

WUR of October 11<sup>th</sup>, 2015... “Embracing Global Goals, Scope and Action: Becoming Global Actors... Claiming the ‘All’” – Segue From *Antisystemic Movements*... To Alice (Dft 15)

---

*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 26)

---

[“151011endgametime.mp3”:]

October 6, 2015... Sisters and Brothers: Our argument here is that to successfully organize to design a global alternative to the regime of 'class'... reclaiming our human energy globally... we have to address the actual conditions that 'power' has used to defeat our organization: agent infiltration... and EMF (electro-magnetic-force) weapons... These actual conditions then become assumptions of our activism... and only focuses of it in the sense of (in the case of agents) structuring our practice to eliminate the possibility of agents undermining it... and... (in the case of EMF weapons) to protect ourselves against them...

...protection against EMF-weapons means doctors willing to be 'Miklos'... tracing the physiological effects of these various weapons on our bodies... devising tests that confirm them (at times I taste metal... so is there a 'saliva-test'?...) helping to document their existence...

...and it means folks who can design low-cost detection devices... and others with means to help disseminate them...

...it means folks willing to create the online mechanisms for organizing global General Strikes... as well as to counter attempts to suppress them...

...and... we need discussion: various venues and platforms for propagating it... particularly in neighborhoods... using the tools above just mentioned (more on this next week...) (When I talk about 'agent infiltration' I'm not talking just about 'movements'... I'm talking about into all aspects of our existence under class... This is something they have been preparing for... this 'end-game-time' when the resources run out [which they read as “too many people...”] and as 'stewards' of Plato's dream – the *Republic* – they follow that playbook pretty carefully... and Plato advised them: “You've got to manage the population... don't allow it to get so large such that it threatens your rule...” Point being: they are organizing in our communities... and I'm not just talking about on the level of infiltration of the media and the arts... which are obvious because those are the thoughts that occupy folks' heads – that's the front-line there – but I'm talking about buying up land and real estate in areas where there had been progressive movements... and being the ones that write those 'letters to the editor'... They are actively involved in crafting public opinion... and we haven't talked about that... We have to... those are barriers that have to be addressed... barriers to our believing that we deserve our freedom...)

...and we must urge ourselves on despite what seems like a world set against it... acknowledging that it's very challenging to confront a global set of 'rulers' who stay hidden.

[“151011thetofourgreatness.mp3”:]

Perhaps the most useful (strategic) way of thinking about hidden-'power' (as we neither know nor care who the ten thousand 'power'-guys are exactly...) is as a series of suppressions... or thefts... i.e.... the effects of these busy-as-bees-global-misanthropists: what has been taken from us – our 'selves'... most fundamentally – that must be recovered for us to have certainty about the need to defend it... the recovered self... the authentic. (More and more of us today are seeing that it is this individual 'self' that we have to have allegiance to... in order to want the bigger societal vision that allows that individual self to flourish... We can't want that global alternative if we don't desperately want this jewel... this gem... this treasure... which is ourselves... our individual 'self'... to be able to flourish and expand limitlessly... And we want the 'authentic' – that's key... – as we can't expand limitlessly unless we have a world... designed by us... which is honest...)

We have been synthesizing and advancing our ancestors' gifts... coming to (our own) terms with what has happened to us... What is this 'history' that we're given? If not a 'history' of our suppression? What does this 'history' mean... for us?... if not the theft of our greatness? (and we need to ponder this... the reality that each human being possesses the seed of 'greatness'... and that has been suppressed massively... across the millennia – which is why it is going to be a dazzling thing to see those seeds sprout and bear fruit – that's our future...)

["151011wearenotworkers.mp3":]

What is this 'history' that we're given? If not a 'history' of our suppression? What does this 'history' mean... for us?... if not the theft of our greatness?... leaving us with a dangerous (for 'power'...) pack of unanswered questions... that we set aside when we decide to 'fit'... into 'the system'... into one of those 'roles' those ten thousand guys have created for us...

["151011followingourquestions.mp3":]

...but when we revisit that 'pack' with new information – a sun opening the darkness – we are born anew (an expression unfortunately already [multiply] claimed... but no less apt for that...)

I've found that the process of regaining our original 'selves' is as many-faceted as that of losing it – another expression of the 'class'-system's inherent totalitarianism... We didn't lose our 'self' all at once... it was a many-layered theft... a series of multiple suppressions – which is what makes its recovery so challenging... and so inevitable once we embark on the path of seeking it... which is the path of 'following-our-questions'... For each of us those questions vary somewhat – though they are uniformly sourced in 'power's thrust to ensnare us in a 'web of obligation' (and of course initially it is our parents who do this... ) –

...from infancy up... 'force' never felt right... provoked unease... and unanswered questions... stimulated discord... put us at odds with the very ones we must learn from... and this process was for us... various...

...but for each of us (under 'class'...) our search for answers got interrupted. We cannot battle long when 'the world' confirms as 'right' a massive 'wrong'...

Our determination... despite this early silencing... to "follow our questions" *is* the re-education process... it is the 'pursuit of happiness'... as... to solve long-buried riddles not only gives us satisfaction... but peace... it is restorative of calm... to finally find ourselves on a true path... the path that leads to a reincorporation of all the true power of which we were systematically robbed.

"Following our questions" begins by writing them down... taking them seriously... it means never being without our notebooks...

And just as 'power's need to divide us (from ourselves and from each other...) is the source of our unanswered questions under 'class'... recovering our lost connections with all our relations... and particularly with our Brothers and Sisters... is the source of our freedom...

This process is much more contagious than 'power'-worship... the earth bends us to her... once we attend to her (the circularity of 'power's propaganda is an attempt to put itself in the way of... and to replicate... this effect – that's why we need those notebooks... because they are consciously... continuously... trying to wear down our belief in our body's truth... our certainty... so we have to give ourselves that space that those questions allow when they're given to us... to not just 'revisit our earlier truth' but... see that it still exists all around us... every moment we can reconnect...) and...

