

WUR of September 13<sup>th</sup>, 2015... “Embracing Global Goals, Scope and Action: Becoming Global Actors... Claiming the ‘All’” – Segue From *Antisystemic Movements...* To Alice (Dft 19)

---

*Today's show:* “Establishing a 'safe' place to plan and express our love: places for the cultivation of soul-sufficiency... which necessarily means: helping each other get 'big' – the process of reclaiming... sharing... and expanding our original 'selves'...” (Part 22)

---

[“150913statecraftingclass.mp3”:]

[...before I forget... there's a question I've been meaning to ask about drones. Often I've noticed when my connection is blocked that a drone is hovering in the vicinity overhead... whether at the library... or outdoors at a location where I upload [I hear the hovering drones at home... but I don't upload at home anymore... I also hear it generally when I awake... and as it flies away...] – and what I want to know is... is a 'hovering' capability in a drone an expensive accessory? You see where I'm going: is it only military that has it?]

September 7, 2015... Sisters and Brothers: We are approaching our free future... Tell a cell-mate... a loved one... a friend... After an unimaginable bludgeoning of us and the planet... Ten thousand years of 'class'... is coming to an end...

Marcuse referred to this time we're in as 'the reversal'... a good way... in many ways... to think of it...

The way we're considering today is from the aspect of the word itself: 'class'. As Hirschman told us in our last show... it's a term that came suddenly upon us... which came not to be questioned:

As happens frequently with concepts that are suddenly thrust to the center of the stage – class, elite, economic development, to name some more recent examples – interest appeared so self-evident a notion that nobody bothered to define it precisely.

But though we are reversing from *being classed* (which necessarily means a hierarchical ordering... some group of folks imposing that idea on us...) I think it makes more sense to see this as returning to our original wholeness (at birth...) rather than to an earlier social arrangement – i.e.... we are inventing something altogether new... as never before have we been consciously a global “community' of communities of fully-developing individualities.”

Marx's observations and 'thought' provide much insight into this question. Recall... for instance... the following comment of his from the August 30, 2015 show:

Camille Desmoulins, Danton, Robespierre, Saint-Just, Napoleon, the heroes as well as the parties and the masses of the old French Revolution, performed the task of their time in Roman costume and with Roman phrases, the task of unchaining and setting up modern bourgeois society. The first ones knocked the feudal basis to pieces and mowed off the feudal heads which had grown on it. The other created inside France the conditions under which alone free competition could be developed, parceled landed property exploited, and the unchained industrial productive power of the nation employed; and beyond the French borders he everywhere swept the feudal institutions away, so far as was necessary to furnish bourgeois society in France with a suitable up-to-date environment on the European Continent. [Recall that he's talking about a moment when the full horrors of the 'Industrial Revolution' were engulfing the English people... This is what he means by “up-to-date”... – P.S.] The new social formation once established, the antediluvian Colossi disappeared... bourgeois society in its sober reality had begotten its true interpreters and mouthpieces in the Says, Cousins, Royer-Collards, Benjamin Constants and Guizots; its real military leaders sat behind the office desks, and the hog-headed Louis XVIII was its political chief.... [So... 'new bosses' is what he's saying... new terms by which we may be eaten... – P.S.]

...and consider this in juxtaposition with the following linguistic observations – thinking in terms of the evolution of 'statecraft'...

...recalling that 'class' was an idea imposed on us...

...recalling that the 'thought' that gets preserved and handed down generally is the 'thought' that assists 'power' with that 'state-preservation' project... i.e. the 'thought' of the would-be social managers... who would see in Plato a mission calling out for their gifts... and in the French Revolution... a spur to action...

...'class' was imposed... by who?... and how?... we are asking today. For guidance I turned to Raymond Williams, who taught drama at Cambridge:

'Class' is an obviously difficult word, both in its range of meanings and in its complexity in that particular meaning where it describes a social division. The Latin word *classis*, a division according to property of the people of Rome, came into English in the late 16<sup>th</sup> century in its Latin form, with a plural *classes* or *classies*... But '*classis*' was primarily used in explicit reference to Roman history, and was then extended, first as a term in church organization...

[...and John Boswell's important book: *The Kindness of Strangers: The Abandonment of Children in Western Europe from Late Antiquity to the Renaissance* (1988) sheds light on this... sheds light on the innovators of Europe's intellectual life... he cites the monastery as the general destination for the abandoned children of the 'elite'. This practice was known as 'oblation'... an 'oblate' is "a thing presented or offered to God or a god..." – P.S.]:

As a formal system, oblation bore striking resemblances to other forms of abandonment, in terms of its social utility (e.g., in limiting the number of heirs [a point emphasized by Plato in the *Republic*... – P.S.] the conflicts it raised about irrevocability (much like imperial Roman struggles over the permanence of servile status) and even some very technical details: the setting of ten, for example, as the ultimate age for such donations in some locales matches age distinctions for other forms of parental divestment, such as fostering or sale. (p. 249)

Dynastic considerations might render children not only unwanted but dangerous: younger sons or siblings regularly challenged succession to the thrones of early medieval Europe, and children of second and third marriages represented threats to those of the first, and vice versa. The motif of the child destined to injure his parents, his family, or his kingdom, ubiquitous in ancient and medieval mythology and folklore, must to some extent reflect anxieties of this sort: "The fewer full-grown male relatives a king had around him, the easier he slept at night." Abandoning such persons as children – through exposing, fosterage, or oblation – was certainly more humane than murdering them, sometimes resorted to in later ages. (p. 257 – 8)

[The daily life of oblates] was not greatly different from that of children in strict religious boarding schools in many ages, except that in addition to school and work, they had long and exacting liturgical duties throughout the day. By and large, the monastic daily regimen involved about four hours of liturgy, four of reading, six of work, six to eight hours of sleep (from about 5 P.M. To about 2 A.M.), and two to four hours for eating, hygiene, and other physical needs. Most oblates would have spent more time in school than at work. Children were required to eat standing, but were usually given more meat and fed more frequently than the adult monks (although the amounts and variety were still ascetic); in influential Carolingian commentaries a special diet is prescribed for each year of childhood. (p. 249 – 50)]

...and later as a general term for a division or group...

["150913powerhidesmakesitself.mp3":]

...From the late 17<sup>th</sup> century the use of 'class' as a general word for a group or division became more and more common. What is then most difficult is that 'class' came to be used in this way about people as well as about plants and animals, but without social implications of the modern kind... Development of 'class' in its modern social sense, with relatively fixed names for particular classes ('lower class', 'upper class', 'working class' and so on) belongs essentially to the period between 1770 and 1840, which is also the period of the Industrial Revolution and its decisive reorganization of society.... [There's that abstract-actor again... concealing the existence of conscious *human* actors... – P.S.]

