

WUR of September 6th, 2015... “Embracing Global Goals, Scope and Action: Becoming Global Actors... Claiming the ‘All’” – Segue From *Antisystemic Movements...* To Alice (Dft 13)

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 21)

[“150906onedayglobalgeneralstrike.mp3”:]

September 2, 2015... Sisters and Brothers: Should ten thousand guys decide for seven billion? No. So... how do we get free of them?

A one-day global General Strike... followed by another one... followed by another one... is the only way we can get free... We cannot get free working within the interstate system. What is the mechanism by which we organize it? We pick a day... May Day... say... and a year in advance everyone who claims to be a 'Marxist'... or a 'Socialist'... or a 'progressive'... or an 'Anarchist' – anyone who wants global human freedom... and not global totalitarianism (which is what we got in this 'class'-system because it admits no alternatives...) all who want this... commit... to using every means... network... connection... and medium to promote – with the express and clear goal of global freedom – a one-day global General Strike...

...and... to begin visioning it in concrete terms – like someone who works construction – and I don't mean in our 'jobs'... those energy-sinks they plug us into... there is no part of a coerced-work system that's not corrupted... utterly illegitimate. No... I mean as 'soul-sufficient' beings... as 'fully-developing individualities'.

Let's put on our coveralls Sisters and Brothers... put our hands into the rich soil of our relationships... and start feeding it with good... healthy... information: i.e.... we were born free... and we deserve to keep so... design a world for ourselves – every one of us – that ensures we can be so.

But the second we start... trust... a battalion of false folks will descend on each one of us – and there is no business... non-profit or institution... public or private... that they have not infiltrated. We will need the strategies we've been discussing here to stay focused. (And if they pooh-pooh a global General Strike... that's a 'tell'... But the point is not to expose... the point is to stay focused.)

We are recognizing that unless we see 'power' where it hides in that place it resides... of Zero-Consequences-For-Its-Actions... it can continue to undermine our ability to organize – by undermining our certainty – that we deserve to be free... that trust and love can exist between us... we commoners... globally... and that we have the ability... both spiritually and materially... to achieve it: our global freedom...

We asked ourselves some questions last week – “what do we mean by “hidden-'power'?”... “how do we see hidden-'power'?”... and “why must we incorporate an understanding of it into our strategic planning?” – and I'm not sure we answered them... except the last one... by implication – by... citing as authority our Kropotkin... and the fact that what is key for us (in beginning to move toward 'the global unity of we-commoners'...) is a process for clarifying our picture of the world we want: a world fit for the self-development of our gifts... based in our mutual-aid arrangements (“the organization is how we cooperate...”) and for that we need certainty – and therefore what is key... is keeping 'power' from undermining it – with agents... and with economic hardship...

...a picture with which to excite our Brothers and Sisters just beginning to look around them... at the possibilities emerging with our proliferating discussions... freeing the thought process... thawing that original hope for a vital existence that hidden 'power' decimated with its successful systematic planning.

Through 'misdirection' ('philosophical education') and 'making us hunger'... along with constant media-bombardment... designed to keep us uncertain... (behind which 'power' hides – our opponent feels amorphous... it is 'the system' itself... designed to keep us uncertain... as we ourselves constitute it daily...) a worm was inserted into the fruit of our resistance...

["150906skewedbydualism.mp3":]

...and Marx could not see it...

As Popper said... Marx's was not "a radical form of materialism..." his world-view was skewed by its dualism... its division between 'mind' and 'hand'... and in that division... 'Thought' always took precedence... and this 'Thought'... because not rooted in our deep earth-connectedness... sought... like 'power's... to rule 'earth'... subject it to 'Thought's authority – and especially the earth-in-us... for we are the raw material from... and by... which... "Thought' (or 'History'... if you prefer) realizes itself..." and the Plato's Tribesmen – the 'power'-guys – 'make themselves.'

Marx... like Bentham... views us with a 'benevolent' utilitarian lens: we exist to fulfill our 'historic mission'. And while he (unlike Bentham) encourages us to keep fighting for 'more'... a bigger slice – because according to his analysis (as we learned in our discussion of how the rate of profit falls as 'capitalism' 'develops' ["150503talkaboutpower.mp3": "Marx concludes by saying that the law of the tendency of the rate of profit to fall is "in every respect the most important law of modern political economy... It is from the historical standpoint the most important law." (*Capital, III*)"...] it speeds up 'power's demise – he doesn't recognize that in accepting subject-status... for ourselves and our children... we've lost everything that matters.