...as Walter Lundquist (quoted in *Waking Up*, p. 80) said: "Once you wake up the human animal you can't put it back to sleep again."

—

["151011derangeddreamofthepowermad.mp3":]

'Martial artists' in this moment... I've been arguing we must be... as 'power' wars on us incessantly when we claim our right to be fully-developing individualities... i.e.... pursue our happiness collectively... This 'project' requires us to resist 'power's totalitarian ethics... its utilitarian 'morality'.

But what we haven't discussed is the degree to which... our freedom is an intervention in... unconscious patterns of these global-'statesmen'... Plato's Tribesmen...

...patterns that they have no ability to see... let alone alter...

...and that these patterns mean... they cannot feel remorse or empathy... they cannot feel anything... though they long for a sense of absolute safety...

...and their dream... is a world... not just machine-like... but run by... machines.

Their need for what they think of as absolute 'safety' explains their obsession with social fabrication... with being the 'architect' of what... under 'class'... is called 'reality' – though it is anything but...

We are trying to be authentic in a world of 'class'... a world therefore false by definition... but... in addition... we are trying to be authentic in a world which they... these Sad-Abandoned-Children-Made-Misanthropists... who hide their faces from us... while claiming global-provenance... are actively trying to make more inauthentic by the minute...

(...and I'm more and more convinced... that this daily invention and dissemination of more falseness... ever-deeper lies... while done to achieve their obvious end of increasing divisions between us – we-the-people – is also done just to keep us disoriented... dispirited... off our centers... never knowing what anything is [and this is... of course... what was done to them... as children...])

Brothers and Sisters... this charade is not worthy of us... being forced to live out the 'Power'-mad Few's experience of abandonment... as if we were but shadows in a dream... the dream of a diseased mind.

We have been collectively enacting the fantasies of the deranged.

It's long past time for us to live authentic lives.

Karl Popper has reminded us that 'the state' is a recent invention... coterminous with the 'birth'... the 'self-creation'... of the global-state-statesmen... these self-same 'power'-mad Few...

...and we said that it is only by self-creating ourselves into 'a people' here in the U.S.... that we can confront global-'power'... confront the 'logic' and the repressive machinery of 'the state'... and this is confirmed by Kropotkin when he says that “mutual aid leads to mutual confidence... which is the first condition for courage...”

The key to the successful organizing of ourselves into groups... 'core-selves'... and broader associations around the implementation of specific plans... lies in the open acknowledgement of the tactics 'power' uses to destroy 'solidarity' (which is an embedded goal in whatever we do.)

What we're doing is showing that there is an authentic way to engage with 'power' – eschewing the phony routes it provides...

Once we see their penchant for orchestration... recognize that they own the media... we cannot help but also see that almost all the 'news' we get has some element of fabrication or craft... as controlling what we think is (for their sense of 'security'... their 'rule'...) everything.

---

[“151011sleepingmonsterawakes.mp3”:]

Alice Miller explains the roots of totalitarianism – the disease we have been discussing – in child-rearing under the regime of 'class'. Karl Popper exposes the roots of totalitarianism... and 'collective utility' – its ideological justification – in Plato...

In the key elements of Plato's – and the totalitarian's – political programme that Popper identifies (in what follows...) do we not recognize our current reality? – clearly... these post-French Revolution... self-invented global-'rulers' have followed Plato's guidance carefully. Let's ask ourselves what their adherence to this program... the imposition of these ideas on us – and the suppressed synthesis of Karl Popper... Martin Bernal... his exposure of *Bildung*... and Gottingen... Albert O. Hirschman... who clarifies their broad political strategy... and Alice Miller... who explains how it was accomplished with 'child-rearing'... confirms both the imposition... and the conscious intention behind it – has meant for the scope of the human spirit... what it has meant for us to be *assigned* [by the market or otherwise...] our functions... what it has meant for our common earth that we have allowed such tiny spirits to ravage her. So here's Plato's political program:

“(A) The strict division of the classes; i.e. the ruling class consisting of herdsmen and watchdogs must be strictly separated from the human cattle. [This goal was achieved by its being embedded in an 'objective' 'education system' – i.e. by means of 'educational' screening (a 'system' which provides them with a comforting self-justification: they tell themselves they identify and promote 'the best' of 'the best'...) – the pretence of 'objectivity' helps to conceal its absence... is in keeping with their need to stay hidden... to escape detection... to hide the hand behind the plans to capture and command the mystery of our human energy... – P.S.]

“(B) The identification of the fate of the state with that of the ruling class; the exclusive interest in this class, and in its unity; and subservient to this unity, the rigid rules for breeding and educating this class, and the strict supervision and collectivization of the interests of its members.

“From these principle elements, others can be derived, for instance the following:

“(C) The ruling class has a monopoly of things like military virtues and training, and of the right to carry arms and to receive education of any kind [and recall we said last week (the October 4, 2015 show) that 'the state' is “the self-organization of 'power'” ... – P.S.]; but it is excluded from any participation in economic activities, and especially from earning money. [I would argue that utilizing 'accumulation' as a political strategy... i.e. its use as a stratagem... they see as distinct from pursuing money for its own sake... – P.S.]

“(D) There must be a censorship of all intellectual activities of the ruling class, and a continual propaganda aiming at moulding and unifying their minds. All innovation in education, legislation, and religion must be prevented or suppressed.

“(E) The state must be self-sufficient. It must aim at economic autarchy ['economic independence... self-sufficiency...]; for otherwise the rulers would either be dependent upon traders, or become traders themselves. The first of these alternatives would undermine their power, the second their unity and the stability of the state.” [And here we are in debt to Hirschman... who explains the way in which the 'modern'... self-created... 'power'-guys implemented this injunction... by monopolizing the financial mechanisms... access to credit. And so... we see... the sleeping monster Plato... awoke in the minds of these sick folks... and from the seed of his flights of fancy and careless jokes... was built... millennia later... a massive yoke... – P.S.] (*The Open Society and Its Enemies: The Spell of Plato*, p. 86 – 7)

[“151011disposedofinsecret.mp3”:]

And what practice is key to the totalitarian creed... to 'collective utility'? – where does it begin... if not in child-alienation?... the practice Plato recommended: child abandonment...

