
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 23)

[“150920designbydualism.mp3”:]

I'd just like to mention before we get started that... according to a local weekly... the weapons-industry declined to present more EMF-weaponry at this year's Urban Shield “police war-games exposition”... They must be feeling the pressure of our questions... so let's please keep it on them Brothers and Sisters... Unless we display some solidarity on this question it will be hard to move ahead with assurance having forfeited the authentic turf before even getting well-underway... And forfeited other things – meaning... by my experience... that even when – if you're targeted – these EMF-weapons don't kill you... their effect on a life can be debilitating: they've made mine a hellish minefield to negotiate. The only time I find relief is during my walk at Lakeshore Park at Lake Merritt because it's harder to target me there. But even there I've had to get there ever-earlier in the morning for that to be the case. This morning I got there at 4 AM and it was still crawling with agents – and I use that term loosely... It's just like Marx said... without the pejoratives... about the Society of December 10: anybody who can be bought is put into action... So... the low-income... students... out-of-'work'-anybodies...and no one wants to probe too deep into who's paying or why... is what I'm seeing... they just want food and a place to sleep (i.e.... the ability to pay their bills...) So what do we call this state of things... when we must obey... do heinous things... or starve?... if not “fascism on the back of a buck...”

September 15, 2015... Sisters and Brothers: When we don't have an “authentic 'self’” – and we're reading Alice Miller so she can help us understand what that means – what do we have? Where does the authentic 'self' go? If we had been subjected to utilitarian child-rearing methods as infants and youth... in which... per 'Plato'... consciously or no... our parents with us were trying to design the 'perfect human'... early on we would come to believe that our worth was not clearly seen... that our parents needed 'proof'.

If... as we pondered such questions... we were led to Hegel for answers to them... we might write something very like this:

Man as an objective, sensuous being is therefore a *suffering* being – and because he feels that he suffers, a *passionate* being. Passion is the essential force of man energetically bent on its object.

(But man is not merely a natural being: he is a human natural being. That is to say, he is a being for himself. Therefore he is a *species-being*, and has to confirm and manifest himself as such both in his being and in his knowing. Therefore, *human* objects are not natural objects as they immediately present themselves, and neither is *human sense* as it immediately is – as it is objectively – *human* sensibility, human objectivity. Neither nature objectively nor nature subjectively is directly given in a form adequate to the *human* being.) And as everything natural has to *come into being*, *man* too has his act of origin – *history* – which, however, is for him a known history, and hence as an act of origin it is a conscious self-transcending act of origin. History is the true natural history of man (on which more later)....

...The way in which consciousness is, and in which something is for it, is *knowing*. Knowing is its sole act. Something therefore comes to be for consciousness insofar as the latter *knows* this *something*. Knowing is its sole objective relation.

It, consciousness, then, knows the nullity of the object (i.e., knows the non-existence of the distinction between the object and itself, the non-existence of the object for it) because it knows the object as its *self-alienation*; that is, it knows itself – knows knowing as object – because the object is only the *semblance* of an object, a piece of mystification, which in its essence, however, is nothing else but knowing itself, which has confronted itself with itself and hence has confronted itself with a *nullity* – a something which has *no* objectivity outside the knowing. Or: knowing knows that in relating itself to an object it is only *outside* itself – that it only externalises itself; that *it itself* only *appears* to itself as an object – or that that which appears to it as an object is only itself.... (Karl Marx, *The Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*, p. 136 – 7), Progress Publishers edition)

[When I read that I cannot help but hear Virginia Woolf saying: "...there can be no doubt that to this segregation [of the worlds... of 'the self'...] we owe... all those meaningless but highly ingenious turnings and twistings into which the intellect ties itself when rid of the cares of the household and the family..."]

...and the longer I ponder her words the deeper they become... as with other parts of her book *Three Guineas*... and I'm sure we'll be returning to them... they have a lot to say about our freedom... – P.S]

["150920utilitarianfacets.mp3":]

When Karl Popper said that we cannot truly apprehend Marx's contribution to our efforts to achieve global human freedom... without appreciating his 'thought's 'dualism'... what did he mean? We'll be considering that question today... but also going further... beyond Popper's meaning to... what I hope we will agree will be... a deeper level: to the installation of 'the state' itself... especially... 'the-state-in-us'... beginning with the 'academic forefront' of folks with the 'dual' role of determining what constitutes 'thought'... and propagating – as the frontline troops for the installation of 'the state'... you could say – 'dualism' as the dominant 'mode of thought' in the world today...