...The essential history of the introduction of 'class', as a word which would supersede older names for social divisions, relates to the increasing consciousness that social position is made rather than merely inherited [i.e.... the conscious awareness that there is a *system*... i.e.... signals that 'power' has retreated behind scenes... has gone into hiding... – P.S.]. All the older words, with their essential metaphors of standing, stepping and arranging in rows, belong to a society in which position was determined by birth... What was changing consciousness was... the new sense of a society or a

particular 'social system' which actually created social divisions, including new kinds of division. This is quite explicit in one of the first clear uses, that of Madison in *The Federalist* (USA, c. 1787): moneyed and manufacturing interests “grow up of necessity in civilized nations, and divide them into different classes, actuated by different sentiments and views”. Under the pressure of this awareness, greatly sharpened by the economic changes of the Industrial Revolution and the political conflicts of the American and French Revolutions, the new vocabulary of 'class' began to take over....

...With this said, we can trace the formation of the newly specific class vocabulary. 'Lower classes' was used in 1772, and 'lowest classes' and 'lowest class' were common from the 1790s. These carry some of the marks of the transition, but do not complete it. More interesting because less dependent on an old general sense, in which the 'lower classes' would be not very different from the common 'people', is the new and increasingly self-conscious and self-used description of the 'middle classes.' This has precedents in 'men of a middle condition' (1716), 'the middle Station of Life', (Defoe, 1719), 'the Middling People of England,... generally Good-natured and Stout-hearted' (1718), 'the middling and lower classes,' (1789), Gisborne in 1795 wrote an 'Enquiry into the Duties of Men in the Higher Rank and Middle Classes of Society in Great Britain'.... 'Rank' was still used at least as often, as in James Mill (1820): 'the class which is universally described as both the most wise and the most virtuous part of the community, the middle rank' (*Essay on Government*), but here 'class' has already taken on a general social sense, used on its own. The swell of self-congratulatory description reached a temporary climax in Brougham's speech of 1831: 'by the people, I mean the middle classes, the wealth and intelligence of the country, the glory of the British name.'

There is a continuing curiosity in this development. 'Middle' belongs to a disposition between 'lower' and 'higher', in fact as an insertion between an increasingly insupportable 'high' and 'low.'... But clearly in Brougham, and very often since, the 'upper' or 'higher' part of the model virtually disappears, or, rather, awareness of a 'higher' class is assigned to a different dimension, that of a residual and respected but essentially displaced aristocracy. (Raymond Williams, *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society*, p. 51 - 3)

What these observations suggest – particularly in the context of our on-going theme of 'power' hiding itself in the aftermath of the French Revolution... in its determination to 'make-itself'... and the world... make mischief clandestine... according to the 'guidance' provided by Plato's *Republic* – is the emergence of a conscious strategy... among a self-identifying (self-creating?... self-reflecting trans-national people... adopted with a missionary zeal... to make 'order' from 'mess'... using money and 'philosophical education'... and of course... us... we who make everything... as means. In order for them to 'make themselves'... they 'make us' simultaneously... – this is making the 'society' they want. This is why we've just been along for the ride... because consciousness is everything. Those who act with consciousness multiply their impact many many fold... This is one of the lessons 'power' has shown us that we need to begin taking to heart. ASAP.

["150913starttheballrolling.mp3":]

They became 'social experimenters'... we... were *made* into the means...

...and in the context of us being made into means... a 'class analysis'... is by definition 'historicist'... – and is not 'historicism'... in the examples Popper gives in *The Open Society* and that we are considering... a conscious tactic... and so necessarily social engineering?... i.e.... a conscious attempt to re-make 'society'... and to realize... impose... the vision of the few? – an imposing upon events a pattern... a mold... into which you make them fit – the primary political effect being... to train 'the people' to accept those new categories: 'class'... and 'economic development'. (Those are key tools that 'power' has used to make the world they want... and we're going to be considering that Marx unconsciously played a role in that...)

A world shifted in that 'power'-defined space of 'forgetfulness' called “seizing and re-meaning – a new set of meanings and associations attendant upon – the thoughts we think...”

...yet another way 'power' hides: by claiming the turf of 'words'...

...so in the reversal... we take it back...

'Reversal' means... the 'world' once again shifting... from 'slave' back to 'human being'...

...and though it may seem that the millennia-long re-making of us... from human beings to 'slaves'... 'workers' and 'classes'...

...taking time to make... must take time to un-make... this is not so...

...our freedom is innate... a 'longing-to-burst-forth' held back by a barrage of words...

...thinking 'strategic' we see: our counter-barrage releases our freedom... and then... the calculus changes.

It's time we recognized and gave full weight to the fact... that words... our voices speaking them... not just 'matter'... but are everything... when it comes to our getting free...

...that and working together simultaneously... I've been pondering a lot the fact that I've been... in some respects... *made* singular... This is one of the things 'power' prides itself on: being able to craft and sculpt the reality it wants... well this is true on a macro and micro scale... So... for instance... by using the 'money-lever' they can cause it to seem to be that one person 'takes off'... another doesn't... And in my case what it has meant is an isolating effect as a result of a variety of small acts and measures... happening behind scenes – that is... their hands enacting them have been behind scenes... have made it such that I have been pretty much isolated. But I am one person – one person who is certain... and it shows the importance of 'certainty'... and it shows what a single person can do – I'm not trying to say I've done an enormous amount... but I've done some... and I've had help... no doubt... from the ancestors... and from good folk... many many I don't know... behind scenes... I'm sure... that the book *Waking Up: Freeing Ourselves From Work*... that there have been folks who've helped get it out... whether intentionally or no... they helped. So I've had help... and I am so grateful for that. But if two were to stand together and do this... you see the trouble that they've gone to isolate me... and to remove me from the planet... but it's difficult... because it has to seem 'accidental'... it has to seem 'natural'... and so... according to those terms... it's 'taken longer' than they certainly would want it to take... But those terms apply to whoever stands with me... So... I am encouraging us to start being 'bigger'... 'bolder'... and claiming what we want *openly*... saying what we want openly... standing with those who say this openly... to... e.g.... contact KPFA and say: “Why are we not talking about a one-day global General Strike?... Is it not true that 'power' is global?... There is this book called *Antisystemic Movements* by Giovanni Arrighi... Terence K. Hopkins... and Immanuel Wallerstein... which argues that we cannot get free except globally... and that we cannot get free working within the nation-state system... it is designed to contain us.”

“So... why not... KPFA... talk about the fact that we need to use *the* lever we got: our energy... and start the ball rolling...”  
May 1... a good day to start planning it for the following May.

You would have to be in my shoes... perhaps... to have certainty about this – though I know there are many folk who have walked this walk before me... and who know – to know that there is a serious attempt to install global totalitarianism... fascism 'cropping up' in individual nation-states... – is not by accident by any means. And the fact that these guys have their international planning mechanisms... and talk behind scenes... and that they move and forth between 'money'-positions and straight-up 'power' positions... is a key indicator of the fact that 'power' operates behind scenes... and that the 'nation-state'-means is theater... and that it is time for us to start taking each other much more seriously than we take that theater. We have the mechanism: the instantaneous communication (thanks to Nikola Tesla...) and the Internet... We know that Nikola Tesla intended instantaneous communication to be our means for freeing ourselves... He used the term 'global unity'... It's a good word. We cannot achieve it while these ten thousand guys who want to be gods are allowed to continue to manipulate our lives.