(Popper was attacked for this translation: “The race of the guardians must be kept pure”, says Plato (in defence of infanticide) when developing the racist argument that we breed animals with great care while neglecting our own race, an argument which has been repeated ever since.”

His reply: “Is my translation wrong? Or my assertion that this has been, ever since Plato, the main argument of racials and breeders of the master race? Or are the guardians not the masters of Plato's best city?”

“As to my translation, Shorey puts it a little differently; I shall quote from his translation (the italics are mine) also the preceding sentence (referring to infanticide): ‘...the offspring of the inferior, and any of those of the other sort who are born defective, they [the rulers] will properly dispose of in secret, so that no one will know what has become of them. “That is the condition,” he said, “of preserving the purity of the guardian's breed.”) (*The Open Society and Its Enemies: The Spell of Plato*, p. 337 – 8)

And it seems to me... there is a direct line from that command... to the centuries... millennia... that follow... of child-abandonment under 'class' (this is the subject of John Boswell's *The Kindness of Strangers: the Abandonment of Children in Western Europe from Late Antiquity to the Renaissance...*)

...and... again... we see in their use of EMF [electro-magnetic-force] weaponry... with which we are “disposed of in secret...” what (historically) was done to them.

It must have seemed like a dream come true... manna from heaven... these EMF (electro-magnetic-force) weapons... to the 'power'-mad Plato's Tribesmen... confirmation that they were 'meant' to 'rule'... But could they get people to do it?... administer 'shocks' to fellow 'citizens'... those the 'power'-mad (on Plato's authority...) label 'deficient' – 'unneeded'... 'superfluous'... deleterious to the herd... upsetting them... interfering with the plans of 'the chosen' – and target for elimination...

...and an experiment at Yale (one of the hubs for the propagation of the 'new master class' ideology...) in 1961 answered the question: yes they could (there's a film out now about that question... called *The Experimenter...*)

How many of our loved ones... in the years subsequent... have they killed? You know folks who have had these weapons used against them. I suspect that almost all of us in urban areas know someone who was targeted... “disposed of in secret...” as Plato authorized 'rulers' to do: eliminate the 'unneeded'... the elderly... the homeless... the disobedient... those with 'heart'... those who care about their Brothers and Sisters. These weapons... after all... would 'have' to be tested... and 'the deficient' needed to go... a 'perfect' conjoining of streams of Necessity...

...all of us have lost folk... without knowing it – and those targeted wouldn't know either... because the symptoms are misdiagnosed (or insufficiently diagnosed) as 'strokes'... 'heart attacks'... congestive heart failure... various cancers... and Alzheimer's...

The cost of accommodating ourselves to 'the false' has come home... we dare not tarry long in deciding to act... now we know... now we know that the world is waiting for us accept the mantle of our 'greater freedom'... bought with their blood and suffering... and... now we know... with our own.

---

[“151011lossofthemothersaffection.mp3”:]

(And what is the thrust of almost every TV-show my son watches?: “Killing people's not so bad... it's all relative... morally-neutral even... it all depends on 'context'...” [on what 'the state' – which is in all of us... i.e. the 'utilitarian mindset' – feels is needed... Read: “Morality is nothing but political hygiene...” Karl Popper noted a half century or so ago. He was talking about Plato... but Plato lives... in the global-state-statesmen...] This is a new development... designed to dull our sensibilities... make us more like them... so they'll feel safer... safe from any threat of challenge...)

And what is the mindset inherent in the totalitarian creed... and its defining practice of child-alienation?: dualism ('collective utility'...) the deification of 'Mind'... contempt for 'the material'... the real... the concrete... for what Marx (with the ancient Greeks...) would call 'Necessity' – into which category... necessarily... their children... and ours... were placed – all for the sake of the 'idea' of the 'Perfect State'... that state that manifests... expresses... and elevates 'the best'... from which striving to 'achieve' the goal of the most 'perfect' human being... arises... identified as supreme... the 'philosopher-king'.

How much damage has this one man... Plato... done? It is incalculable... but one thing is certain... it is on his authority that the abandoned-children-who-would-be-gods have contaminated society with the glorification of their own fundamental dishonesty... their obsession with hiding... and lying:

The contrast between the Platonic and the Socratic creed is even greater than I have shown so far. Plato, I have said, followed Socrates in his definition of the philosopher. “Whom do you call true philosophers? – Those who love truth,” we read in the *Republic*. But he himself is not quite truthful when he makes this statement. He does not really believe in it, for he bluntly declares in other places that it is one of the royal privileges of the sovereign to make full use of lies and deceit: “It is the business of the rulers of the city, if it is anybody's, to tell lies, deceiving both its enemies and its own citizens for the benefit of the city; and no one else must touch this privilege.”

“For the benefit of the city”, says Plato. Again we find the appeal to the principle of collective utility is the ultimate ethical consideration. Totalitarian morality overrides everything, even the definition, the Idea, of the philosopher. It need hardly be mentioned that, by the same principle of political expediency, the ruled are to be forced to tell the truth. “If the ruler catches *anyone else* in a lie... then he will punish him for introducing a practice which injures and endangers the city...” Only in this slightly unexpected sense are the Platonic rulers – the philosopher-kings – lovers of truth.

Plato illustrates this application of his principle of collective utility to the problem of truthfulness by the example of the physician. The example is well chosen, since Plato likes to visualize his political mission as one of the healer or saviour of the sick body of society....