["150906constitutiveorders.mp3":]

In their discussion [see the menu] in the "Introduction" to *Antisystemic Movements: "Rethinking the Concepts of Class and Status-Group in a World Systems Perspective"*... our Good Three noted important shifts in emphasis in Marx's concept and analysis of 'the state'... and 'the market'... from that which went before:

If we contrast [Adam Smith's and other classical economists'] analytical framework with that associated with Karl Marx's *critique* of political economy..., we notice two consequential shifts of focus: a shift away from state-defined economic spaces to world-economic space on the one hand, and a shift away from the marketplace to the workplace on the other.

The first shift implied that the market was no longer seen as enclosed within (or "embedded" in) each nation-state as an independent economic space, and that the world-economy was no longer conceived of as an interstate economy linking discrete national economic spaces. Rather, nation-states were seen as jurisdictional claims in a unitary world market. By effecting the socialization of labor on a world scale, the world market determined the most general context of the class contradictions and therefore of the class struggles of capitalist society, which Marx defined by its constitutive orders, the bourgeoisie and the proletariat: ['Earth-speak' would be: those 'power'-mad-few – and... by the way... while they tell themselves they want all the 'power' (resources) because they are the only ones 'qualified' to have it... they are all the more mad for believing that – these 'power'-mad-few are determined to ground all earth... but particularly the earth which is us... down into one placid unresisting material... on which they 'work'... made uniform in being made uniformly malleable to 'its' 'will'... – P.S.]

["150906innovationisus.mp3":]

The modern history of capital dates from the creation in the sixteenth century of a world-embracing commerce and world-embracing market. (*Capital, Volume I*)

This market has given an immense development to commerce, to navigation, to communication by land. This development has, in its turn, reacted on the extension of industry; and in proportion as industry, commerce, navigation, railways extended, in the same proportion the bourgeoisie developed, increased its capital, and pushed into the background every class handed down from the Middle Ages. (*The Communist Manifesto*) [This is what I mean by "unleashed 'Greed'"... But... stepping back... I am searching for a good metaphor to explain why that's a con... because it is we who do this... and yet 'power' that gets... takes... is given... the credit... and that con has been so embedded in our heads... primarily by the 'official' Left (the academics and pundits...) the professional Left has driven... with Marx's help... that notion into our heads that somehow without these 'power'-guys 'doing it' (forcing us...) we would not have been able to be innovative at all – that is so wrong... so backwards and upside-down... so twisted... I'm searching for a way so we can see that clearly... – P.S.]

This was not a mere matter of trade relations between sovereign states. Rather, the developing bourgeoisie...

...compels all nations, on pain of extinction, to adopt the bourgeois modes of production; it compels them to introduce what it calls civilization into their midst, i.e., to become bourgeois themselves. In one word, it creates a world after its own image. (*The Communist Manifesto*) [While recognizing the vampiric nature of 'power'... it seems Marx never felt any interest in the spiritual implications for we-the-people of this tendency of 'power' to turn us... into 'it' (that is that metaphor that was updated in the Matrix-series of films... in which the 'Mr. Smith' virus replicates by turning us into 'it'...) – P.S.]

The world so created was characterized by a highly stratified structure of domination and had more than market interests as subjective grounds for collective action:

Just as it has made the country dependent on the towns, so it has made barbarian and semi-barbarian countries dependent on the civilized ones, nations of peasants on nations of bourgeois, the East on the West. (*The Communist Manifesto*)

Marx went looking for 'capital'... we – and Rosa and Kropotkin and Bakunin – are looking for 'power'. Marx is looking for 'laws' that capture the trajectory of the accumulation of 'capital'... in order to 'prove' that that trajectory ends in our freedom... (He needed to 'prove' it... isn't that suggestive of 'the abandoned child mindset'?... the need to seek approval... and the need to 'prove' that one is right... are intimately tied... and this is so alive all around us – because it's about 'class'... and it has been alive around us for ten thousand years: this need to 'prove' one's worth... and escape 'slave' status – that is the mindset from which we are freeing ourselves... right now... in this moment... I think it's worth a little extra effort to start these conversations. And I hope I've been of some help in providing some tools... some means... some ways into... the route... into these conversations... into the notion that it is time now to end ten thousand years of class... We gotta bring that up... because that's amazing... *that is 'world historic'...*)

