propaganda, and Archbishop William Temple set in opposition the terms "welfare state" and "power state", pointing out Britain's preoccupation with providing aid in the

---

[1] The first influential European politician in the League of Nations who voiced his support for a union of European nations was Aristide Briand. He recognized the benefits of a union of the European nations in the political, economic and social spheres. At a meeting of the League of Nations in 1929, Briand expressed his belief that an organised cooperation is feasible in Europe, not only on the economic level, but on the political one as well. The representatives of all twenty-seven present European states entrusted Briand to issue a memorandum on the organization of such a union. However, in 1929, political thinking in Europe was already affected by the Wall Street Crash of 1929 and its possible impact on certain European countries caused their political representatives to shift their attention towards protecting their own economic interests.

[2] The founders of the Federal Union were Charles Kimber, Derek Rawnsley and Patrick Ransome.

[3] Arthur Greenwood (1880–1954) was a prominent member of the Labour Party and for more than two years a member of the War Cabinet. In 1940, he was an advocate of British resistance to the aggression of Nazi Germany.

most delicate aspects of social life contrasted with Germany's preoccupation with war. The victory over Nazism did not mean a departure from the concept of the welfare state. With the support of the Marshall Plan, the concept of a social market economy has begun to be promoted in many Western European countries.

3 Clash of ideologies and social theories

Propaganda in Nazi Germany "presented an image of society that had successfully manufactured a 'national community' by transcending social and class divisiveness through a new ethnic unity based on 'true' German values" (see Welch, 2004: 213). During the most destructive conflict in human history, Nazi propaganda also used the concept of the 'New Order' in Europe, which symbolized the Nazi vision of the post-war order in Europe. Some Euro-sceptics are trying to portray the Nazi "New Order of Europe" as the precursor of the modern proponents of European political and economic integration. Regarding the opinions held by Nazi economists about the "European family of nations", it is not difficult to spot concepts such as the "European Economic Community" or "single economy." The German Nazis tried to present this opinion even when they occupied France. In reality, however, their goal was to use the French resources for the German war effort. But as historian Tony Judt points out: "... there were many of both sides who saw in this later Franco-German ´collaboration´ the germ of a new European economic order. Thus Pierre Pucheu, a senior Vichy administrator later to be executed by the Free French, envisaged a post-war European order where customs barriers would be eliminated and a single European economy would encompass the whole continent, with a single currency. Pucheu's vision-which was shared by Albert Speer and many others-represented a sort of updating of Napoleon's Continental System under Hitlerian auspices, and it appealed to a younger generation of continental bureaucrats and technicians who had experienced the frustrations of economic policy making in the 1930s" (Judt, 2010: 154).

Hitler tried to misuse also the concept of the Monroe Doctrine and he attempted to persuade the American public that the increasing Nazi influence in Europe is actually a kind of "Monroe Doctrine for Europe." In February and March 1940 Sumner Welles, President Roosevelt's envoy to Europe, visited Italy, Germany, and England to discuss peacemaking proposals. Nazi leaders in the course of their conversations with Welles "stated that they sought only a Monroe doctrine for Europe." (The Advertiser, 6 March 1940: 19). Already at the beginning of the war, Hitler accused British politicians of fearing that the model of German social policy would prevail in Europe: "What they hate is the Germany which sets a dangerous example for them, this social Germany. It is the Germany of a social labor legislation which they already hated before the World War and which they still hate today. It is the Germany of social welfare, of social equality, of the elimination of class differences—this is what they hate!" (Hitler's speech, November 8, 1939; see Patel, November 2015: 4). Hitler tried to misuse also the concept of the Monroe Doctrine and he attempted to persuade the American public that the increasing Nazi influence in Europe is actually a kind of "Monroe Doctrine for Europe." In February and March 1940 Sumner Welles, President Roosevelt's envoy to Europe, visited Italy, Germany, and England to discuss peacemaking proposals. Nazi leaders in the course of their conversations with Welles "stated that they sought only a Monroe doctrine for Europe." (The Advertiser, 6 March 1940: 19).