—

[“150913bruceleesbody.mp3”:]

So what we are considering in this space... and what I have been led... come... to see... is that the suppression of political speech... is not just a tacked-on extra tactic from their tool-box of tactics for keeping us under control... no... it is key... because it is what we think that determines what we allow ourselves to do and be... so controlling what we *can* think... by controlling the words and the concepts we think in... has always been key... ever since 'class' began... and that's why you can find these tactics gift-wrapped and handed to 'power' from Plato... two thousand five hundred years ago...

So... that counter-barrage of our words... our thoughts... our key messages... is key... releases our freedom... releases our 'power'... – our words... our voices speaking them... not just matter... but are everything...

...when it comes to our getting free...

It gets back to the fact... again... to what I've experienced since writing *Waking Up*... these hidden folk have had to show themselves in order to attempt intimidation... In my shoes... from my vantage... folks would see... if you were in them... if you were seeing from my vantage you would see... they have been busy... and that the 'news'... so called... we are given... is created... is presented... is vetted... and to a degree that most of us would not believe on its face... the degree to which they simply 'off' the people that they find 'inconvenient'... none of us could ever have imagined... until you're walking in these shoes... – and we're going to read some quotes from Karl Popper that explain why that's the case: that they must *seem* to be a 'superior race'... and what they cannot demonstrate 'superiority in... they just eliminate the 'competition'... I remember seeing a documentary about the life of Bruce Lee after he died... in which an actor-friend... I think it was James Coburn... said that when he saw the body of Bruce Lee at the funeral... it didn't look like him... Well Brothers and Sisters... when I look at myself in the mirror after a night-time of being subjected to this EMF-barrage... bombardment... it don't even look like me anymore... the swollen-ness in my lower cheek... along the jaw-line... So... I have to think... I have to be suspicious... when someone who is other-worldly supreme in what he does – and... further... not in 'power's pocket... does not 'fit' with the picture of the top of the hierarchy that they want us to see... and... moreover... a man who wants us *all* to be powerful... and wants to help unite us across race and culture – that person is more than 'inconvenient'... that person is a direct threat.

I don't want a world in which the 'reality' we are given is invented... is created... I want a world in which our children apply their magnificent gifts to what is authentic.

I don't think we have – all of us globally – wrapped our minds around the fact that the control these new... self-made 'power'-guys want over us... is *total*...

Yet that is clearly what the facts show... clearly where the evidence tends: they want to define us... design us... from the thoughts we think on up... to see them as 'supreme beings'...

Recall how Hirschman termed them 'administrators'... and Marx notes this new breed leads from behind a desk... but never doubt for a moment that they still harbor hopes... for the throne.

We are being turned into passive quiescent unresisting fuel for a totalitarian machine... Every one of us needs to be thinking furiously about how to turn that around... That's what the earth needs... that's what we need... that's what all life needs... for us to turn that around.

—

[“150913mischiefmakers.mp3”:]

In what follows from Albert O. Hirschman's *The Passions and the Interests: Political Arguments for Capitalism before Its Triumph*... consider the turn-of-thought wrought by his argument.

But the idea that men pursuing their interests would be forever harmless was decisively given up only when the reality of capitalist development was in full view. As economic growth in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries uprooted millions of people, impoverished numerous groups while enriching some, caused large-scale unemployment during cyclical depressions, and produced modern mass society, it became clear to a number of observers that those caught in these violent transformations would on occasion become passionate – passionately angry, fearful, resentful. There is no need to list here the names of those social scientists who recorded these developments and analyzed them under the terms of alienation, *anomie*, *ressentiment*, *Vermassung*, class struggle, and many others. It is precisely because we are under the influence of those analyses, and even more under the impact of cataclysmic events which we try to understand with their help, that the doctrine reviewed here has an air of unreality about it and, on superficial acquaintance, appears not to deserve to be taken seriously.... (p. 126 -7)

It is precisely because it strikes the contemporary mind as odd that it can throw some light on the still puzzling ideological circumstances of the rise of capitalism.

An obvious way of entering into this topic is to compare the account of the emergence of money-making as an honored occupation that has been presented in this essay with Weber's thesis on the Protestant ethic and with the debate around it. As was noted repeatedly in the previous pages, the expansion of commerce and industry in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries has been viewed here as being welcomed and promoted not by some marginal social groups, nor by an insurgent

ideology, but by a current of opinion that arose right in the center of the “power structure” and the “establishment” of the time, out of the problems with which the prince and particularly his advisors and other concerned notables were grappling. [There we have it folk... this is a suppressed book – his argument... his analysis... his serious delving into this question... is invaluable for us... – P.S.] ...promoted not by some marginal social groups, nor by an insurgent ideology, but by a current of opinion that arose right in the center of the “power structure” and the “establishment” of the time, out of the problems with which the prince and particularly his advisors [those abandoned children who grew up in those monasteries... that very literate bunch... who at age ten were 'alienated' from their royal and elite families... who therefore harbored deep feelings of not being appreciated or seen... or being 'not good enough'... perhaps?... and needing to 'prove' their worth?... by serving who?... the king... – that was that 'task' of childhood they never completed: their need to 'prove' they really were 'good enough' after all... – P.S.] – and other concerned notables were grappling. Ever since the end of the Middle Ages, and particularly as a result of the increasing frequency of war and civil war in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the search was on for a behavioral equivalent for religious precept, for new rules of conduct and devices that would impose much needed discipline and constraints on both rulers and ruled, and the expansion of commerce and industry was thought to hold much promise in this regard.

Weber and his followers as well as most of his critics were primarily interested in the psychological processes through which some groups of men became single-minded in the rational pursuit of capitalist accumulation. My story takes it for granted that some men became so impelled and focuses instead on the reaction to the new phenomenon by what is called today the intellectual, managerial, and administrative elite. That reaction was favorable, not because the money-making activities were approved in themselves, but because they were thought to have a most beneficial side effect: they kept the men who were engaged in them “out of mischief,” as it were, and had, more specifically, the virtue of imposing restraints on princely caprice, arbitrary government, and adventurous foreign policies.... [And here we have another prime example of a suppressed book... as... with Hirschman's and Popper's help... had their words been discussed by we commoners... we would long since have seen the flaws in Marxism as an ideological tool to assist in our mobilization for freedom... and... clearly... these Plato's Tribesmen see themselves as the opposite of 'mischief-makers'... and therefore entitled to 'rule us... to see this is false... we need only look around us... look at the mess they have made of our common earth... – P.S.]