["150906nothingmoreexciting.mp3":]

(To get 'force' off the backs of us... and allow our gifts to grow and develop under their own agency and initiative... the guidance of the earth – that world is going to be so amazingly interesting... to see each other... who we are really... not these poor-sad-distorted mutilations of ourselves... but *us*... nothing more exciting than that.)

["150906powerinchilddrearing.mp3":]

...others... like Albert O. Hirschman... saw a different trajectory: the 'evolution' of 'statecraft' – putting the hand that crafts... their acts... before the abstractions that 'Thought' creates... to legitimate those actions. Because 'explanation' in terms of 'inherent laws of development' is necessarily legitimization.

What Hirschman found... a continuously renewed and strengthened attendance to Plato's dictum... "there must be no split in the unity of 'the master class'..." i.e.... the point then... now... and ever will be while it lasts: preserving 'class'... which means... 'herding the cattle'.

Marx was looking for money and means... so to theorize how we-the-people would conquer them... thereby 'guaranteeing' our freedom... it wouldn't even occur to him to look for child-rearing activists... for a bunch of Humboldts and Cousins... installing the 'systems'... that would make us all – 'rulers' and 'ruled'... 'shepherds' and 'sheep' – obedient to... and lusting for... 'Authority'... – because that's how we got conquered... that's what we needed Marx's eyes on... not the stage... the theater...

And so... in answer to the question we asked last week: "why are we devoting time to an *Eighteenth Brumaire* reading?": one answer is because we want to know how Marx sees 'the state'... sees 'power'... so we can get clearer... and all get on the same page and together... that we're wrestling with an entirely different animal from what Marx thought – so we need to not allow that weight of mistaken thinking to hold us down right now... it's time for us to take off... and we need to encourage each other in so doing...

...but also... in order to see... that abstract theory – in and of itself... *per se* – is but 'the state' in hiding... in its ethereal haunt... from which it comes to corral our heads... as dictatorially as the bayonets press against our chests...

["150906itispowerthatviolent.mp3"]

So... are there 'laws' that govern 'accumulation'... and how is 'the accumulation of capital' different from 'the love of gain' *per se*? This is the question that absorbed Marx... But he was... as Popper said... someone who thought very highly of human heads... so he viewed from the money-side... the abstractions – he became fixated on... the curtain...

...others asked the same question... but from the aspect of 'power' standing naked... without the abstractions to conceal them. Albert O. Hirschman's *The Passions and the Interests: Political Arguments for Capitalism before Its Triumph* is divided into two parts. The first is titled: "How the Interests ['the love of gain'] were Called Upon to Counteract the Passions" [the vicious competition between the 'power'-guys for supremacy ('glory'... 'standing'... recognition... adulation... – Adam Smith (who also said that we-the-people – our voice – is "little heard and less regarded"...)] Adam Smith noted this in his *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*... in which he said: "What is the end of avarice and ambition, of the pursuit of wealth, of power and preeminence?... From whence... arises the emulation which runs through all the different ranks of men and what are the advantages which we propose by that great purpose of human life which we call bettering our condition? To be observed, to be attended to, to be taken notice of with sympathy, complacency, and appreciation, are all the advantages which we can propose to derive from it. It is the vanity, not the ease or the pleasure, which interests us." – words admirably evidenced by Mussolini's "every hierarchy must culminate in a pinpoint..." Is it not clear... this is the mindset... of abandonment?...

Part Two is titled: "How Economic Expansion was Expected to Improve the Political order"... which... in a sense is also Marx's conclusion.

The book opens with the question that absorbed... not just Marx... but all those struggling with the concept of 'freedom'... and what it means in a social arrangement defined by an endless scramble for place... rank... by those restless souls who were abandoned as children... and were consequently determined to 'prove' their 'worth'... and use us – our human energy – to do it...