...What kind of lies has Plato in mind when he exhorts his rulers to use strong medicine? Crossman rightly emphasizes that Plato means "propaganda, the technique of controlling the behaviour of... the bulk of the ruled majority." Certainly, Plato had these first in his mind; but when Crossman suggests that the propaganda lies were only intended for the consumption of the ruled, while the rulers should be a fully enlightened intelligentsia, then I cannot agree. I think, rather, that Plato's complete break with anything resembling Socrates' intellectualism is nowhere more obvious than in the place where he twice expresses his hope that even *the rulers themselves*, at least after a few generations, might be induced to believe his greatest propaganda lie; I mean his racialism, his Myth of Blood and Soil, known as the Myth of the Metals in Man and of the Earthborn. Here we see that Plato's utilitarian and totalitarian principles overrule everything, even the ruler's privilege of knowing and of demanding to be told, the truth. The motive of Plato's wish that the rulers themselves should believe in the propaganda lie is his hope of increasing its wholesome effect, i.e. of strengthening the rule of the master race, and ultimately, of arresting all political change. (*The Open Society and Its Enemies: The Spell of Plato*, p. 138 – 140)

...and in this compulsive need of 'power's to lie... to stay hidden... to punish the 'disobedient'... and eliminate the 'unnecessary' (or merely 'deficient'...) we see a key 'repetition compulsion.' They – these ten thousand die-hard misanthropists – have been afraid of us and afraid of us and afraid of us for... – let's say for the sake of convenience – two and a half centuries... ever since the French Revolution... they have projected all of their fear of the unknown onto us. This is... for our purposes... perhaps their most devastating repetition compulsion...

...but it is derived from another... more basic... one: their need to 'win' affection... to 'prove' they deserve our attention... because they are 'the best'...

...this is the key side-effect... of abandonment... of loss of the mother's affection.

---

[Apologies... this portion of the show I unfortunately neglected to read... please look for it next week...]

We are reclaiming our authentic selves... and in order to do that we need support... we need others similarly focused on the development of 'self / soul-sufficiency' – individually – as well as our development... collectively... into 'a people' able to advance our right to pursue happiness...

...so we must confront the barriers to our doing these things... – all of these barriers being in essence one: "hidden-'power'"... 'power' in one of its many guises. And I think there is some advantage... some ways in which it may be helpful... for us to understand where they came from... these Plato-worshippers... how they think... the kinds of things they do to destroy our hope (and why...)

...that it is important for us to see what they will... inevitably... try to do... in order to prevent it from happening.

What are the kinds of things they will want to do... to undermine our solidarity?... and how do we withstand such attempts?

The Zapatistas use 'conflict resolution' to ensure there is no erosion of group cohesion... which is... I think... useful guidance... something we also must design...

...but of a particular kind.

---

["151011theaterforrevolution.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*...]

[We are reading excerpts from Marx's *Eighteenth Brumaire...* and Immanuel Wallerstein's *The Modern World-System IV: Centrist Liberalism Triumphant, 1789 – 1914*, in order to see the origins of the 'modern' bureaucratic nation-state in the fixed determination of 'statesmen' to repress us... we-the-people... It is a new invention... with no less devastating effects for being so. And so long as it lasts... it – these global-'statesmen' – will forestall our growth... our right to express our infinite expansiveness... – P.S.]

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." [Now that's astute political analysis... Do we have a press... of any kind... that independent of 'power'... or its utilitarian mindset... today? Moreover... we see that no one is deceived... not even for a moment... the performance is so seen... – P.S.]

[October 11, 2015 show ends here.]

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 party 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 sauses 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-statemens' against we-the-people... and as an ideological tool to indoctrinate their children... Since then I've found Immanuel Wallerstein's answer... in his 2011 book... *The Modern World-System IV: Centrist Liberalism Triumphant, 1789 – 1914*... which 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 (p. 5 - 6) 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'... the 'power'-guys... post-French Revolution... 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.” (p. 5 - 6)

[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. Thiers said in a statement to the Chamber of Deputies: “The day after the Revolution of July, we saw our duty to moderate it. In effect it was no longer liberty, but order which was in danger” (cited in Bezucha, 1974, 137).

The next few years were to see worker unrest of a new intensity and quality in both France and Great Britain. It has been increasingly noted in the literature on strikes and workers' unrest how much of this activity was that of “artisans” as opposed to “workers.” Although the line is not always as clear as some seem to think, in general those referred to as “artisans” had more technical skills, higher real income, and more workplace autonomy than other kinds of workers.

Many of these “artisans” were members of organizations that had been in existence long before the nineteenth century, and which functioned to advance the welfare of their members through social support and mutual help. The organizations were hierarchical and built around rituals.

These organizations were the only ones permitted at all in the periods when trade-union organization had been strictly forbidden, and then only under the careful surveillance of the authorities. In the changing political situation after 1830, however, even mutual aid societies began to take on new roles, as See (1951, 2:199) pointed out: “Many of these societies served... to hide veritable *resistance organizations*, hostile to the employers; by creating *auxiliary monetary reserves* (*bourses auxiliaires*), they created funds to support the unemployed and strikers.” Thus it could be, as Stearns (1965, 371 – 372) has argued, that such “artisans” were more likely to engage in strike action at this time than the “factory workers,” who, being in an even weaker position, were “almost totally quiescent.” [While Wallerstein – in his use of quotation marks with the ‘class’ designations – acknowledges the fluidity of the categories into which we are put... for ease of analysis in Academe... and to facilitate ‘power’s planning... The critique in this space goes further. You recall during the September 27, 2015 show... my comment that ‘class’ categorizations have no valid use for us... exist... rather... to serve ‘power’s ideological purposes... – P.S.]

The distinction made by many scholars between artisans and factory workers seems to be asserted primarily on the basis of differing workplace organization. But in fact the artisans were usually in “workshops,” which were not all that different in structure and even social organization from the rather small “factories” that existed in this era. I suspect the real difference was in the social origins of the two groups of workers. The “artisans” were males, and males who came for the most part from the immediate area. The “factory workers” were largely either women and children (Bezucha, 1974, 35) or “migrants,” which included both those who came from rural communities and workers speaking another language.