...which... we will be considering... is both what Marxists mean by 'bourgeois revolutions'... and constitutes the 'new' terms of our exploitation – the installation of "the state" in us – terms elaborated by Bentham and his adherents... and the poisonous 'child-corrupting' activists – the political goals of which Alice has exposed.

A case can be made that by 'dualism' what we really mean is 'utilitarianism' – “putting 'the self' to work...” – as the brilliant infant readily perceives that this is what the poisoned parent is doing in regard to her or him: “Since the child's affection can be gained by expressions of love, this same affection can be made use of to make him more amenable to discipline...” (A poisonous pedagogue quoted in our August 23, 2015 show.)

In the following excerpts from previous shows consider to what degree the maxim “might makes right” expresses utilitarianism... and that both concepts underlie the “separation of 'the self'” (they discuss...) and that... further... in 'dualism' / 'utilitarianism'... is included not just “Might Makes Right”... which implies “conquest” as *raison d'être*... but also: “worth must be 'proven' / 'demonstrated' – and therefore 'performance'... 'abandonment / betrayal' – and the 'scarcity-mindset'... which underlies and... in theory... according to the propaganda... 'justifies' everything that 'power' does.

["150920embraceourabundance.mp3":]

...moreover... that in the terms Popper uses for 'dualism': a split between 'the material' and 'the spiritual' (and we are encouraged by 'power' to believe... that the 'spiritual' 'side' of ourselves – the 'side' that marches off to Academe eager to please – is the more 'elevated'... much like 'ancient Greece'...) – that those terms are... practically speaking... names for 'slave' and 'free'... and that all of us – and this is since the inception of 'class' itself – are trying not to be in that 'slave' category... all of the control-mechanisms of 'power' are to remind us that unless we do 'x... y... and z' we're going to get stuck in that 'slave' category... that this is how they get us to betray our Brothers and Sisters... both within the nation-state and – what's really up – globally... because the propaganda that 'power' is putting out for us in the U.S. is to turn our backs on what is going on elsewhere... We're told: “things are going to get really rough... focus on the folks you love... get ready for... if not the apocalypse at least really difficult times... and just hang on and try to get through it... Well... I'm arguing that these are times for just the opposite... these are times for us to embrace our abundance... to realize that they are conning us... that... as soon as we embrace each other globally... we see... that we are everything... – that is abundance: we help each other... we release the power that's in each one of us... in each one of us that power is limitless... and we create everything we need... to be self-sufficient and happy... globally.

—

["130324twoeworlds_1.mp3": “What defines ‘class’? The mindset of “in’ and ‘out’” (Pt. 1): “But very little attention has yet been paid to the intellectual and spiritual effect of this division of duties [imposed by our totalitarian 'rulers'...] upon those who are enabled by it 'to forsake all worldly cares and studies.' Yet there can be no doubt that we owe to this segregation the immense elaboration of modern instruments and methods of war, the astonishing complexities of theology [into which category can there be any doubt now that Marx himself falls?... – P.S.]; the vast deposit of notes at the bottom of Greek, Latin and even English texts; the innumerable carvings, chasings, and unnecessary ornamentations of our common furniture and crockery; the myriad distinctions of *Debrett* and *Burke*;

and all those meaningless but highly ingenious turnings and twistings into which the intellect ties itself when rid of 'the cares of the household and the family.' The emphasis which both priests and dictators place upon the necessity for two worlds is enough to prove that it is essential to their domination." (Virginia Woolf, *Three Guineas*, p. 181, quoted during our March 24, 2013 *Waking Up Radio* show.) ("While the root manifestation of totalitarian thinking... the root ideology of class is: "we are nothing and the state is all..." its core mindset is "the 'citizen'-'barbarian' divide"... which Virginia Woolf and Alice Miller variously identified as the divide between 'insiders' and 'outsiders'... or those who are 'big' (important)... and those who are 'small' (unimportant)...")

[During the July 13th, 2014 show we talked about this 'conquest' of the heart... this... 'subjection of the self'... – involving a transfer of ownership... and an abdication of responsibility... from ourselves to 'the state' (in one of its several guises... at one of its layered levels.) What returnees [from Nazi concentration camps] were forced to see... if only unconsciously... but never allowed to discuss... is something that we... these seventy years later... are also encouraged to not think about: that the totalitarian horror called "conquest of the self"... "submission to 'rule'"... "obedience to the state"... is the problem – not just its 'Nazi' version....] You see... for 'power' to exist... it's critical for them that they not get 'outed'... ..but particularly... not get 'outed' to the children... the youth... the next generation... ..because... otherwise... 'the future' is not seeded with 'contempt'... self-betrayal... and would revert... to freedom... – P.S. (From the July 20, 2014 *Waking Up Radio* show.)