---

[“150913platosracistrepublic.mp3”:]

[Today's reading: continuing our interlude: Marx's *Eighteenth Brumaire*... before returning to the chapter "Poisonous Pedagogy" in Alice Miller's *For Your Own Good*... – P.S.]

[And as a 'Preface'... because *The Eighteenth Brumaire* has been hailed as a masterful... and prescient... example of 'class analysis'... I found myself asking... what makes a 'class analysis'?... and how can it be... when the ones constructing the key struggles that come to define us and have led to our defeat (up to now...) are in hiding? So let's think on that further... But I also want to give Marx's answer... from a letter at the back in which he says:

And now as to myself, no credit is due to me for discovering the existence of classes in modern society or the struggle between them. Long before me bourgeois historians had described the historical development of this class struggle and bourgeois economists the economic anatomy of the classes. What I did that was new was to prove: 1) that the *existence of classes* is only bound up with *particular historical phases in the development of production*, 2) that the class struggle necessarily leads to the *dictatorship of the proletariat*, 3) that this dictatorship itself only constitutes the transition to the *abolition of all classes* and to a *classless society*. (From Marx's letter to J. Weydemeyer, March 5, 1852)

[What he did was to inject Hegel into our longing to be free. The Prussian king Frederick William did this before him... as we learned from Karl Popper... in response to the revolutionary nationalism that arose in Germany “as a reaction to the Napoleonic invasion...” His use of Hegel was very concrete... (Hegel was assigned the “urgent task [of] taming... the revolutionary nationalist religion. Hegel fulfilled this task in the spirit of Pareto's advice 'to take advantage of sentiments, not wasting one's energies in futile efforts to destroy them.' He tamed nationalism not by outspoken opposition but by transforming it into a well-disciplined Prussian authoritarianism...” [the full quote is in *Revealing Division*.) Hegel's service to Marx was in the realm of ideology.

Whence this sudden obsession with taxonomy linked with 'historical progression'? According to V. Gordon Childe (*Man Makes Himself...*) who cites a Professor Bury... "the ideal of progress was itself a novelty, entirely foreign to mediaeval or ancient writers on history..."

Martin Bernal ties it to the project to re-write the origins of 'classical civilization'.... But why?

By the middle of the 18<sup>th</sup> century... a number of Christian apologists were using the emerging paradigm of 'progress', with its presupposition that 'later is better', to promote the Greeks at the expense of the Egyptians. These strands of thought soon merged with two others that were becoming dominant at the same time: racism and Romanticism.... This racism pervaded the thought of Locke, Hume and other English thinkers. Their influence – and that of the new European explorers of other continents – was important at the university of Gottingen, founded in 1734 by George II, Elector of Hanover and King of England, and forming a cultural bridge between Britain and Germany. It is not surprising, therefore, that the first 'academic' work on human racial classification – which naturally put Whites, or to use his new term, 'Caucasians', at the head of the hierarchy – was written in the 1770s by Johann Friedrich Blumenbach, a professor at Gottingen.

The university pioneered the establishment of modern disciplinary scholarship.... By the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, 'progress' had become a dominant paradigm, dynamism and change were valued more than stability... [I would argue... however... that this 'value' was strictly utilitarian... i.e.... propagandistic... the budding social-engineers could not help but see... that the only way to realize Plato's dream... was to 'divest' us of our certainty... our security... our earth... – P.S.] (Martin Bernal, *Black Athena: The Afroasiatic Roots of Classical Civilization, Volume 1: The Fabrication of Ancient Greece 1785 – 1985*, p. 27 – 8)

[Here's another good example of 'power's m.o. (and fundamental dishonesty) from the get-go... it pawns its defects off on us – chief among them... its violence and racism... – and in 'exchange' seizes the credit for our innovation and creativeness... – P.S.]

["150913platostotalitarianobsession.mp3":]

...it is an obsession... moreover... that interweaves notions of 'perfection'... classification... ranking... and social engineering. It is an obsession... we will be arguing... sprung from the totalitarian... Platonic... obsession with designing the 'perfect' human... and designing the 'perfect' state.

There was... in response to 'the statesman's dilemma'... discussed by Hirschman... of the ineffectuality of 'reason' for reining-in the bloodletting of the 'rulers'... a gradually building reconsideration of the guidance provided by Plato... to understand the substance of which... no one better to assist... than Karl Popper:

If, as I believe, the philosophies of Plato as well as Heraclitus sprang from their social experience, especially from the experience of class war and from the abject feeling that their social world was going to pieces, then we can understand why the theory of Forms came to play such an important part in Plato's philosophy when he found that it was capable of explaining the trend towards degeneration. He must have welcomed it as the solution of a most mystifying riddle. While Heraclitus had been unable to pass a direct ethical condemnation upon the trend of the political development, Plato found, in his theory of Forms, the theoretical basis for a pessimistic judgement in Hesiod's vein.

But Plato's greatness as a sociologist does not lie in his general and abstract speculations about the law of social decay. It lies rather in the wealth and detail of his observations, and in the amazing acuteness of his sociological intuition. He saw things which had not been seen before him, and which were rediscovered only in our own time. As an example I may mention his theory of the primitive beginnings of society, of tribal patriarchy, and, in general, his attempt to outline the typical periods in the development of social life. Another example is Plato's sociological and economic historicism, his emphasis upon the *economic background* of the political life and the historical development; a theory revived by Marx under the name 'historical materialism'. A third example is Plato's most interesting law of political revolutions, according to which all revolutions presuppose a disunited ruling class (or 'elite'); a law which forms the basis of his analysis of the means of arresting political change and creating a social equilibrium, and which has been recently rediscovered by the theoreticians of totalitarianism, especially by Pareto....

According to Plato, internal strife, class war, fomented by self-interest and especially material or economic self-interest, is the main force of 'social dynamics'. The Marxian formula 'The history of all hitherto existing societies is a

history of class struggle' fits Plato's historicism nearly as well as that of Marx. (Karl Popper, *The Open Society and Its Enemies, Vol. 1: The Spell of Plato*, p. 40 – 1)

It's worth considering that Marx shares with Bentham yet another quality... in addition to their fondness for a "benevolent' utilitarianism" (discussed in our last show...) that being a reluctance to give credit... to Plato. Continuing with Popper:

I believe... that he made a serious attempt to reconstruct the ancient tribal forms of social life as well as he could. There is no reason to doubt this, especially since the attempt was, in a good number of its details, very successful. It could hardly be otherwise, since Plato arrived at his picture by an idealized description of the ancient tribal aristocracies of Crete and Sparta. With his acute sociological intuition he had seen that these forms were not only old, but petrified, arrested; that they were relics of a still older form. And he concluded that this still older form had been even more stable, more securely arrested. This very ancient and accordingly very good and very stable state he tried to reconstruct in such a way as to make clear how it had been kept free from disunion; how class war had been avoided, and how the influence of economic interests had been reduced to a minimum, and kept well under control. These are the main problems of Plato's reconstruction of the best state.