The most dramatic expression of protest by the “artisans” was that of the *canuts* of Lyon, first in 1831 and then in 1834. The struggles began right after the July Revolution, and included machine destruction and eviction of “foreign” workers. The background to this was an eighteenth-century militancy of journeymen, which had erupted in 1786 in the so-called tuppenny riot (*emeute de deux sous*), in which the journeymen sought to obtain a fixed minimum rate for finished cloth. The ongoing turmoil continued up to the French Revolution and the enactment of the *Loi Le Chapelier*. Bezucha (1974, 46) concludes that “the French Revolution, in fact, broke the momentum created prior to 1789 and may have retarded the development of a workers’ movement in Lyon.” In the years between 1789 and 1830, however, the relatively stable system of the *compagnon* had been replaced by a more “fluid one of piece-work laborers” (Bezucha, 1974, 46)

Levasseur (1904, 2:6) asks the questions, Why Lyon? Why 1831? His answer is that Lyon was living off a luxury industry, silk, which made it more “sensitive... to economic crises and political turmoil.” The immediate issue, as in 1786, was a minimum wage, which had been agreed to by the prefect but subsequently revoked by the central government. The first strike was relatively nonpolitical. But discontent continued. There was a strike in Paris in 1832. The atmosphere was more and more politicized, partly by the dissatisfaction of the working classes with the politics of the July Monarchy, partly (at least in Lyon) by the agitation of the Italian nationalist forces. Mazzini’s aide-de-camp, General Romorino, was often in Lyon recruiting persons for their attempts to liberate Savoy and Piedmont (Bezucha, 1974, 122). On February 14, 1834, a general strike was called. It did not succeed. The local Republican party was divided in its attitude. A repressive law caused a further reaction by the workers in April, an uprising in which some three hundred were killed. This attempt came to be viewed as a “landmark in the history of the European working class” (Bezucha, 1974, 124). This time the repression by the authorities was definitive. There was a “monster trial” in 1835, which the government used “to get rid of the republicans.” Faced with the beginnings of a serious class struggle by the urban working class, the liberal state initially reacted as repressively as did its predecessors.

The story was not very different in Great Britain. The moral equivalent of the July Revolution was the Reform Bill of 1832. Great Britain did not know “three glorious days” of “revolution.” Instead, there was a parliamentary battle in which the revolution was “voted” in, on the crucial second reading in 1831, by a single vote.

When, despite this, the bill was defeated in committee. Parliament was dissolved, and a pro-reform Parliament elected. At the time there was great awareness of events in France, and the possibilities of “worse” happening. Macaulay’s speech on March 2, 1831, in favor of reform makes clear the reasoning of those who advocated it:

Turn where we may, within, around, the voice of great events is proclaiming to us, Reform, that you may preserve... Renew the youth of the State. Save property divided against itself. Save the multitude, endangered by its own ungovernable passions. Save the aristocracy, endangered by its own unpopular power. Save the greatest, and fairest,

and most highly civilised country that ever existed, from calamities that may in a few days sweep away all the rich heritage of so many ages of wisdom and glory. The danger is terrible. The time is short. If this Bill should be rejected, I pray to God that none of those who concur in rejecting it ever remember their votes with unavailing remorse, amidst the wreck of laws, the confusion of ranks, the spoliation of property, and the dissolution of social orders.

Macaulay's argument was heard. And, exactly as in France, once the middle strata had won their *droit de cite*, attention turned immediately to containing the claims of the working classes. Chartism, "much the most important movement of working men" (Evans, 1983, 215) and a continuation of the old radical reform movement, was contemporaneous with and strongest during the great industrial depression from 1837 to 1843. It gained considerable notoriety and seemed a real menace to the authorities for several years. A large part of Chartist ranks were drawn from members of trade societies. But it also had support from middle-class radicals (Rowe, 1967, 85). The Chartist movement existed simultaneously with, and was in direct rivalry with, the free-trade movement of the Anti-Corn Law League. Halevy (1947, 9) raises the specter of a potential for "civil war." Briggs (1959, 312) speaks of the two movements as representing "a contrast between two segments of a divided society." Gash (1965, 2) says of the "Movement" ("a phrase borrowed from Continental politics") that it "had an undeniable air of class war...."

...The internal problems of Great Britain and France never became large enough that those powers could not concentrate attention on the geopolitics of the world-system. The July Revolution, repeated and confirmed by the independence of Belgium and the Reform Act of 1832, was to have an immediate effect on Europe. Whereas the relations of Great Britain and France between 1815 and 1830 had been correct, and those countries often found themselves on similar sides of world issues, the heritage of the two-century struggle for hegemony continued to ensure enough mutual suspicion to preserve a degree of distance. The July Revolution overcame that, affecting even the Tory government of Wellington before the Reform Bill was enacted. Europe now entered the era of the *entente cordiale*, a marriage perhaps not of love but certainly of reason, one that would survive all subsequent quarrels until at least 1945. The term itself was probably coined by Palmerston in 1831, although it did not come into official use until 1842 (Guyot, 1926, 220; Halevy, 1950, 3:73, n. 1). The geopolitical basis of the alliance was clear, "As a Liberal power, France was [after the July Revolution] in the nature of things the ally of Liberal England" (Halevy, 1950, 3:73). Great Britain could now pursue with greater ease its containment of absolutism in Europe and expand the circle of liberal states (Guyot, 1926, 88, 117)

But there were further motives. Great Britain and France faced the same internal problems, and even if France was not yet ready to embrace the free-trade nostrums of Great Britain, the *entente cordiale* seemed "in the eyes of democrats and socialists" as an "alliance of capitals" that was a "*fait accompli*" (Guyot, 1926, 302). Was this so wrong? Indeed, the two effects were not separate. In pressuring other powers to follow their example, Great Britain and France, with the *entente cordiale*, "discouraged the international revolutionary propaganda which counted on the divisions among the powers" (Guichen, 1917, 424 – 425).

Furthermore, 1830 launched a pattern that would discourage such propaganda even further. For France at least, 1830 served to restore France to a sense of world centrality and nationalist pride. It was not Guizot but the French socialist Louis Blanc (1844, 4:143 – 144) who would write:

The July Revolution... was more than the *denouement* of a struggle against the Church and royalty; it was the expression of national sentiment that had been excessively repressed by the treaties of 1815. We were determined to shake off the yoke of these treaties and restore the European equilibrium.