...and then ferrets out the seeds of the belief that emerged in late seventeenth century Europe... that 'the interests' might be able to tame 'the passions' (i.e.: the 'power'-guys tearing themselves to shreds... This absorbed Plato too... by the way... trying to figure out how to rein-in those 'power'-guys passions... And this would be a really good example of 'projection' if it weren't primarily political strategy: always telling us that *we're* the violent ones. What a con. It's just the opposite. It's their own rage they're trying to control... while telling us that we are the ones who are violent... and then create the conditions to ensure that that seems so... because caged animals under stress do lash out at each other... that does not mean that violence is inherent in our nature... far from it. Keep in mind as we read... that... as Adam Smith said... our voice is "little heard and less regarded..." that we have been [up to now] simply along for this wild ride of 'Mind-Deified'... beginning its stamping of the planet – long past time for us to be the ones who decide... We have the right to be happy – and we can only be authentically happy – within the core of our being – when we are free... We start out free and we need to stay free... "No coercion" is the world we make to serve *us*... a world in which we never dissemble – there is no need – only honesty can knit together our human communities):

["150906powerseeksreason.mp3"]

At the beginning of the principle section of his famous essay [*The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*], Max Weber asked: "Now, how could an activity, which was at best ethically tolerated, turn into a calling in the sense of Benjamin Franklin?" In other words: How did commercial, banking, and similar money-making pursuits become honorable at some point in the modern age after having stood condemned or despised as greed, love of lucre, and avarice for centuries past? (p. 9)

The idea of an opposition between interests and passions made its first appearance, to my knowledge with the previously noted work of Rohan, which is wholly concerned with rulers and statesmen. In subsequent decades the dichotomy was discussed by a number of English and French writers who applied it to human conduct in general...

The infatuation with interest as a key to the understanding of human action carried over into the eighteenth century when Helvetius, in spite of his exaltation of the passions, proclaimed: "As the physical world is ruled by the laws of movement so is the moral universe ruled by laws of interest."

As happens frequently with concepts that are suddenly thrust to the center of the stage – class, elite, economic development, to name some more recent examples – interest appeared so self-evident a notion that nobody bothered to define it precisely. Nor did anyone explain the place it occupied in relation to the two categories that had dominated the analysis of human motivation since Plato, namely, the passions on the one hand [that's the 'power'-guys tearing themselves to shreds... – P.S.], and reason on the other [that's Plato and his fellow philosophers thinking they had to find a way to stop these guys from killing each other... – P.S.]. But it is precisely against the background of this traditional dichotomy ['traditional dichotomy'... i.e.... within 'power' itself... I guess you could say 'the shepherds and the sheepdogs... or 'the philosopher-kings' and 'the shepherds'... or something like that... – P.S.] that the emergence of a third category in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century can be understood. Once passion was deemed destructive and reason ineffectual, the view that human action could be exhaustively described by attribution to either one or the other meant an exceedingly somber outlook for humanity. A message of hope was therefore conveyed by the wedging of interest in between the two traditional categories of human motivation. Interest was seen to partake in effect of the better nature of each, as the passion of self-love [giving yourself permission to accumulate... – P.S.] upgraded and contained by reason, and as reason given direction and force by that passion [of endless accumulation... – P.S.]. The resulting hybrid form of human action was considered exempt from both the destructiveness of passion and the ineffectuality of reason. No wonder that the doctrine of interest was received at the time as a veritable message of salvation. (p. 43 – 44)

[I was planning to expand this fragment on Millar... but it would take up too much time... so... I will omit the following two paragraphs from the show... – P.S.]:

An explicit account of the historical reasons for which [the merchant and middle classes] not only come to exercise increasing political influence in general but are able to *react* to abuses of power by others through collective action was put forward by John Millar, another prominent member of the Scottish Enlightenment.

In a posthumous essay entitled “The Advancement of Manufactures, Commerce, and the Arts; and the Tendency of this Advancement to diffuse a Spirit of Liberty and Independence,” Millar states his subject as follows: “The spirit of liberty appears, in commercial countries, to depend chiefly upon two circumstances: first, the condition of the people relative to the distribution of property, and the means of subsistence: secondly, the facility with which the several members of society are enabled to associate and to act in concert with one another.” [Millar] shows how the advances of productivity in manufacturing and agriculture lead in both these branches to greater “personal independence, and to higher notions of general liberty.” (p. 88 – 9)

[“150906tyrannyishere.mp3”:]

Hirschman goes on to explain that those consumed by the idea of 'statecraft'... by the project of 'managing' 'society' efficiently... grew attached to the notion of a 'delicate watch mechanism'... as a metaphor for a well-managed 'state'...