How does Plato solve the problem of avoiding class war? Had he been a progressivist, he might have hit on the idea of a classless, equalitarian society; for, as we can see for instance from his own parody of Athenian democracy, there were strong equalitarian tendencies at work in Athens. But he was not out to construct a state that might come, but a state that had been – the father of the Spartan state, which was certainly not a classless society. It was a slave state, and accordingly Plato's best state is based on the most rigid class distinctions. It is a caste state. The problem of avoiding class war is solved, not by abolishing classes, but by giving the ruling class a superiority which cannot be challenged. As in Sparta, the ruling class alone is permitted to carry arms, it alone has any political or other rights, and it alone receives education, i.e., a specialized training in the art of keeping down its human sheep or other human cattle. (In fact, its overwhelming superiority disturbs Plato a little; he fears that its members 'may worry the sheep', instead of merely shearing them, and 'act as wolves rather than dogs'. This problem is considered later in the chapter.) As long as the ruling class is united, there can be no challenge to their authority, and consequently no class war.

Plato distinguishes three classes in his best state, the guardians, their armed auxiliaries or warriors, and the working class. But actually there are only two castes, the military caste – the armed and educated rulers – and the unarmed and uneducated ruled, the human sheep; for the guardians are no separate caste, but merely old and wise warriors who have been promoted from the ranks of the auxiliaries. That Plato divides his ruling caste into two classes, the guardians and the auxiliaries, without elaborating similar subdivisions within the working class, is largely due to the fact that he is interested only in the rulers. The workers, tradesmen, etc., do not interest him at all, they are only human cattle whose sole function is to provide for the material needs of the ruling class...

[Any doubt... from the above... that Plato's Tribesmen are salivating at seeing... in this moment... how close they are to realizing... this 'vision'?... – P.S.]

...Since the ruling class alone has political power...

[...for instance... can we dismiss such ruses as 'participatory budgeting' from our thinking?... refuse to be played at this stage in the advancement of their 'statecraft'... can we recall 'power' is global... and so... therefore... must our resistance be to it... and rather than be used... choose for ourselves our own future?... in which each individual one of us... lives their gifts... and shares them without coercion... without 'managers' deciding for us what world we 'want'?... – P.S.]

...Since the ruling class alone has political power, including the power of keeping the number of the human cattle within such limits as to prevent them from becoming a danger...

[...and we don't have to imagine their tactics in this regard... our whistleblower at DARPA [Leuren Moret... this issue also came up in our January 19, 2014 show... included in the pdf: "Miklos Nyiszli's Lessons On 'Class'"] has already said... they know how to "weaponize the energy in the environment..." create earthquakes and hurricanes and such... Let's not wait for hearings in Congress... before waking up... – P.S.]

Since the ruling class alone has political power, including the power of keeping the number of the human cattle within such limits as to prevent them from becoming a danger, the whole problem of preserving the state is reduced



to that of preserving the internal unity of the master class. How is this unity of the rulers preserved? By training and other psychological influences [see Alice Miller's *For Your Own Good*], but otherwise mainly by the elimination of economic interests which may lead to disunion. This economic abstinence is achieved and controlled by the introduction of communism, i.e. by the abolition of private property... This communism is confined to the ruling class, which alone must be kept free from disunion; quarrels among the ruled are not worthy of consideration. Since all property is common property, there must also be a common ownership of women and children... Only a communist system which has room neither for great want nor for great wealth can reduce economic interests to a minimum, and guarantee the unity of the ruling class...

...In order that the ruling class may feel really united, that it should feel like one tribe, i.e. like one big family, pressure from without the class is as necessary as are the ties between the members of the class. This pressure can be secured by emphasizing and widening the gulf between the rulers and the ruled. The stronger the feeling that the ruled are a different and an altogether inferior race, the stronger will be the sense of unity among the rulers. (p. 45 – 9)

[So... do we see?... we... as a generality... must determine ourselves to be... fully-developing-individualities... as a two-sided political strategy for getting free – as the true power and beauty we show ourselves to be... robs 'power' of our use for its totalitarian machine... and forces 'power's children to re-think their conditioning... Together... both sides... stem the tide... of the functionaries...]

I apologize for once again not getting to our *Eighteenth Brumaire* reading... but I think apprehending the broader context is needed to fully apprehend Marx's analysis – and 'Marxism' has so captured the time... energy... and resources of us on the Left... that it's really important that we take the time to think it through... as claiming those resources and that energy for what I think are more useful strategies... is what we want to do... We got the numbers – seven billion... – We got the critical mass – a bunch of us progressives... globally... once we discuss it... and get conscious and certain... We got the technology (thank you Nikola...) – the Internet and instantaneous communication – ... We have everything we need... to call the question... and choose freedom... – May it be soon... – P.S.]

[September 13, 2015 show ends here.]

---

Finally, in its struggle against the [1848] revolution [in France], the parliamentary republic found itself compelled to strengthen, along with the repressive measures, the resources and centralization of governmental power. All revolutions perfected this machine instead of smashing it. The parties that contended in turn for domination regarded the possession of this huge state edifice as the principle spoils of the victor. [Remove the abstract actors and what are we left with?: 'power' will ever... so long as 'class' exists... be determined to control us... and should we resist... to clamp down ever harder on us... – P.S.]

But under the absolute monarchy, during the first Revolution, under Napoleon, bureaucracy was only the means of preparing the class rule of the bourgeoisie. Under the Restoration, under Louis Philippe, under the parliamentary republic, it was the instrument of the ruling class, however much it strove for power of its own.

Only under the second Bonaparte does the state seem to have made itself completely independent... Bonaparte represents a class, and the most numerous class of French society at that, the small-holding peasants... [If so... he did a damn poor job of it... truly incompetent... unless we conclude... that the man was a buffoon... But 'History' proved otherwise... – P.S.]

But let there be no misunderstanding. The Bonaparte dynasty represents not the revolutionary, but the conservative peasant... the peasant who wants to consolidate [his] holding... [but] the three years' rigorous rule of the parliamentary republic had freed a part of the French peasants from the Napoleonic illusion and had revolutionized them... but the bourgeoisie violently repressed them, as often as they set themselves in motion...

After the first revolution had transformed the peasants from semi-villeins into freeholders, Napoleon confirmed and regulated the conditions on which they could exploit undisturbed the soil of France which had only just fallen to their lot and slake their youthful passion for property. But what is now causing the ruin of the French peasant is his small holding itself [...now that strikes me as a really twisted way to describe it... – P.S.], the division of the land, the form of property which Napoleon

consolidated in France. It is precisely the material conditions which made the feudal peasant a small-holding peasant and Napoleon an emperor. Two generations have sufficed to produce the inevitable result: progressive deterioration of agriculture, progressive indebtedness of the agriculturist. The “Napoleonic” form of property, which at the beginning of the nineteenth century was the condition for the liberation and enrichment of the French country folk, has developed [...'power' hides in the passive tone... – P.S.] in the course of this century into the law of their enslavement and pauperization. And precisely this law is the first of the “*idees napoleoniennes*” [“an allusion to Louis Bonaparte's Book *Des idees napoleoniennes*, published in Paris in 1839.” (editor)] which the second Bonaparte has to uphold....