One of the curious facts to note about the July Revolution was what happened in Algeria. Charles X's launching of the imperial venture had made Great Britain most unhappy, and Louis XVIII was ready to sacrifice it to appease the British. When, however, the French restrained themselves from direct intervention in Belgium, they felt they had done their share of pleasing the British, and simply continued the occupation, this time without British protest. One reason clearly was its effect on worker unrest within France. The "floating" population of Paris, the potential revolutionaries, were being encouraged to settle in Algeria. Indeed, in 1838 Leon Blondel, a high civil servant in Algeria, could say with some confidence: "Africa is an element of order in France" (cited in Tudesq, 1964, 2:815).

The liberal states thus combined legitimating the political role of the middle classes (and thereby receiving from them legitimation in turn) and internal repression of working-class discontent with an *entente cordiale* between themselves to ensure their dominance in the geopolitical arena. This seemed to work at first. But it was fragile, as the European revolution of 1848 was to demonstrate. More would have to be done to secure a stable political framework for the capitalist world-economy in the post-1789 situation. [And... again... as Hirschman suggests... a lot of megalomaniacal

scheming can be hidden 'neath the ideology of 'an economy' that never stops eating... because of some supposed 'inherent logic of accumulation'... – P.S.]

... 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, unfranchised 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. John Stuart Mill (1849, 7) was very severe on Louis-Philippe in assessing the causes of the February 1848 uprising in Paris, which was the beginning of the 1848 European revolutions:

No government can now expect to be permanent unless it guarantees progress as well as order; nor can it continue really to secure order, unless it promotes progress. [It certainly seems the global-state-statesmen have taken this advice to heart... although modified to say: “*seem* to guarantee ‘progress’...” that message is drummed into all school-children and every other ‘class’-bound human... across the globe – an associated set of messages actually: “not everyone is smart...” “the system identifies and rewards the ‘smart ones’...” “the ‘really smart’ are busy making our lives easier...” “the system works hard to provide you with ‘the good life’ but you must do your part too... and keep your skills marketable... because ‘science’ is developing so fast... if you don’t you could fall through the cracks (and of course that would be *your* fault...”) – these are just a few of ‘the system’s key messages about ‘progress’... – P.S.] It can go on as yet, with only a little of the spirit of improvement; while reformers have even a remote hope of effecting their objects through the existing system, they are generally willing to bear with it. But when there is no hope at all; when the institutions themselves seem to oppose an unyielding barrier to the program of improvement, the advance of tide heaps itself up behind them till it bears them down.

The tide – that is, the European revolution of 1848 – as all such great happenings, was made up of a mixture of movements and objectives. In France, it consisted essentially of the joining together of Europe’s ‘first great proletarian insurrection’ (Tilly, 1971, 228) with the acute discontent of the left liberals who shared John Stuart Mill’s view of the conservatization of the July Monarchy. Elsewhere in Europe, instates that were not as yet committed to liberalism, there were no proletarian insurrections; rather, there were liberal uprisings combined with nationalist uprisings. Two situations, with two solutions: Louis Napoleon handled the first; Palmerston, the rest.

The uprising of February 1848 illuminated the hopes of a ‘social republic,’ a vague socialist utopia that would provide jobs to the unemployed and liberation to all those who suffered indignities and inequalities. Everyone put forward their claims: the “artisans,” who sought to restore their privileges and their mode of production; the peasants, who sought to reestablish traditional rights of collective usage; the women, who sought the extension of “universal” suffrage to include them; the slaves, who sought abolition. The pendulum was beginning to swing too far, and in June the forces of order under General Cavaignac reined in the unruly dangerous classes. “Pitiful provisional government!” cried Labrousse (1948,2) “It feared the social revolution as much as it did the counter-revolution.”

Cavaignac could repress; he could not re-legitimize the state. Nor could the monarchs return; they had exhausted their credit. Into this void stepped Louis Napoleon, who sought to re-create a liberal, orderly, modern state and who, as Zeldin (1958, 6) puts it so well, “was not elected because he was [the] candidate [of the Party of Order], but... was their candidate because they saw he was bound to win.” But what did Louis Napoleon represent? He represented, first of all, the Napoleonic tradition, which combined the legacy of the French Revolution, a commitment to scientific and industrial progress, and nationalism. During the 1840s, Louis Napoleon had been a sharp critic of the July Monarchy because he felt that, by distancing itself from progressive liberalism, it was “building on sand and would surely tumble.” And, unlike Guizot, he was aware that “with proper safeguards a democratic regime could be established without threatening the stability of the country.”

---

The liberals acted in 1848 just as they had in 1830. Dismayed by a regime that had become too rigid, too illiberal, they rose up and quickly won the day. Then, dismayed by the possibility that the lower strata would be able to take advantage of the situation and push things too far, they renewed their links with the political groups they had just ousted from power, because 'the enemy, at present, is on the left' (Palmede, 1961, 255). When Louis Napoleon made his coup d'état on December 2, 1851, the primary objective was to repress the left. The secondary objective was, however, to constrain the ability of conservative forces to act other than through him. One can, if one wants, emphasize the Caesarist – the so-called Bonapartist – element in the regime. If one does, however, one risks missing the degree to which the outcome of the repression, which was both real and effective, was that of a centrist regime, oriented to capitalist expansion, constructing a liberal compromise – one led not by a classical liberal but by an enlightened conservative.” (Immanuel Wallerstein, *The Modern World-System IV: Centrist Liberalism Triumphant, 1789 – 1914*, p. 77 – 92)