The military success of Nazi Germany in the summer of 1940 alongside with the conceptions of the New Order in Europe pressured British policy-makers to outline a New Order of their own (Mazower, 1999: 186). The post-war welfare state in Western Europe was influenced in particular by the report of the inquiry into the Social Insurance and Allied Services. Even before the outbreak of World War II, an organization named Federal Union was established in Great Britain. It soon attracted prominent academics and politicians. As early as 1939, some activities were associated with The Federal Union Research Institute (FURI). This institute created proposals for a federation

of European democracies. It gained the support of numerous personages in the public as well as academic spheres. The official policy statement which the Federal Union released in its first annual conference in March 1940 announced their intention to form a Federal Union of Europe headed by Great Britain and France, allowing for the likely possibility of including a democratic Germany (together with other post-war European democracies) in the following years (see Koziak, 2003: 37). The Inter-Departmental Committee on Social Insurance and Allied Services, chaired by the economist William Beveridge, was appointed by the British coalition government in 1941 to undertake a survey of Britain's social services, and The Beveridge Report gained quite wide admiration in post-war western Europe.

3.1 The Nazi "New Order of Europe"

The vision of the economy within the New Order was most clearly outlined in the assertions that the Reich minister of Economic Affairs Walther Funk made about the economic reorganization of Europe. His speech delivered in July 1940 is "regarded as a kind of semi-official blueprint for all the occupied countries" (North, 2012: 72). The following stood out in this speech: "A stronger sense of economic community among European nations must be aroused by collaboration in all spheres of economic policy (currency, credit, production, trade, etc.). The economic consolidation of European countries should improve their bargaining position in dealings with other economic groups in the world economy. This united Europe will not submit to political and economic terms dictated to it by any extra-European body. It will trade on the basis of economic equality at all times in the knowledge of the weight which it carries in economic matters." Funk adds, however, that the main purpose of this economic reorganization of Europe is to "guarantee for Greater Germany a maximum of economic security and for the German nation a maximum consumption of goods to raise the level of the nation's well-being" (Funk, July 25, 1940, in Lipgens, 1985: 71).

The Nazi propaganda tried to conceal the real objectives of Hitler's imperial policy behind the "New Order of Europe", which were based on pseudo-scientific theories of race, the supremacy of the Aryan race, ethnic discrimination; all of which lead up to the Holocaust itself. In order to create a new and thriving culture, the Germans had to dominate the European continent. The "New Order of Europe" was a profoundly hegemonic construction. In Hitler's view, all was allowed in war, as the vanquishing heroes and their admirers will not judge the morality of their actions. This belief shaped the Nazi ideology. He tried to evoke the hope that he can make the German masses into a kind of *Nietzschean Übermensch race*. Nations superior to others had the right to expand at the expense of racially inferior peoples. However, in the particular era, he considered establishing colonies as problematic; hence the concept of *Lebensraum* which referred to policies aiming to create more "living space" in Europe.

3.2 Churchill's coalition government and the importance of socio-economic issues

On 10th May 1940, Winston Churchill became the new Prime Minister of Great Britain. The very same day the German blitzkrieg offensive was launched on the Western front.[4] Only a few days into the offensive, on 15th May, the words that the French Prime Minister Paul Reynaud addressed to Churchill in a phone-call were indeed gloomy: "We have been defeated. We are beaten; we have lost the battle!" (Shirer, 1960: 720). In less than a month on 14th June, the German army entered Paris without battle. The new French government lead by the First World War veteran and hero Philippe Pétain asked Germany for a humiliating armistice, a step opposed by Charles de Gaulle, whose speech broadcasted from London appealed to the French to carry on fighting: "Whatever happens, the flame of French

---

[4] Inspired by the success of the German offensive, 10th June 1940, Italy declared war on Britain and France, allying with Nazi Germany.

resistance must not and shall not go out." This appeal to the French (*L'appel du 18 Juin*) is often considered to have lain foundation for the French overseas Resistance (see Corbett, July 2000).