["140713classic.mp3": "The 'classical' mindset of "Might Makes Right"... is inculcated in all future statesmen... as... you cannot manifest your vision of the *Republic* unless you've cultivated the human material willing to do it... willing to subjugate the true, authentic, self... And as this is a totalitarian system (mindset...) and therefore one we are all trained in... although in wildly divergent versions... these rules apply whether you're Plato... or Hitler... or Bill Gates... or an underage member of a gang... ..and it is only by leaving behind that state of mind... rejecting the rules and the game entirely... that 'conquest' is no longer your *raison d'être*... because you have chosen to represent... with consciousness... the 'all' of it..." [From the July 13, 2014 *Waking Up Radio* show.]

["150920regainyourcertainty.mp3":]

And to my Marxist Brothers and Sisters... I would encourage you... because a lot of this is addressed to you... the messages and ideas I'm putting out there today... I'd encourage you to consider that this whole notion... from Hegel... of "stages of 'History'... of 'development'" is really just 'power's attempting to regain control of us...and then they set the academics to work to create some sort of 'scientific' justification – of their control... of their maintaining their 'power' – with this notion 'Progress'... I mean it's all really quite simple and basic... and unfortunately our academic Brothers and Sisters... in their efforts to escape that 'slave' category... have done exactly what Virginia is pointing out... have overly-complicated things (and they had an 'interest' in not seeing... which reinforced their conditioning to not see... hidden-'power'...) and in that song-and-dance that they put out there for us to try to digest... try to figure out... untangle... in the course of all that we lose our ability to fight back... we lose our certainty... and that's what we're honing in on in recent shows: regaining the certainty we're born with – because we start out 'big'... and confident... and raring to go... and then we get *blasted* with all the confusing messages and the unhappiness that we see around us... and it sets us on a path... a lifetime course... to try to understand 'what is going on?' That's what I mean by 'wasted life' – a sacrifice imposed by 'power' regardless of 'station' – all of us have our lives wasted when we are not allowed to confront the truth: the reality of what's going on with us... and with our Brothers and Sisters all over the world... This is a global system... and it's only when we confront that openly and honestly with each other that we begin to... in our living authentically... we begin to make of our lives what they were meant to be... growing our gifts as we're *meant* to... not as we've been conditioned to allow 'power' to use them... our gifts are for each other... for helping each other get 'bigger'... to release our energy... to get free of those who want to 'make use of' us and the planet... and to start realizing our inherent freedom.

We said that the control 'power' wants of us is *total*... that they want to design us from the thoughts we think on up... and that to do so they have claimed the turf of words: 'job'... 'class'... 'economic development'... 'worker'... – and that to get free we cannot use their terminology...

...but neither can we use the mindset expressed by such terms: utilitarianism... which has at its core the maxim: "might *makes* (says what is) – right..."

...and as we heard in the excerpt (posted with this show) from the July 13, 2014 broadcast... if the choice we are given... if our parents have internalized 'the state'... is to be a 'citizen' or a 'barbarian'... we will choose the former... as we *must* please our parents. 'Power' knows this. This is obvious. This is how 'power' stays hidden and can... [if you read ahead... we will be excerpting a piece from Wallerstein who has a lot to share on 'power's plan to...] reproduce itself over the generations...

...and this is how we are conquered before we're aware... aware that we're under assault.

["150920powerguysgetbusy.mp3":]

Last week... with Popper's help... we were able to see that Marx's 'thought'... his reasoning... in many respects followed Plato's... While not tracing the correspondence in their thinking... Martin Bernal has noted Marx's affinity for Ancient Greece... a predilection for which was installed in every 'educated' European.

Recall Martin Bernal told us (we noted in our August 30, 2015 show... that in the wake of the French Revolution:

...after the humiliation of the traditional government and its beloved army after their catastrophic defeat by Napoleon at Jena in 1806... the Prussian monarchy turned to [W. von] Humboldt to undertake reforms... In 1809, among other reforms undertaken to face the French Revolutionary challenge, Humboldt was entrusted with the reorganization of the educational system. He based the new structure on *Bildung* (derived from his earlier sketch: 'On the Study of Antiquity and of the Greeks in Particular') which he believed would reanimate the German people after their crushing defeats...