[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 *obligé* man in France because he had turned all his estates into his partisans' obligations to him, so Bonaparte would fain be the most *obligé* 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. The witticism with which Countess L., the mistress of M. de Morny, characterized the confiscation of the Orleans estates: “*C'est le premier vol de l'aigle*” [“It is the first flight (theft) of the eagle”] is applicable to every flight of this *eagle*, which is more like a *raven* [I resent that! The raven is most regal... – P.S.]. He himself and his adherents call out to one another daily like that Italian Carthusian admonishing the miser who, with boastful display, counted up the goods on which he could yet live for years to come: “*Tu fai conto sopra i beni, bisogna prima far il conto sopra gli anni.*” [“Thou countest thy goods, thou shouldst first count thy years.”] Lest they make a mistake in the years, they count the minutes. A bunch of blokes push their way forward to the court, into the ministries, to the head of the administration and the army, a crowd of the best of whom it must be said that no one knows whence he comes, a noisy, disreputable, rapacious bohème that crawls into gallooned coats with the same grotesque dignity as the high dignitaries of Soulouque. One can visualize clearly this upper stratum of the Society of December 10, if one reflects that *Veron-Crevel* [In his work, *Cousine Bette*, Balzac delineates the thoroughly dissolute Parisian philistine in Crevel, a character which he draws after the model of Dr. Veron, the proprietor of the *Constitutionnel* ('a French bourgeois daily')] is its preacher of morals and *Granier de Cassagnac* its thinker. When Guizot, at the time of his ministry, utilized this Granier on a hole-and-corner newspaper against the dynastic opposition, he used to boast of him with the quip: “*C'est le roi des droles*,” “he is the king of buffoons.” One would do wrong to recall the Regency or Louis XV in connection with Louis Bonaparte's court and clique. For “often already, France has experienced a government of *homme entretenus*” [kept men].

Driven by the contradictory demands of his situation and being at the same time, like a conjurer, under the necessity of keeping the public gaze fixed on himself, as Napoleon's substitute, by springing constant surprises, that is to say, under the necessity of executing a *coup d'état en miniature* every day, Bonaparte throws the entire bourgeois economy into confusion, violates everything that seemed inviolable to the Revolution of 1848, makes some tolerant of revolution, others desirous of

revolution, and produces actual anarchy in the name of order, while at the same time stripping its halo from the entire state machine, profanes it and makes it at once loathsome and ridiculous. The cult of the Holy Tunic of Treves [“a Catholic relic preserved in the Treves Cathedral, alleged to be a holy vestment taken from Christ while he was suffering death. It was regarded by pilgrims as an object of veneration.”] he duplicates at Paris in the cult of the Napoleonic imperial mantle. But when the imperial mantle finally falls on the shoulders of Louis Bonaparte, the bronze statue of Napoleon will crash from the top of the Vendome Column. (Karl Marx, *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*, p. 133 – 135)

[Because our – that is... we-the-people's – understanding of 'historical' events is generally through the lens of the 'educational system' of (premised on) 'class'... designed to reinforce the 'logic' of 'rule' (consciously or unconsciously...) which 'logic'... we are now seeing... is embedded in the utilitarian mindset (and vice versa...) a.k.a. 'dualism'... on which 'thought' itself is premised – under 'class' – how do we 'make' authentic 'sense' of the blow-by-blow 'class'-sanctioned ('system'-stamped-legitimate) historical descriptions we are given?

What does this 'history' *mean*... for us?... what are we to make of it?

Let's return to this question after considering the broader world-systems context provided by Immanuel Wallerstein – this will be his view further into the same chapter (“The Liberal State and Class Conflict”) we've been excerpting. Two things stand out... one: “the supremacy game” the 'power'-guys are engaged in with each other... experimenting with their new toy... the 'powerful'... bureaucratic... nation-state – and two: their self-creation as 'global-state-statesmen'... with a common vision and purpose... inventing... as the key structural means for accomplishing this... an interstate 'mechanism' to ensure our – that is... we-the-people's – suppression... A question we should ask ourselves... I think... is... why... even in the analyses of those who have our interests in mind... these obvious motives of 'power' are not the starting point of these analyses... and why... rather... our advocates help legitimate these unmistakable motives by employing the ideology of 'economic development'? Wherever we stand on this issue... there needs to be discussion... – P.S.]:

The 1850s marked the high point of growth in British exports. The export of cotton piece goods “just about doubled” in the decade, actually increasing even the *rate* of growth, which, Hobsbawm argues (1975, 30 – 31), provided “invaluable [political] breathing-space.” Cotton textiles were still central to British wealth, but this was the period in which metals and machinery moved to the fore as the leading industry, and with them the emergence of “bigger industrial units all along the line” (Clapham, 1932, 2:114). Great Britain was clearly on the road to becoming an industrial state. “The course was set” (Clapham, 1932, 2:22). For Great Britain, these were “buoyant years,” in which her economic dominance of the world-economy went “virtually unchallenged” and in which the new world of industry “seemed less like a volcano and more like a cornucopia (Coleman, 1973, 7 – 8). Great Britain was comfortably hegemonic, but also complacently so, not always feeling she had to watch over every fluctuation of the world-economy.

Yet, we should not exaggerate. The voyage was “not half over.” Agriculture remained “by very far the greatest of [Great Britain's] industries” (Clapham, 1932, 2:22). Church (1975, 76) believes that calling this period the “mid-Victorian boom” must be severely qualified.” Yes, there was a price rise, business expansion, and an improved standard of living, but the growth rate in production was not all that big, and 1858 saw the most profound downward business cycle of the century. Like all economic leaders, Great Britain was preparing its own fall. It was resistant to innovation. It was in 1856 that Bessemer first read his paper on his use of air blasts to make quality steel more inexpensively, but his ideas would not be widely adopted until the Kondratieff B-phase. The expansion of the world-economy was bringing in its wake further industrialization in the United States and various parts of Europe, making Great Britain's competitive position “steadily more difficult,” particularly because these countries indicated, with the significant exception of France, that they had “no intention of following Britain's example” in adopting free trade (Schlote, 1952, 43). Indeed, Great Britain itself would eventually sour on free trade.

In this midcentury British glow, France seemed initially at a disadvantage because of the turmoil of 1848. Once again, its revolutions seemed to be hurting its economic development. But this time only most briefly, because the political solution to the turmoil – the populist authoritarianism of the Second Empire – served to resolve some of the political tensions precisely because this regime had made itself, as none had done before, the proponent and propellant of a leap forward of French economic structures, thereby consolidating the liberal core of the world system.