Already in November 1939, as Britain's political parties sought to articulate what they were fighting for, Clement Attlee at the meeting of the Labour Party stated that "Europe must federate or perish" (see Lipgens - Loth, 1986: 167-168). "At the darkest hour in French history" in June 1940, Churchill offered a proposal for a Franco-British Union, which would have "joint organs of defence, foreign, financial and economic politics" (Churchill, 1941: 225-234). The proposal of the Franco-British Union was first developed by Jean Monnet the head of the Anglo-French Coordination Committee which was set up in London in December 1939. Jean Monnet's name is closely linked to the beginning of the post-war period of Western European integration. Monnet, who tried to prevent the return to the conditions of Europe prior to 1939, already on 5 August 1943 wrote: "The countries of Europe are not strong enough individually to be able to guarantee prosperity and social development for their peoples. The States of Europe must therefore form a federation or a European entity that would make them into a common economic unit" (Jean Monnet. Notes on Reflections. August 5, 1943). After the war, he presented a project in which he proposed to put all of France and Germany's steel and coal production in an organization under common authority which would also be open to the participation of other European countries (see Katuninec, 2016: 341). "Monnet's approach to the building of a federal Europe was a major breakthrough in conventional inter-state relations. ... Monnet was attempting something that had no historical precedent" ((Burgess 1995: 229).

Churchill, who announced the 'Declaration of Union' between Great Britain and France, is also well known for his view that the British are with Europe, "but not of it". Britain's wartime leader later explained that support he gave to the notion of the "union of common citizenship" was rooted in the necessity of keeping alive the French spirit of resistance. He supported Charles de Gaulle and their agreement was supposed to represent the unity of those who were determined to carry on fighting the Germans (Koziak, 2003: 63-64).

Already in 1939 the British Ministry of Information prepared a motivational poster "Keep Calm and Carry On". The British government printed nearly 2.5 million copies, but this motivational poster was never officially issued because it was only foreseen after the German invasion of England. Later, when this invasion seemed a very real possibility, the Ministry of Information prepared the leaflet, boldly called "Beating the Invader". In April 1941, the War Cabinet decided to print more than 14 million copies and distribute the leaflet to all British households. The leaflet provides instructions from the Ministry of Information with a message from Prime Minister Winston Churchill on what to do in the case of invasion. Churchill's powerful and inspirational introduction begins with the words: "If invasion comes, everyone — young or old, men and women — will be eager to play their part worthily" (Churchill, 1941).

Although the invasion did not take place and the situation in the war began to develop in favour of Great Britain, British politicians realized very well that in the struggle with Nazi totalitarianism propaganda was also essential, in which social and economic issues played an important role. The Federal Union Research Institute (FURI) has become an important center of intellectual activity. Some of the leading members of this Research Institute served in Churchill's coalition government in the years 1941-1942. Such was the case of William Beveridge who chaired this institute. The institute provided opportunities for notable individuals from across the political spectrum to discuss the course of post-war European integration. Studies covering various issues underlying the integration were published mainly by the section of the institute which was dedicated to constitutional law. A publication worth mentioning is the work *A Federation for Western Europe* written by the

British lawyer Ivor Jennings. Jennings assumed that after the war continental Europe would follow the path of democracy inspired by British legal and political institutions, which could provide bedrock for the federation of European nations. Jennings did not think that after the defeat of Nazism, Britain and France would be strong enough to oppose the USSR's expansionist policy. It was not a federation of exclusively Western European states that he envisioned; in the long term, he was not opposed to the idea of including a democratic Russia. Yet if Russia was to be included, he would welcome the idea of the inclusion of the United States as well, "because it would redress the balance of the enormous Russian population" (Jennings, 1940: 30-31).

The economic section of the Research Institute focused on the analysis of various crucial economic aspects concerning the potential existence of a post-war union. The economic plans put forward by the members of the economic section varied mainly on the questions concerning the extent to which central institutions would interfere in running the economy. Friedrich von Hayek, an Austrian-British economist and philosopher, who was also a member of the institute, pointed out that all the projects of the federal government would be limited by economic differences and conflicting interests, resulting in the inability to agree on a common policy (Koziak, 2003: 77-78). In Hayek's viewpoint, the success of fascism and Nazism could be blamed on the refusal of socialist parties to assume responsibility in coalition governments as well as on their populism and effort to appeal to masses even in difficult times. He believed that socialism impedes social development, because a planned economy stifles competition. According to Hayek, best known for his defence of classical liberalism, redistributing wealth would lead people whose wealth is taken from to be less productive because they do not see the benefits in working as much if the benefits of their work is taken away from them.