It is possible that Humboldt originally intended this *Bildung* for the whole population. In the event, however, it became the stamp of the meritocratic elite... (Martin Bernal, *Black Athena: The Afroasiatic Roots of Classical Civilization, Volume 1: The Fabrication of Ancient Greece 1785 – 1985*, p. 282 – 5)

[And the Wallerstein book I mentioned (*The Modern World-System IV: Centrist Liberalism Triumphant, 1789 – 1914...*) – published in 2011... I'm still trying to decide how much of it to share – is directly relevant to the subject matter we're now engaged with... which is: "What happened in the aftermath of the French Revolution? These 'power'-guys got busy. What did they do?" So we're going to think through his take on it... after an adequate chunk of *The Eighteenth Brumaire...* – P.S.]

He quotes Hegel (1770 – 1831):

The name of Greece strikes home to the hearts of men of education in Europe, and more particularly is this so with us Germans... They [the Greeks] certainly received the substantial beginnings of their religion, culture... from Asia, Syria and Egypt; but they have so greatly obliterated the foreign nature of this origin, and it is so much changed, worked on, turned around and altogether made so different, that what they – as we – prize, know and love in it is essentially their own.

Bernal says that Hegel was "no doubt typical of his age..." and that Karl Marx (1818 – 1883) shared his beliefs about ancient Greece:

Hegel's argument that the Orient was the childhood of mankind and Greece its adolescence strongly resembles, of course, the views of the Young Hegelian Karl Marx. Marx argued that it was only in Greece that the individual had cut the umbilical cord from his community, and had changed from a *Gattungswesen* (species being) to a *zoon politikon* (political animal / city dweller). With his lifelong love for the country [Greece], he completely accepted the prevailing view that in every aspect of its civilization Greece was categorically different from – and superior to – all that had gone before. However, Marx went beyond this to claim... that Greece towered over its posterity. Such a claim then caused a problem, in that it made Greece go against the stream of progress. In an attempt to deal with this Marx wrote...: "In the case of the arts, it is well known that certain periods of their flowering are out of all proportion to the general development of society, hence also to the material foundation... For example, the Greeks as compared to the moderns or also Shakespeare." He nevertheless saw the paradox that "in their world-epoch-making classical stature... certain... forms... of the arts are possible only at an underdeveloped stage of artistic development." ...Marx was... sufficiently aware of the Ancient Model to have to face the possibility that Greek mythology – hence art – did not come from Greek social relations but from Egypt. To accept this would, of course, make nonsense of his scheme. And he was living in an age when everybody felt in

their bones that Greece was categorically apart from, and above, Egypt. Thus the destruction of the Ancient Model gave his generation a freedom on this question that was not available to Hegel. Marx was able to deny Egyptian influence on Greece outright. (Martin Bernal, *Black Athena: The Afroasiatic Roots of Classical Civilization, Volume 1: The Fabrication of Ancient Greece 1785 – 1985*, p. 295 - 6)

["150920whatmakesushappy.mp3":]

But this ideology of 'ancient Greece-elevation' served a political function that continues to infect the thinking of those of us under 'class' to this day. It created a bifurcated condition for 'thought' itself... because 'class' is its basis and unstated assumption... to the degree that... to this day... to 'reverse' from 'class'... to the minds of many... is to 'reverse' from 'thinking' itself... as this dualism of 'thought' in itself suggests... a concept of 'freedom' that is largely contemplative... a positive premised on – *requiring* – a negative.

“Marx loved freedom...” Popper told us... So do we all at base... It's how we arrive... and it's how we long to stay... Unconsciously we follow our body's longing for it as we attend to those around us for clues to the mystery of generalized unhappiness...

(And I think some may dispute whether that's the case... whether there's generalized unhappiness... Certainly this is the case by my definition... which I see as 'earth-based'... and therefore authentic... that being: 'self-creation'... creating oneself – because we *long* to use our gifts... and that's what 'self-creation' means... it means we grow our gifts... and we see ourselves develop as we engage with all our relations: the ancestors... the earth... and our Brothers and Sisters... and we share with those... and in those... relationships... That makes us happy... And in those rare moments throughout the history of 'class' when we've done that – most recently with the Occupy Movement – when folk did not need to be told what to do... They showed up. As soon as a need was identified... someone stepped up. We know what to do... we have all we need... we are – all together – the physical manifestation of 'abundance'... What we *do* need... however... is 'power' off our backs. So we do have generalized unhappiness because we have a generalized condition... across the global 'class'-system... of having to put ourselves on the market... and turn our gifts over to the highest bidder... we are not allowed to grow them under our own self-directed power... which means 'not allowed to grow them'...)

The 'solution' on offer under a 'class'-system... is to 'prove' one's worth... and 'earn' the 'right' to be free from material compulsion. But generally in accepting those terms we miss the underlying utilitarianism... 'thought's dualism... and the hidden mindset of “Might Makes Right”... and the requirement that we betray ourselves... our children... and our Brothers and Sisters.