The economic indicators were clear: Foreign trade tripled (Palmade, 1961, 193). The production of the means of production grew relative to the production of consumable goods (Markovitch, 1966, 322). There was a boom not only in domestic investment but also in foreign investment, such that by 1867 net income from external investments exceeded net

export of capital. For Cameron (1961, 79), this meant that France had become “a 'mature' creditor nation.” And French public finances had become, along with those of Great Britain, “solid.” The public subscription to government loans “demonstrated the strength of savings and the abundance of capital which existed in the *two* countries” (Gille, 1967, 280). In short, this was a time of economic glory for France as well as for Great Britain. This was “to the benefit, if not the credit, of the Second Empire,” but, as Palmade (1961, 127, 129) insists, “the externally favorable situation fell to a government firmly committed to taking advantage of it.”

Furthermore, it was a government that thought governmental action was essential to this economic expansion, one that did not consider, in the words of Napoleon III [Louis Bonaparte], that state action was a “necessary ulcer” but rather that it was “the benevolent motor of any social organism.” The intention nonetheless was to promote private enterprise thereby. Although the “primary concern” of the government was to “create as many [economic] activities as possible,” still the government wished to “avoid this grievous tendency of the state to engage in activities which private individuals can do as well as or better than it can.” Furthermore, the public works program of the government was directed not merely to aid industry, but to shore up the agricultural sector. And behind this practice – “a precursor of technocratic Gaullist modernization” – was the objective of combating “political instability and class conflict (Magraw, 1985, 159), crucial for a regime that had emerged in the crucible of the Revolution of 1848.

---

This is where the famous Saint-Simonian link comes in. Actually, we should talk of the post-Saint-Simonians, those who had emerged out of the pseudoreligious phase under Enfantin and who retained only the “radical” spirit of Saint-Simon – rigorously modernist, technocratic, reformist, ultimately neither “socialist” nor “conservative” (as some have claimed) but essentially “liberal” in spirit, as became most clear in the Second Empire. It was liberal in spirit because it combined the two key features of liberalism: economic development linked to social amelioration. [And by 'social amelioration'... recall... he's referring to the continuous provision of 'progress' to 'the people'... and the maintenance of 'order' – i.e. a 'social contract' dependent on being able to rape the earth elsewhere... i.e.... dependent on 'the colonies'... – P.S.] For liberals, the two are obverse [“corresponding to something else as its opposite or counterpart...” I would say that one implies the other... – P.S.] sides of the same coin. The Saint-Simonians affirmed “the primacy of the economic over the political sphere” (Blanchard, 1956, 60). But they also argued, in the 1831 formula of Isaac Pereire, that economic progress would bring about “an amelioration of the lot of the largest and poorest strata” (cited in Plessis, 1973, 86). This is of course why Napoleon III and the Saint-Simonians were “made for each other” (Weill, 1913, 391 – 92). To be sure, the Saint-Simonians were “about the only intellectual group available to [Napoleon]” (Boon, 1936, 85). But also vice versa: the modernist sector of the bourgeoisie, the true liberals, “needed [Napoleon] to liberate themselves from the timidities of the well-to-do” (Aguilhon, 1973, 234), who had dominated the Party of Order in the July Monarchy. This is why Guerard (1943, chap. 9) called Napoleon III “Saint-Simon on horseback.”

It is in this period as well that banks came into their own as key agents of national economic development. In this, too, the credit must go to the post-Saint-Simonians (such as the brothers Pereire), who were “the first to realize the role of stimulus and coordinator that banks could play in economic life” (Chlepner, 1926, 15). But the story predates the brothers Pereire. From at least 1815 on, the biggest banks – notably the Rothschilds and the Barings – shifted their emphasis to long-term loans, first in negotiating and promoting loans to governments and second in sustaining large private enterprises. Since, as Landes (1956, 210 – 212) notes, were these banks to show “too voracious an appetite,” they could be undercut by competitors, they tended to form cartels. The Rothschilds in particular found their best profits in a tacit link with the Holy Alliance [“In September 1815, the three monarchs of the 'east' (Austria, Prussia, and Russia) signed the document that became known as the Holy Alliance – the pledge to work together to maintain the status quo in Europe, if necessary by intervention in countries threatened by revolution. Great Britain did not join the signatories.” p. 42... – P.S.] and were thus able to locate themselves in the principal money markets, which at that time were “more markets of demand than centers of money supply” (Gille, 1965, 98). Furthermore, the “favorite gambit” of the Rothschilds – the short-term emergency loan to a government in difficulty – was not necessarily an aid to national self-sufficiency. Cameron (1957b, 556) argues that such governments “rarely ever regained [their] independence” and compares the practice to a “habit-forming drug.” [And we... of course... immediately think of 'payday lending'... which comparison succinctly expresses the downward trajectory of 'the system'... its urgent sense that they must develop lock-down techniques to use on us that are guaranteed effective... before we get... globally... that their jig is up... and that it is for us imperative that we begin designing our alternative... – P.S.]

The need, of course, was for more locally controlled sources of credit. Chlepner (1926, 19) reminds us that, before the Credit Mobilier of the brothers Pereire, there were “predecessors” in Belgium – most notably the Societe Generale,

founded by King William in 1822. It was, however, only after Belgium marked its independence in 1831 with the enthronement of Leopold I that the bank became a major actor in economic development, primarily in the construction of railways. If this bank and the rival Banque de Belgique, founded in 1835, both went into relative hibernation after the financial crisis of 1838, they were even harder hit by the Anglo-French economic crisis of 1846 – 1847. With this in the background, February 1848 led to fear of revolution, fear of the loss of independence, and a “veritable financial panic” (Chlepnier, 1926, 238; see also 1931), which caused the state to come to the aid of the bank and end the period of agitation. Belgium thus was able to avoid the revolutionary upsurge and could then move to a more truly liberal system, eliminating the semiofficial character of the Societe Generale in 1851....

(Immanuel Wallerstein, *The Modern World-System IV: Centrist Liberalism Triumphant, 1789 – 1914*, p. 102 – 119)

... – 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....