Hayek's opinions prompted criticism on the part of leftist economists. Harold Wilson, a post-war politician and some years later Prime Minister of Great Britain,[5] rejected the claim that peace can be achieved only through economic liberty and voiced the concern that accepting such a claim would not be a step forward for democracy, but rather sliding into the past. (Koziak, 2003: 79). For a certain amount of time Wilson worked as a research assistant of William Beveridge and was heavily influenced by this famous economist who is known for his work on the foundations of a welfare state. Having used this term in 1942, Beveridge drew on the economic theories of state social policy developed by John Keynes in the late 1920s and early 1930s. Keynes based his theory on the idea that the key variable that governs economics is aggregate demand. In his view what causes the crisis of capitalism is not only inadequate supply, but especially the declining demand on the consumers' part. In order to raise wages, consumption must grow and the collective purchasing power must be insured. In other words, nobody, not even entrepreneurs, can profit from social phenomena such as low wages, unemployment, or poverty.

The report "arising out of the work of the Inter-departmental Committee on Social Insurance and Allied Services" (officially known as Cmd 6404) was presented to parliament in November 1942 and published in the same year. Beveridge was convinced that the war provided an opportunity to ensure that the type of social deprivation seen during the worldwide economic downturn in the 1930s could not happen again. In connection with the "Three Guiding Principles of Recommendations" Beveridge said: "Now, when the war is abolishing landmarks of every kind, is the opportunity for using experience in a clear field. A revolutionary moment in the world's history is a time for revolutions, not for patching" (see Beveridge Report, November 1942). The committee's report drawn up for the British Parliament focused on how to tackle the five "giant evils": want disease, ignorance, squalor, and idleness. His welfare provisions were based on four assumptions which were to be incorporated into British post-war policy: "that there should be a national

---

[5] Harold Wilson served two terms as Prime Minister – from 16th October 1964 until 19th June 1970 and from 4th March 1974 until 5th April 1976.

health service, an adequate state pension, family allowances and near-full employment" (Judt, 2010: 74-75).

3.3 "Welfare state" and "power state"

There is no single precise definition of what a welfare state is.[6] Even the origin of the term itself is still debated. Numerous historians agree that the term goes back to the Archbishop of York William Temple.[7] The Anglican prelates Archbishop of Canterbury William Cosmo Gordon Lang and Archbishop of York William Temple, together with the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Westminster, Cardinal Hinsley and the Moderator of the Free Church Federal Council Walter H. Armstrong all signed a letter to the editor of *The Times* entitled *Foundations for Peace: a Christian Basis, Agreement among the Churches.* They endorsed "The Pope's Five Peace Points", which Pope Pius XII raised in his *Christmas Address* broadcasted from the Vatican on 24th December 1939. The Pope requested "the assurance to all nations of their right to life and independence", emphasising "the will of one nation to live must never mean the sentence of death passed upon another. When this equality of rights has been destroyed, attacked, or threatened, order demands that reparation shall be made, and the measure and extent of that reparation is determined, not by the sword nor by the arbitrary decision of self-interest, but by the rules of justice and reciprocal equity." That required, in his opinion, "that the nations be delivered from the slavery imposed upon them by the race for armaments and from the danger that material force, instead of serving to protect the right, may become an over-bearing and tyrannical master. The order thus established requires a mutually agreed organic progressive disarmament, spiritual as well as material, and security for the effective implementing of such an agreement." He also pointed out the importance of certain juridical institutions "which shall guarantee the loyal and faithful fulfilment of conditions agreed upon and which shall in case of recognized need revise and correct them." Incentives to violent action would be removed by acknowledging the rights of nations, populations and racial minorities, which would eventually lead to the renewal of basic mutual trust. The Pope appealed to nations and their leaders that they should adopt a responsible attitude towards the human rights which uphold the "sacred and inviolable standards of the laws of God. They must hunger and thirst after justice and be guided by that universal love which is the compendium and most general expression of the Christian ideal" (Discorso di Sua Santità Pio XII al Sacro Collegio e alla Prelatura Romana, December 24, 1939; see The Role of Religion in Post-War Reconstruction, 1943: 123-124).