“Marx loved freedom... and under 'class'... 'power' has made certain... that 'freedom' is promoted as equivalent to 'freedom to think'... this... is the practical expression of the ideology of 'ancient Greece-elevation'... which 'justifies' abandonment (betrayal) and presents 'necessity' ('scarcity') as 'inevitability' – they erect all the misery they've done... since 'class' begun... on that lie.

["150920talkourselvesintofreedom.mp3":]

And because everything – the results of all their malevolence – is erected on it – scarcity... they will ever be busy to try to make it so... ever be busy creating misery and hardship and divisions... and making it seem that we are at each other's throats by 'our nature' instead of by their design... by their orchestration and manipulation...

Martin Bernal has shown us how this utilitarian mindset – the mindset of 'making-use-of' the 'natural world... and especially the natural 'material' that is our children and ourselves – was intentionally created and promulgated via 'elite' universities. Alice Miller has shown us how 'power' established this mindset in the children of the 'elite' by means of the child-rearing pedagogues... thereby ensuring its reproduction into the future... hidden under the euphemism 'education':

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. [Salzmann (1796), quoted in Rutschky]

It's time for us... whether we're ready to defend *ourselves* or not... to defend the children irregardless...

...and for us to start here in the U.S.: to use our “freedom of speech”... use our “right as a people to pursue happiness”... to push the limits of 'power's need to protect its seeming legitimacy... to speak up for the children.

Two hundred years ago these Plato-lovin'-proto-Fascists devised a conscious strategy to confuse... corrupt... and condition... the children... We have to undo that damage. It is wrong for the brilliance of our children to be working on lies – we want to release their brilliance for the creation of our beautiful free future... for our freedom...

When I read the following from a young student... the first thing that struck was that it illustrated well enough the typical psychological abuse our children are subjected to under 'class': forced to make of themselves an object that must perform... 'prove' its 'worth' by 'objective' criteria:

I've been mulling over something that I just can't wrap my brain around for the last few months... A) Attending a [prestigious] school... requires a great deal of hard work and intellect. We should be proud to go here. B) Members of marginalized populations... face... obstacles that their non-marginalized peers do not face, and these should be accounted for when considering any single person's achievements... I completely believe both... I'm someone who, relatively speaking, won the birth-circumstance lottery. My married, supportive, American parents have been well-off as long as I've been alive... But... how am I supposed to feel proud of my accomplishments, if the unfair advantages I've been given are totally beyond my control? (G. Haley Massara, “Two truths and a lie,” *The Daily Californian*, September 8, 2015)

But another way of saying this is to say that the utilitarian mindset *masks* 'power'... which here... we can see... has misdirected this young person's energy away from the true culprit... 'power' itself... to herself or himself. Typically... our children's energies rarely are allowed to view and work with 'the authentic'...

...which means their lives... typically... as with ours... are thrown away.

The name of the game... if you're 'power'... is duping the children... Children are thirsty for truth... hunger for the authentic...

...and so... to gain our freedom... move on from ten thousand years of 'class' (and these ten thousand guys who want to be gods...) we need only to disseminate widely... and especially to every youth we have access to... our discussions of hidden-'power'... the need for an alternative (to a 'class'-based... hierarchy-based...) global social arrangement – discussions that reside at the intersection of the insights provided by all the folk who 'out' 'power'... who expose hidden-'power': Karl Popper... Alice Miller... Peter Kropotkin... Albert O. Hirschman... Martin Bernal... John Boswell... Miklos Nyiszli... and our Good Three: Terence K. Hopkins... Giovanni Arrighi... and Immanuel Wallerstein – and I hope that the form these discussions take here... the tools provided on the Nascence website... prove useful too.

No violence... no weapons beyond the 'weapon' of truth... are needed for us to gain our free future... all we need do... is get these suppressed discussions to the youth... and to each other too. It doesn't matter if you agree with the analysis... all that matters is that you value free... open... discussion...

...the earth – the earth in us – will do the rest... Just as Fromm said... it's about faith in our Brothers and Sisters.

["150920marxsutilitarianism.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*...]

...and recall as we read that we're on the look-out for hidden-'power'... which exists in the creation of 'scarcity' (making us hunger... as Townsend... and Bentham... said...) in the fostering of divisions... in the widening of the gap between 'the elite' and the rest of us (as Popper showed us Plato emphasized...) and in the installation of the 'utilitarian' propaganda – the 'make-use-of-the-natural-world'-mindset (and Martin Bernal has been key in helping us see that... as well as Alice Miller...)