The economic development of small-holding property has radically changed the relation of the peasants to the other classes of society. Under Napoleon, the fragmentation of the land in the countryside supplemented free competition [...'power' hides in the ideology of 'economic development'... in the economic propaganda... – P.S.] and the beginning of big industry in the towns. The peasant class was the ubiquitous protest against the landed aristocracy which had just been overthrown. The roots that small-holding property struck in French soil deprived feudalism of all nutriment. Its landmarks formed the natural fortifications of the bourgeoisie against any surprise attack on the part of its old overlords. But in the course of the nineteenth century the feudal lords were replaced by urban usurers; the feudal obligation that went with the land was replaced by the mortgage; aristocratic landed property was replaced by bourgeois capital. The small holding of the peasant is now only the pretext that allows the capitalist to draw profits, interest and rent from the soil, while leaving it to the tiller of the soil himself to see how he can extract his wages. The mortgage debt burdening the soil of France imposes on the French peasantry payment of an amount of interest equal to the annual interest on the entire British national debt. Small-holding property, in this enslavement by capital to which its development inevitably pushes forward [...this attribution to an imposed scarcity (i.e.... a result born of force... coercion) of some 'natural' inherent 'development' and an 'historical role' – proposing the existence of 'inevitable' 'economic laws' that produce it... is doing 'power's work for it... weaving the curtain that 'power' stands behind... – P.S.], has transformed the mass of the French nation into troglodytes. Sixteen million peasants (including women and children) dwell in hovels, a large number of which have but one opening, others only two and the most favoured only three. And windows are to a house what the five senses are to the head. The bourgeois order, which at the beginning of the century set the state to stand guard over the newly arisen small holding and manured it with laurels, has become a vampire that sucks out its blood and brains and throws it into the alchemistic cauldron of capital. The *Code Napoleon* is now nothing but a codex of distraints, forced sales and compulsory auctions. To the four million (including children, etc.) officially recognized paupers, vagabonds, criminals and prostitutes in France must be added five million who hover on the margin of existence and either have their haunts in the countryside itself or, with their rags and their children, continually desert the countryside for the towns and the towns for the countryside. The interests of the peasants, therefore, are no longer, as under Napoleon, in accord with, but in opposition to the interests of the bourgeoisie, to capital. Hence the peasants find their natural ally and leader in the *urban proletariat*, whose task is the overthrow of the bourgeois order. But strong and *unlimited government* – and this is the second “*idee napoleoniennne*,” which the second Napoleon has to carry out – is called upon to defend this “material” order by force. This “*ordre materiel*” also serves as the catchword in all of Bonaparte's proclamations against the rebellious peasants....

One sees: *all “idees napoleoniennes” are ideas of the undeveloped small holding in the freshness of its youth; for the small holding that has outlived its day they are an absurdity. They are only the hallucinations of its death struggle, words that are transformed into phrases, spirits transformed into ghosts. But the parody of the empire [des Imperialismus] was necessary to free the mass of the French nation from the weight of tradition [...translation into 'earth-speak': “disconnect the earth-connected – and so soul / self-sufficient – from their earth-connectedness... in order to force them into a dependent relation to 'power'... subject to its 'grand' objectives... – P.S.] and to work out in pure form the opposition between the state power and society. With the progressive undermining of small-holding property, the state structure erected upon it collapses. The centralization of the state that modern society requires arises only on the ruins of the military-bureaucratic government machinery which was forged in opposition to feudalism. [Now that we have lived this... “state centralization”... now that we have seen what it means to have 'consent' imposed by the elimination of all other options... must begin challenging this assumption of the inevitability – because ordained by 'History' – of 'power's appropriation of our planet... – P.S.]*

The condition of the French peasants provides us with the answer to the riddle of the *general elections of December 20 and 21*, which bore the second Bonaparte up Mount Sinai, not to receive laws, but to give them.

Manifestly the bourgeoisie had now no choice but to elect Bonaparte... Only... disorder [can save] order!

As the executive authority which has made itself an independent power, Bonaparte feels it to be his mission to safeguard “bourgeois order.” But the strength of this bourgeois order lies in the middle class. He looks on himself, therefore, as the representative of the middle class and issues decrees in this sense. Nevertheless, he is somebody solely due to the fact that he

has broken the political power of this middle class and daily breaks it anew. Consequently, he looks on himself as the adversary of the political and literary power of the middle class. But by protecting its material power, he generates its political power anew. The cause must accordingly be kept alive; but the effect, where it manifests itself, must be done away with. But this cannot pass off without slight confusions of cause and effect, since in their interaction both lose their distinguishing features.... As against the bourgeoisie, Bonaparte looks on himself, at the same time, as the representative of the peasants and of the people in general, who wants to make the lower classes of the people happy within the frame of bourgeois society.... But, above all, Bonaparte looks on himself as the chief of the Society of December 10, as the representative of the *lumpenproletariat* to which he himself, his *entourage*, his government and his army belong, and whose prime consideration is to benefit itself and draw California lottery prizes from the state treasury. And he vindicates his position as chief of the Society of December 10 with decrees, without decrees and despite decrees.

This contradictory task of the man explains the contradictions of his government, the confused groping about which seeks now to win, now to humiliate first one class and then another and arrays all of them uniformly against him, whose practical uncertainty forms a highly comical contrast to the imperious, categorical style of the government decrees, a style which is faithfully copied from the Uncle.

Industry and trade, hence the business affairs of the middle class, are to prosper in hothouse fashion under the strong government. The grant of innumerable railway concessions. But the Bonapartist *lumpenproletariat* is to enrich itself. The initiated play *tripotage* [hanky-panky] on the *bourse* with the railway concessions.... Leonine agreement of the Bank with the government. The people are to be given employment. Initiation of public works.... Dissolution of actual workers' associations, but promises of miracles of association in the future. The peasants are to be helped. Mortgage banks that expedite their getting into debt and accelerate the concentration of property. But these banks are to be used to make money out of the confiscated estates of the House of Orleans. No capitalist wants to agree to this condition, which is not in the decree, and the mortgage bank remains a mere decree, etc. etc.