Striving to establish permanent peace, the representatives of the three abovementioned churches in England added five more points to the appeal of Pope Pius XII. These points focused on the economic and social spheres. They requested removing "extreme inequality in wealth and possessions", providing equal education of all children regardless of race or class, safeguarding the "family as a social unit", restoring the spiritual dimension of daily work, and using the resources of the Earth as "God's gifts to the whole human race" and doing so with "due consideration for the needs of the present and future generations" (see Foundations of Peace: A Christian Basis, Agreement Among the Churches, Letters to the Editor. The Times, December 21 1940, in The Role of Religion in Post-War Reconstruction, 1943). Archbishop William Temple set in opposition the terms "welfare state" and "power state", pointing out Britain's preoccupation with providing aid in the most delicate aspects of social life contrasted with Nazi Germany's preoccupation with war; this comparison emphasised the ethical dimension and cultural values of the welfare state. William Temple welcomed the

Beveridge Report because it corresponded with the Christian ethic. The idea of a welfare state also inspired several post-war Christian intellectuals and politicians, according to whom it was in accordance with the principles of Christian social teaching (Human dignity, Solidarity, Subsidiarity, Common good).

The Beveridge system provided a summary of principles necessary to banish poverty and its ambition was to included all citizens. It was primarily funded from the state budget, which was criticized by some liberal economists, especially the already mentioned F. A. Hayek. Between 1940 and 1943 Hayek worked on the book The Road to Serfdom first published in Britain by Routledge in March 1944 (see Hayek, 1944). In this book Hayek asserted that economic freedom and political freedom are linked and that peace can be preserved only through economic liberty. Unlike the Beveridge Report, *The Road to Serfdom* had only been a small success in post-war Britain and much better was sold in the United States.[8]

According to Beveridge: "The Plan for Social Security is put forward as something that could be in operation in the immediate aftermath of the war" ((Social Insurance and Allied Services, 1942: 17). The Beveridge Report laid the foundation of post-war social policy in Britain, including the provision of family allowances, comprehensive social insurance, and health care coverage.[9] His proposals practically influenced the evolution of welfare system in much of Western European countries" (Ştefan, 2015: 28).

4 Conclusion

In a democratic Europe, there has never been a coherent model of a social state. But the trust in democracy and its institutions is very narrowly connected with the issue of the living conditions of citizens.[10] "The social rights, income security, equalization, and eradication of poverty that a universalistic welfare state pursues are necessary precondition for the strength and unity that collective power mobilization demands" (Esping-Andersen, 1990: 16). This issue belongs in the set of activities defining social policy as a central subject (see Martinkovič, 2016: 50). This is also evidenced by historical experiences with the existence of totalitarian regimes who came to power during the Great Depression of the 1930s. The Nazis gained popularity in Germany also with their social policy and at the international level they presented themselves as the "New Order of Europe". However, during World War II the term "New Order" changed its meaning several times.

After the fall of France, when it seemed that Britain could remain alone in the war conflict with Germany, British politicians realized that they could not underestimate social issues either. Representatives of Christian churches in Britain also took part in the ideological struggle against Germany, and the leader in the ecumenical movement, Archbishop William Temple contributed to the popularization of the term "welfare state". After the war, almost all European democracies recognized the welfare state "as an essential institution which aims to ensure a relatively decent life for its citizens" (Social Insurance and Allied Services, 1942: 30). At the end of 1942 William Beveridge prepared an important report for the British Parliament. The Beveridge report was presented as a key instrument of radical social security reforms and gained quite wide admiration in post-war Western Europe.