...and consider as well the implications of this 'utilitarian' / 'Might Makes Right' / 'scarcity'-mindset thinking on Marx himself... and on his resulting theory... consider that he followed Plato's thinking (as Popper has shown us he did) further... in the equalitarian direction Popper suggested... and asked: “What leads to divisions in human society?”... and answered: “...]

an insufficiency materially...” Hence: “...there must be 'the development of the productive forces...’” and... given that “Might Makes Right”... these 'forces' must be in the hands of we-the-people... and... given his (no doubt – it also is the mindset of 'class'...) experience of abandonment... the inevitability of this outcome must be 'proven'... and so conclusively that it will inspire we-the-people to hurry ourselves to it...

...except... his 'proof' had the opposite effect: it misled the self-proclaimed 'leaders' of 'the people' to believe that 'history' required them to harness our energy... 'benevolently'... 'for the greatest good for the greatest number'... delivering us into the hands of Bentham... into the hands of the 'power'-guys... now securely ensconced in their private place of hiding... from which they plot and plan their malevolence... dressed up as 'benevolence'... – P.S.]

[“150920gramscipointsout.mp3”:]

[Returning to the *Eighteenth Brumaire*:]

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 (which is why the state keeps getting stronger and stronger...) and should we resist... to clamp down ever harder on us... Antonio Gramsci... speaking in the language of 'class'... explains why this is so... why... as our Good Three have shown us... the 'strategy' 'claim the state' can never be a strategy we embrace to achieve global freedom (the only kind that is authentic...) First he says that the transforming force (transforming to a free future...) comes from a strong 'economic capacity' that's being artificially held back... i.e. from outside the existing “economic world of a specific system of production [utilitarianism...]” then he says: “The problem can be formulated as follows: since the State is the concrete form of a productive world and since the intellectuals are the social element from which the governing personnel is drawn, the intellectual who is not firmly anchored to a strong economic group will tend to present the State as an absolute; in this way the function of the intellectuals is itself conceived of as absolute and pre-eminent, and their historical existence and dignity are abstractly rationalised.” (From Antonio Gramsci’s *Prison Notebooks*, written from February, 1929 onwards, Gramsci died in 1937...) He seems to be saying – presupposing 'production' as the basis of the social-system – that 'the future' is seeded with the economic activity that exists outside the 'mainstream' of economic activity... acknowledging that is... that 'the state' is introjected (as Marcuse said...) in us... and only those outside of it – e.g. the earth-connected ('peasants') – can be truly 'radical'... i.e. not see 'the state' as an absolute... or 'intellectuals' as 'absolute and pre-eminent'... because they are still self-sufficient – not tolerating 'managers'. But this only calls attention to the spiraling-consumption pattern of 'accumulation'... which is also the effect of its totalitarian nature... requiring ever-more (all) “to come in...” – eating ever more until the resources of the planet are effectively tapped-out...

...and... if their propagandistic control and superiority in arms is sufficient... to then start winnowing our numbers... I believe that's what they've been busy doing... clandestinely: 'winnowing our numbers'... Brothers and Sisters... it is time for us to reclaim responsibility for our lives... to start these conversations in groups together... under the aegis of our right as a people to determine what makes us happy... We do... each other... being together... is what makes us happy... growing our gifts freely is what makes us happy... *You* make me happy... – P.S.]

[September 20, 2015 show ends here.]

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... Rather... let us consider that this could be... an example of hidden-'power'... planning behind scenes... never revealing the intention... to create 'scarcity'... – 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 bohème*; 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 Schufferles 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 Carrier 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 official disbandment of the Society of December 10 and the dismissal of the War Minister d'Hautpoul, Bonaparte had with his own hand sacrificed the scapegoats on the altar of the country. He had blunted the edge of the expected collision. Finally, the part of Order itself anxiously sought to avoid, to mitigate, to gloss over any decisive conflict with the executive power. For fear of losing their conquests over the revolution, they allowed their rival to carry off the fruits thereof. "Above all things, France demands tranquillity." This was what the party of Order had cried to the revolution since February [1848], this was what Bonaparte's message cried to the party of Order. "Above all things, France demands tranquillity." ["The people will choose totalitarianism over chaos..." we are told Plato said... – P.S.] Bonaparte committed acts that aimed at usurpation, but the party of Order committed "unrest" if it raised a row about these acts and construed them hypochondriacally. The sausages of Satory were quiet as mice when no one spoke of them. "Above all things, France demands tranquillity." Bonaparte demanded, therefore, that he be left in peace to do as he liked and the parliamentary party was paralyzed by a double fear, by the fear of again evoking revolutionary unrest and by the fear of itself appearing as the instigator of unrest in the eyes of its own class, in the eyes of the bourgeoisie.... (p. 75 – 81)