Bonaparte would like to appear as the patriarchal benefactor of all classes. But he cannot give to one class without taking from another. Just as at the time of the Fronde it was said of the Duke of Guise that he was the most *obligeant* man in France because he had turned all his estates into his partisans' obligations to him, so Bonaparte would fain be the most *obligeant* man in France and turn all the property, all the labour of France into a personal obligation to himself. He would like to steal the whole of France in order to be able to make a present of her to France or, rather, in order to be able to buy France anew with French money, for as the chief of the Society of December 10 he must needs buy what ought to belong to him. And all the state institutions, the Senate, the Council of State, the legislative body, the Legion of Honour, the soldiers' medals, the washhouses, the public works, the railways, the *etat major* [General Staff] of the National Guard to the exclusion of privates, and the confiscated estates of the House of Orleans – all become parts of the institution of purchase. Every place in the army and in the government machine becomes a means of purchase. But the most important feature of this process, whereby France is taken in order to give to her, is the percentages that find their way into the pockets of the head and the members of the Society of December 10 during the turnover....

[Earlier in the book Marx describes the Society of December 10 in this way:

This society dates from the year 1849. On the pretext of founding a benevolent society, the *lumpenproletariat* of Paris had been organized into secret sections, each section being led by Bonapartist agents, with a Bonapartist general at the head of the whole. Alongside decayed *roues* with dubious means of subsistence and of dubious origin, alongside ruined and adventurous offshoots of the bourgeoisie, were vagabonds, discharged soldiers, discharged jailbirds, escaped galley slaves, swindlers, mountebanks, *lazzaroni*, pickpockets, tricksters, gamblers, *maquereaus* [procurers], brothel keepers, porters, *litterati*, organ-grinders, ragpickers, knife grinders, tinkers, beggars – in short, the whole indefinite, disintegrated mass, thrown hither and thither, which the French term *la boheme*; from this kindred element Bonaparte formed the core of the Society of December 10. A “benevolent society” – in so far as, like Bonaparte, all its members felt the need of benefitting themselves at the expense of the labouring nation. This Bonaparte, who constitutes himself *chief of the lumpenproletariat*, who here alone rediscovers in mass form the interests which he personally pursues, who recognizes in this scum, offal, refuse of all classes the only class upon which he can base himself unconditionally, is the real Bonaparte, the Bonaparte sans phrases. An old crafty *roue*, he conceives the historical life of the nations and their performances of state as comedy in in the most vulgar sense, as a masquerade where the grand costumes, words and postures merely serve to make the pettiest knavery.... In his Society of December 10, he assembles ten thousand rascally fellows, who are to play the part of the people, as Nick Bottom that of the lion. At a moment when the bourgeoisie itself played the most complete comedy, but in the most serious manner in the world, without infringing any of the pedantic conditions of

French dramatic etiquette, and was itself half deceived, half convinced of the solemnity of its own performance of state, the adventurer, who took the comedy as plain comedy, was bound to win...

[Take this drama to the world stage and you have hidden-'power' today (just think 'ISIS' and drug cartels... 'Boko Haram' and infiltrators-of-police-forces... agent provocateurs of all sorts... etc.... – or in my micro-micro situation: students and the 'low-income'... including immigrants and formerly-incarcerated... and I suppose some bored Plato's Tribesmen-sympathizers eager for action...) for the human-weaponry Marx names... – plotting and planning behind scenes (they live to scheme – it's the only way they can feel smarter than everyone else... and they definitely need to feel smarter than everyone else...) while keeping us... not just ignorant of their actions – that goes without saying – but... as Marx says... ignorant of the play... ignorant that there *is* a play going on... oblivious that we are the puppets... while the hidden 'adventurers' as Marx termed them – and it that not a good word to use... to describe Plato's Tribe?... out to deceive the world while designing the global-stage as a House of Horrors – hand us sentences drenched in blood... our own... and the blood of our Brothers and Sisters... – P.S.]

...Only when he has eliminated his solemn opponent, when he himself now takes his imperial role seriously and under the Napoleonic mask imagines he is the real Napoleon, does he become the victim of his own conceptions of the world, the serious buffoon who no longer takes world history for a comedy but his comedy for world history....

[It may be... it's worth our consideration certainly... that Marx has alighted here... unwittingly (as he could not see the aftermath... as we have...) at a moment of initiation – of the almost-but-one first generation Plato's Tribesmen... first fruit if not First Cause – of the plan to re-invent and realize... Plato's Vision and Handbook... Because ... it seems to me... this is not buffoonery... but 'hidden-power' cracking its knuckles... experimenting... and readying itself... for 'play' on a larger stage... – P.S.]

What the national *ateliers* were for the socialist workers, what the *Gardes mobile* were for the bourgeois republicans, the Society of December 10 was for Bonaparte, the party fighting force peculiar to him. On his journeys the detachments of this society packing the railways had to improvise a public for him, stage public enthusiasm, roar *vive l'Empereur*, insult and thrash republicans, of course, under the protection of the police. On his return journeys to Paris they had to form the advance guard, forestall counter-demonstrations or disperse them. The Society of December 10 belonged to him, it was *his* work, his very own idea. Whatever else he appropriates is put into his hands by the force of circumstances; whatever else he does, the circumstance do for him or he is content to copy from the deeds of others. But Bonaparte with official phrases about order, religion, family and property in public, before the citizens, and with the secret society of the Schuferles and Spiegelbergs [a note at the back reads: “characters in Schiller's drama *Die Rauber* (The Robbers), who plunder and murder unimpeded by any moral scruples...”], the society of disorder, prostitution and theft, behind him – that is Bonaparte himself as original author, and the history of the Society of December 10 is his own history....

[This cannot be the first use of this tactic... is it Machiavellian?... the 'Bonaparte's are Italian... – P.S.]

...Now it happened by way of exception that people's representatives belonging to the party of Order came under the cudgels of the Decembrists. Still more, Yon, the Police Commissioner assigned to the National Assembly and charged with watching over its safety, acting on the deposition of a certain Alais, advised the Permanent Commission that a section of the Decembrists had decided to assassinate General Changarnier and Dupin, the President of the National Assembly, and had already designated the individuals who were to perpetuate the deed.... One comprehends the terror of M. Dupin. A parliamentary enquiry into the Society of December 10, that is, the profanation of the Bonapartist secret world, seemed inevitable. Just before the meeting of the National Assembly Bonaparte providently disbanded his society, naturally only on paper, for in a detailed manner at the end of 1851 Police Prefect Carlier still sought in vain to move him to really break up the Decembrists.

The Society of December 10 was to remain the private army of Bonaparte until he succeeded in transforming the public army into a Society of December 10. Bonaparte made the first attempt at this shortly after the adjournment of the National Assembly, and precisely with the money just wrested from it. As a fatalist, he lives in the conviction that there are certain higher powers which man, and the soldier in particular, cannot withstand. Among these powers he counts, first and foremost, cigars and champagne, cold poultry and garlic sausage. Accordingly, to begin with, he treats officers and non-commissioned officers in his Elysee apartments to cigars and champagne, to cold poultry and garlic sausage. On October 3 he repeats this manoeuvre with the mass of the troops at the St. Maur review, and on October 10 the same manoeuvre on a still larger scale at the Satory army parade. The Uncle remembered the campaigns of Alexander in Asia,

the Nephew the triumphal marches of Bacchus in the same land. Alexander was a demigod, to be sure, but Bacchus was a god and moreover the tutelary deity of the Society of December 10.