---

[6] The name "welfare state" itself implies that it should be a state of prosperity, striving to achieve "the greatest happiness for the greatest number of people." Translations from other European languages show that the concept is also spoken about as a "social state", "providing state" (or "state of Providence), and a state which provides "public social services." The word "welfare" is also used in phrases such as "public welfare" (social support funded by tax income), "private welfare" (social provisions of non-governmental bodies), and "social welfare" (see Štrauss, 2005; Tomeš, 1996: 21).

[7] William Temple was Archbishop of York (1929–1942) and Archbishop of Canterbury (1942–1944).

[8] In the 1950s and 1960s Hayek's book inspired few readers. Margaret Thatcher did read his book already in 1944, "but its impact on her was minimal". In 1974, Hayek was awarded the Nobel Prize in Economics. At that time Thatcher "re-read" his book on the recommendation of Keith Joseph. In 1974, Joseph and Thatcher founded the Center for Politics, one of Britain's leading free market think tanks, which had a significant influence on conservative politics known as "Thatcherism". (see Aitken, 2013: 52).

[9] *The Beveridge Report* is seen as the foundation document for the welfare state created by the post-war Clement Attlee's Labour government.

[10] "Much comparative welfare state research in the social sciences has focused on the details of social insurance scheme in particular. A close analysis of the historical development of social insurance helps to reveal the complexity of these arrangements, and the ways in which they differed across national contexts" (Hilson, 2008: 100).

Although the post-war times were very difficult and the welfare state did not come cheap, the post-war state "was a ´social´ state, with implicit (and often constitutionally explicit) responsibility for the well-being of its citizens". This is emphasized by Tony Judt, according to whom: "... the postwar welfare systems were a guarantee of a certain minimum of justice, or fairness. This was not the spiritual and social revolution for which many in the wartime Resistance had dreamed, but it was a first step away from the hopelessness and cynicism of the pre-war years" (Judt, 2010: 76-77). The experience of the Great Depression and the Second World War should still remind us that the social issues are very closely associated with the existence and stability of a democratic society.

Literature:

1. Aitken, J.: *Margaret Thatcher. Power and Personality.* London: Bloomsbury, 2013, 764 p. ISBN: 9781 408831847.
2. Beveridge Report, *"Three Guiding Principles of Recommendations"*. November 1942. In The National Archives. [online]. [cit.2020-01-08]. Available: https://www.national archives.gov.uk/education/resources/attlees-britain/beveridge-report/
3. Burgess, M.: Comparative Federalism. Theory and practice. London-New York: Routledge, 2006, 357 p. SBN: 978–0–415–36454–6.
4. Churchill, W.: Beating the Invader. A message from the prime minister. Issued by Ministry of Information in cooperation with the War Office and the Ministry of Home Security. In Finest Hour 181, Summer 2018, p. 38. [online]. [cit.2020-01-08]. Available: https://winstonchurchill.org/publications/finest-hour /finest-hour-181/invasion-of-britain-beating-the-invader/
5. Corbett, A.: A Certain June 18th. The anniversary of De Gaulle's London address to 'Free France'. In *History Today*, July 2000, 50 (7) [online]. [cit.2020-01-08]. Available: https://www.historytoday.com/archive/certain-june-18th
6. *Discorso di Sua Santità Pio XII al Sacro Collegio e alla Prelatura Romana*, December 24, 1939. [online]. [cit.2020-01-08]. Available: https://www.vatican.va/content/pius-xii/it/speec hes/1939/documents/hf_p-xii_spe_19391224_questo-giorno.html
7. Esping-Andersen, Gøsta: The three worlds of welfare capitalism. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, (1990) 1998, 248 p. ISBN 0-691-02857-5.
8. Funk, W.: The economic reorganization of Europe (25 July 1940). In Lipgens, W. (ed.): *Documents on the History of European Integration (1). Continental Plans for European Union 1939–1945: (Including 250 Documents in their original Language on 6 microfiches).* Berlin, New York, Walter de Gruten: European University Institute, 1985, pp. 65-71. ISBN 3-11-00-009724-9.
9. Hayek, F. A.: *The Road to Serfdom* 1944. Routledge Press, 1944, 266 p. ISBN: 0-226-32061-8.
10. Hilson, M.: *The Nordic Model. Scandinavia since 1945.* London: Reaktion Books. First published 2008, reprinted 2013, 234 p. ISBN 978-1-86189-366-6.
11. Jennings, I.: *A Federation for Western Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1940. [online]. [cit.2020-01-08]. Available: https://archive.org/details/federationforwes031229 mbp/page/n45/mode/2up
12. Judt, T.: *Postwar: A History of Europe Since 1945.* London: Vintage Books, 2010, 933 p. ISBN 978-0-099-54203-2.
13. Katuninec, M.: Vplyv Kresťanských politikov a sociálneho učenia katolíckej cirkvi na politické myslenie v začiatkocch povojnového integračného procesu v západnej Európe. In *Dejinné premeny 20 storočia*. Bratislava: VEDA, 2016, pp. 335-349. ISBN 978-80-224-1504-0.
14. Koziak,T.: *Federálna únia* a *britské projekty európskej integrácie do roku 1945*. Prešov: SLOVACONTACT, 2003, 146 p. ISBN 80-88876-11-7.
15. Lipgens, W. - Loth, W. (eds.) Documents on the history of European integration. 2 : Plans for European Union in Great Britain and in exile 1939- 1945 (including 107 documents in their original languages on 3 microfiches) Berlin - New York: Walter de Gruyter (European University Institute), 1986, 851 p. ISBN: 3-11-010338-9.
16. Martinkovič M.: Moral Aspects of Politics and their Relation to the Legitimacy of Liberal Democracies. In Katuninec, M., Martinkovič, M.: *Ethical and Social Aspects of Policy: Chapters on Selected Issues of Transformation.* Frankfurt am Main, Berlin: Peter Lang, 2016, pp. 39-62. ISBN 9783631671580.
17. Mazower, M.: Dark Continent: Europe's Twentieth Century. Penguin, 1999, 512 p. ISBN- 0140241590.
18. Nazi 'Monroe' Doctrine for Europe. In *The Advertiser*, 6 March 1940. [online]. [cit.2020-01-08]. Available: http://trove. nla.gov.au/newspaper/article/41655263
19. North, R.: *The Many Not The Few: The Stolen History of the Battle of Britain.* London, New York: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2012, 456 p. ISBN: 9781441131515.
20. Patel, K. K.: Welfare in the Warfare State: Nazi Social Policy on the International Stage. In *German Historical Institute London Bulletin,* November 2015, 37 (2), pp. 3-38. ISSN 0269-8552.
21. Shirer, W. L. The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1960, 1245 p.
22. *Social Insurance and Allied Services. Report by sir William Beveridge, (Cmd 6404).* London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1942. [online]. [cit.2020-01-08]. Available: http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/ shared/bsp/hi/pdfs/19_07_05_beveridge.pdf
23. Ştefan, G. M.: European Welfare State in a Historical Perspective. A Critical Review. In European *Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, 2015, 7 (1), pp. 25-38. [online] [cit.2020-01-08]. Available: https://www.questia.com/library/ p439876/european-journal-of-interdisciplinary-studies/i4509102/ vol-7-no-1-june
24. Štrauss, D.: Štát blahobytu (welfare state, sociálny štát). In *Slovenská politologická revue*, 2005 (4). [online]. [cit.2020-01-08]. ISSN 1335-9096. Available: http://revue.kpol.ff.ucm.sk/ archiv/2005/4/straussd.pdf.
25. The Role of Religion in Post-War Reconstruction. In *World Affairs* 1943, 106 (1), pp. 3-41. [online]. [cit.2020-01-08]. Available: https://www.jstor.org/stable/20663800
26. Tomeš, I.: *Sociální politika. Teorie a mezinárodní zkušenost.* Praha: Socioklub 1996, 213 p. ISBN 80-902260-0-0.
27. Welch, D.: Nazi Propaganda and the Volksgemeinschaft: Constructing a People's Community. In *Journal of Contemporary History* 2004, 39 (2), *Understanding Nazi Germany*, pp. 213-238. [online]. [cit.2020-01-08]. ISSN 0022-0094. Available: https://www.jstor.org/stable/3180722

Primary Paper Section: A

Secondary Paper Section: AB, AD