[I think we have a sense now of the Society of December 10... Before returning to the conclusion of *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*... and from there to Alice... let's step back and view events from the perspective of the 'world-system'... In the September 13, 2015 show... we asked about the word 'class'... sought the origins of its current use... used as an ideological weapon of the 'global-state-statesmen' against we-the-people... and as an ideological tool to indoctrinate their children... Since then I've read Immanuel Wallerstein's answer. His 2011 book... *The Modern World-System IV: Centrist Liberalism Triumphant, 1789 – 1914*... is very relevant to this discussion... and in particular the chapter... "The Liberal State and Class Conflict, 1830 – 1875"... which... as I write this (on September 19, 2015) I'm strongly considering that we read together (although to interject yet another interjection at this point might seem unwieldy... but... I'm thinkin' on it... Here's how that chapter starts... – P.S.):

"The Liberal State and Class Conflict, 1830 – 1875", Chapter 3 in Immanuel Wallerstein's *The Modern World-System IV: Centrist Liberalism Triumphant, 1789 – 1914*... (page 77 – 141)

During the first half of the nineteenth century, socialism as a concept was still not separate from "bourgeois democracy" as a concept or, as Labrousse (1949b, 7) says, "Jacobinism and socialism remained muddled in political life." In some sense, it probably remained for at least a century thereafter that a full distinction of the two concepts did not exist. Nonetheless, liberalism (which seems to me a better locution than "bourgeois democracy") and socialism began to have diverging trajectories as political options after 1830. Indeed, as Hobsbawm (1962, 284) argues:

Practical liberals... shied away from political democracy... The social discontents, revolutionary movements, and the socialist ideologues of the post-Napoleonic era intensified this dilemma [of relying upon the majority to carry out the dictates of reason] and the 1830 Revolution made it acute. Liberalism and democracy appeared to be adversaries rather than allies.

[The following quote from the opening chapter of this book by Wallerstein should help clarify how he is using the term 'liberal' and 'liberalism':

"Liberalism started ideological life on the left of the political spectrum, or at least on the center-left. [From the little I've digested thus far from this book by Wallerstein... he uses 'liberals' as I use 'Plato's Tribesmen'... we shall have to consider whether that comparison is accurate as we go along... but if there is any correspondence at all... to apply the term 'left' to these guys... in any sense of the word... from where I sit... invalidates it... – P.S.] Liberalism defined itself as the opposite of conservatism, on the basis of what might be called a "consciousness of being modern" (Minogue, 1963, 3). Liberalism proclaimed itself universalist. Sure of themselves and of the truth of this new world-view of modernity, liberals sought to propagate their views and intrude the logic of their views within all social institutions, thereby ridding the world of the "irrational" leftovers of the past. To do this, they had to fight conservative ideologues, whom they saw as obsessed with fear of "free men" – men liberated from the false idols of tradition.

“Liberals believed, however, that progress, even though it was inevitable, could not be achieved without some human effort, without a political program. Liberal ideology was thus the belief that, in order for history to follow its natural course, it was necessary to engage in conscious, continual, intelligent reformism, in full awareness that “time was the universal friend, which would inevitably bring greater happiness to ever greater numbers” (Schapiro, 1949, 13). [Straight-up Bentham... of course... who at least was honest... but these guys can absolutely not be taken at their word – not these guys... with their 'lordly lies' and their training as infants to keep secrets. Secrecy is their watchword... hiding their m.o.... public presentation necessarily the dissemination of propaganda... – P.S.]

“...To be sure, the center is merely an abstraction, and a rhetorical device. One can always locate oneself in central position simply by defining the extremes as one wishes. Liberals are those who decided to do this as their basic political strategy. Faced with the normality of change, liberals would claim a position between the conservatives – that is, the right, who wanted to slow down the pace of normal change as much as possible – and the “democrats” (or radicals or socialists or revolutionaries) – that is, the left, who wanted to speed it up as much as possible. In short, liberals were those who wished to control the pace of change so that it occurred at what they considered to be an optimal speed. But could one really know what is the optimal speed? Yes, said the liberals, and their metastrategy was precisely geared to achieving this end.”

[What I want to know is... what happened to the language 'world bourgeoisie'... 'world elite'... 'world right'... the “managers of the status quo...” of *Antisystemic Movements* – true... he uses 'world right' in his chapter of *Does Capitalism Have A Future?*... which is more straight-forward... and states their totalitarian ambition more baldly... perhaps we will discover the answer in the course of our reading...