After the review of October 3, the Permanent Commission summoned War Minister d'Hautpoul. He promised that these breaches of discipline should not recur. We know how on October 10 Bonaparte kept d'Hautpoul's word. As Commander-in-Chief of the Paris army, Changarnier had commanded at both reviews. He, at once a member of the Permanent Commission, chief of the National Guard, the "saviour" of January 29 and June 13, the "bulwark of society," the candidate of the party of Order for presidential honours, the suspected Monk of two monarchies, had hitherto never acknowledged himself as the subordinate of the War Minister, had always openly derided the republican Constitution and had pursued Bonaparte with an ambiguous lordly protection. Now he was consumed with zeal for discipline against the War Minister and for the Constitution against Bonaparte. While on October 10 a section of the calvary raised the shout: "*Vive Napoleon! Vivent les saucissons!*" ["Hurrah for Napoleon! Hurrah for the sausages!"] Changarnier arranged that at least the infantry marching past under the command of his friend Neumayer should preserve an icy silence. As a punishment, the War Minister relieved General Neumayer of his post in Paris at Bonaparte's instigation, on the pretext of appointing him commanding general of the fourteenth and fifteenth military divisions. Neumayer refused this exchange of posts and so had to resign. Changarnier, for his part, published an order of the day on November 2, in which he forbade the troops to indulge in political outcries or demonstrations of any kind while under arms. The Elysee newspapers attacked Changarnier; the papers of the party of Order attacked Bonaparte; the Permanent Commission held repeated secret sessions in which it was repeatedly proposed to declare the country in danger; the army seemed divided into two hostile camps, with two hostile general staffs, one in the Elysee, where Bonaparte resided, the other in the Tuileries, the quarters of Changarnier. It seemed that only the meeting of the National Assembly was needed to give the signal for battle. The French public judged this friction between Bonaparte and Changarnier like that English journalist who characterized it in the following words:

"The political housemaids of France are sweeping away the glowing lava of the revolution with old brooms and wrangle with one another while they do their work."

Meanwhile, Bonaparte hastened to remove the War Minister, d'Hautpoul, to pack him off in all haste to Algiers and to appoint General Schramm War Minister in his place. On November 12, he sent to the National Assembly a message of American prolixity ['prolix': "(of speech or writing)... using or containing too many words; tediously lengthy... – P.S.], overloaded with detail, redolent of order, desirous of reconciliation, constitutionally acquiescent, treating of all and sundry but not of the *questions brulantes* [burning questions] of the moment. As if in passing he made the remark that according to the express provisions of the Constitution the President alone could dispense of the army. The message closed with the following words of great solemnity:

"Above all things, France demands tranquility... But bound by an oath, I shall keep within the narrow limits that it has set for me... As far as I am concerned... elected by the people and owing my power to it alone, I shall always bow to its lawfully expressed will. Should you resolve at this session on a revision of the Constitution, a Constituent Assembly will regulate the position of the executive power. If not, then the people will solemnly pronounce its decision in 1852. But whatever the solutions of the future may be, let us come to an understanding, so that passion, surprise or violence may never decide the destiny of a great nation... What occupies my attention, above all, is not who will rule France in 1852, but how to employ the time which remains at my disposal so that the intervening period may pass by without agitation or disturbance. I have opened my heart to you with sincerity; you will answer by frankness with your trust, my good endeavours with your cooperation, and God will do the rest."

The respectable, hypocritically moderate, virtuously commonplace language of the bourgeoisie reveals its deepest meaning in the mouth of the autocrat of the Society of December 10 and the picnic hero of St. Maur and Satory.

The burgraves of the party of Order did not delude themselves for a moment concerning the trust that this opening of the heart deserved. About oaths they had long been *blasé*; they numbered in their midst veterans and virtuosos of political perjury. Nor had they failed to hear the passage about the army. They observed with annoyance that in its discursive enumeration of lately enacted laws the message passed over the most important law, the elector law, in studied silence, and, moreover, in the event of there being no revision of the Constitution, left the election of the President in 1852 to the people. The electoral law was the leaden ball chained to the feet of the party of Order, which prevented it from walking and so much the more from storming forward! Moreover, by the society

... – P.S.]

[Returning to Alice... and skipping ahead...]

In the three scenes that follow, we see vivid examples of how the principles described above can be put into practice. I quote these passages at such length in order to give the reader an idea of the atmosphere these children (i.e., if not we ourselves, then at least our parents) breathed in daily. This material helps us to understand how neuroses develop. They are not caused by an external event but by repression of the innumerable psychological factors making up the child's daily life that the child is never capable of describing because he or she doesn't know that things can be any other way. [The totalitarian state – which is what we got today... must be systematically replaced... with new thoughts... – P.S.]

Until the time he was four, I taught little Konrad four essentials: to pay attention, to obey, to behave himself, and to be moderate in his desires.

The first I accomplished by continually showing him all kinds of animal, flowers, and other wonders of nature and by explaining pictures to him: the second by constantly making him, whenever he was in my presence, do things at my bidding; the third by inviting children to come play with him from time to time when I was present, and whenever a quarrel arose, I carefully determined who had started it and removed the culprit from the game for a time; the fourth I taught him by often denying him something he asked for with great agitation. Once, for example, I cut up a honeycomb and brought a large dishful into the room. "Honey! Honey!" he cried joyfully. "Father, give me some honey," pulled his chair to the table, sat down, and waited for me to spread a few rolls with honey for him. I didn't do it but set the honey before him and said: "I'm not going to give you any honey yet; first we will plant some peas in the garden; then, when that is done, we will enjoy a roll with honey together." He looked first at me, then at the honey, whereupon he went to the garden with me. Also, when serving food, I always arranged it so that he was the last one served. For example, my parents and little Christel were eating with us once, and we had rice pudding, which he especially liked. "Pudding!" he cried joyfully, embracing his mother. "Yes," I said, "it's rice pudding. Little Konrad shall have some, too. First the big people shall have some, and afterwards the little people. Here, Grandmother, is some pudding for you. Here, Grandfather, is some for you, too! Here, Mother, is some for you. This is for Father, this for Christel, and this? Whom do you think this is for?" "Onrad," he responded joyfully. He did not find this arrangement unjust, and I saved myself all the vexation parents have who give their children the first portion of whatever is brought to the table. [Salzmann (1796), quoted in Rutschky]

The "little people" sit quietly at the table and wait. This need not be demeaning. It all depends on the adult's intention – and here the adult in question shows unabashedly how much he enjoys his power and his bigness at the expense of the little ones.

Something similar occurs in the next story, in which telling a lie is the only possible way for the child to read in privacy:

A lie is something dishonorable. It is recognized as such even by those who tell one, and there probably isn't a single liar who has any self-respect. But someone who doesn't respect himself doesn't respect others either, and the liar thus finds himself excluded from human society to a certain extent....