[Returning to Chapter 3... “The Liberal State and Class Conflict, 1830 – 1875”... – P.S.]:

The concept of class and class conflict was not a contribution of socialist ideologues, much less of Karl Marx. It is a Saint-Simonian idea, developed and pursued by Guizot as part of the liberal project. Saint-Simon's view of the class structure in the modern industrial world was that there were *three* classes: the property owners, the propertyless, and the savants [It seems to me a clear debt here to Plato... – P.S.]. He saw the class conflict between the “industrials” (those who work) and the idlers as a transitional phase, to be superseded by a harmonious society [...and another debt here... to Bentham... as well as to Plato... – P.S.] of productive industrial classes under the aegis of the savants [...the 'philosopher-kings'... – P.S.], a meritocratic vision in which the old aristocracy of birth would be replaced by an aristocracy of talent (Manuel, 1956; Iggers, 1958b). For Guizot, the concept of class was an essential element in his efforts to “legitimate the political aspirations of the bourgeoisie” (Fossert, 1955, 60).

But in 1830, Guizot and his friends succeeded, as they were simultaneously succeeding in Great Britain, in establishing a form of middle-class rule “as a permanent *juste milieu* or golden mean between the extremes of revolution and reaction” (Starzinger, 1965, viii). The Chamber of Deputies on August 7, 1830, suppressed the Preamble to the Charter of 1814 “as wounding the national dignity by appearing to *grant* to Frenchmen rights which belong to them essentially” (Collins, 1970, 90). The liberals politically and the *grande bourgeoisie* socially had at last won their *droit de cite*. [Wallerstein's note (partially) reads: “Both L'homme (1960, 36) and Pouthas (1962, 258) speak of the substitution of one class for the other as the dominant force...”]

Since, in addition, this coincided with a period of accelerating economic and social change, the most urgent problems facing France and Great Britain had now become the “social problems” of industrialism, and especially those of the “new proletariat, the horrors of uncontrolled break-neck urbanization” (Hobsbawm, 1962, 207). Class conflict would therefore come to mean something different from what Saint-Simon and Guizot had had in mind. The Revolution of 1830 itself came at a moment of particular economic difficulty for the workers (high unemployment, unusually high wheat prices). It provided evidence of the utility of political uprising and served to stimulate workers' consciousness, a sense of having common interest “solely as proletarians,” a sense of the “dignity of the worker” (Festy, 1908, 330). The liberals perceived this change immediately.

The conservatization of the French regime contrasted with what was happening in the other liberal states. A liberal pope, Pius IX, had been elected in 1846, to the dismay of Metternich (Bury, 1948, 425). If Belgium remained “calm” in 1848, “it was because it had made its revolution, peacefully, in 1847. (Dhondt, 1949, 124) Similarly, the liberals and radicals had won their internal struggle against the Sonderbund in Switzerland in 1847, with the diplomatic support of the British but amid French hesitation (Halperin, 1948, 1:157). Indeed, this was a moment of temporary breakdown of the entente

cordiale. At home, the British had handled well the chartist challenge at the same time that Sir Robert Peel was steering through the Repeal of the Corn Laws [“Materially the repeal of the Corn Laws would protect the poorer classes in time of scarcity against any disastrous rise in food prices. Morally, it gave them assurances that, unenfranchised though most of them were, their welfare was an object of concern to an aristocratic Government and Parliament” (Gash, 1977, 97)], such that the “specter of Communism” passed them by as well. The crisis of 1847 “provoked no revolutionary disturbance” (Halevy, 1947, 181), although the Irish had to pay the price for this [the Irish potato famine occurred just at the time of the debate on the Corn Laws... that the Irish famine became a ploy in the intra-Conservative political game is clear from Clark’s account of repeal: “The traditional remedy for famine was to suspend the Corn Laws and open the ports. But Peel told his Cabinet that if he did this (in the case of Ireland at this time) he could not promise to reimpose them, and a majority in the Cabinet felt they could not support him in this policy on these terms. He therefore retired, but the Whigs could not, or would not, form a government. Peel therefore returned to office at the Queen’s request (and) repealed the Corn Laws himself.”]]

Nonetheless, the weakening of the liberal project in France, one of the two pillar states, provided enough tinder for the revolutionary flame to be ignited throughout the nonliberal [meaning “non-‘bourgeois’”] parts of Europe. To be sure, Metternich and the Austrians blamed the British, accused of being too liberal, for the uprisings, but the blame is more legitimately placed at the feet of the French, who got cold feet and were not liberal enough...

[Returning now to the conclusion of *The Eighteenth Brumaire*... – P.S.]

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...

(p. 122 – 135)

... – 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....