[Steuart] makes... a two-sided point: on the one hand, increasing wealth causes the statesman to have “so powerful an influence over the operations of a whole people... which in former ages, even under the most absolute governments was utterly unknown”; at the same time, however, “the sovereign power is extremely limited, in every *arbitrary* exercise of it.” The reason lies in the nature of the “complicated modern oeconomy,” which he also calls “the plan” or “the plan of 'economy'”:

The power of a modern prince, let it be, by the constitution of his kingdom, ever so absolute, immediately becomes limited so soon as he establishes the plan of oeconomy which we are endeavouring to explain. If his authority formerly resembled the solidity and force of the wedge (which may indifferently be made use of, for splitting of timber, stones and other hard bodies, and which may be thrown aside and taken up again at pleasure), it will at length come to resemble the delicacy of the watch, which is good for no other purpose than to mark the progression of time, and which is immediately destroyed, if put to any other use, or touched with any but the gentlest hand.

A modern oeconomy, therefore, is the most effective bridle ever was invented against the folly of despotism. (p. 84 -5)

According to Ferguson and Tocqueville... economic expansion and the preoccupation with individual economic improvement that goes with it both cause the advance of the political arts ['statecraft'... the 'art' of controlling us... – P.S.] and can also be responsible for their deterioration [...I suspect... that in the minds of these Plato's Tribesmen... 'wealth' (us and all earth not-us...) 'achieving' its apogee in their hands... would simultaneously be... the apogee of their 'statecraft'... – P.S.]. This thought was later taken up by Marx in his class analysis of the 1848 revolutions: from progressive, the political role of the bourgeoisie turned reactionary as these events unfolded. But the earlier formulations are, in a sense, richer, for they demonstrate that economic expansion is *basically and simultaneously* ambivalent in its political effects, whereas Marxist thought imposes a temporal sequence with the positive effects necessarily antedating the negative ones....

...Ferguson and Tocqueville implicitly criticized the older tradition of thought that had seen in the pursuit of material interest a welcome alternative to the passionate scramble for glory and power. While not invoking the fallacy of composition, they put forward a rather similar point: as long as *not everyone* is playing the “innocent” game of making money, the total absorption in it of *most* citizens leaves the few who play for the higher stakes of power freer than before to pursue their ambition. In this way social arrangements that substitute the interests for the passions as the guiding principle of human action for the many can have the side effect of killing the civic spirit and of thereby opening the door to tyranny. (p. 124 – 5)

A pregnant point to end on... a lot to ponder in it towards our discussion of “seeing 'power'” where it hides... because I believe he hit the nail on the head... While we have been kept busy simply surviving... the global-state-statesmen have been busy constructing a world in the image of their paterfamilias... Plato... who provided for them all 'rulers' needed... to keep us contained... “controlling the 'human cattle'” is the name of that game... But 'the cattle' are growing up aren't we?... and throwing off that pejorative and beginning to talk to each other despite the atomization... considering the possibility... that at long last... it has come to pass... that ten thousand years of 'class'... will very shortly be... in the past...

[September 6, 2015 show ends here.]

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

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

An obvious way of entering into this topic is to compare the account of the emergence of money-making as an honored occupation that has been presented in this essay with Weber's thesis on the Protestant ethic and with the debate around it. As was noted repeatedly in the previous pages, the expansion of commerce and industry in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries has been viewed here as being welcomed and promoted not by some marginal social groups, nor by an insurgent ideology, but by a current of opinion that arose right in the center of the “power structure” and the “establishment” of the time, out of the problems with which the prince and particularly his advisors and other concerned notables were grappling. Ever since the end of the Middle Ages, and particularly as a result of the increasing frequency of war and civil war in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the search was on for a behavioral equivalent for religious precept, for new rules of conduct and devices that would impose much needed discipline and constraints on both rulers and ruled, and the expansion of commerce and industry was thought to hold much promise in this regard.

Weber and his followers as well as most of his critics were primarily interested in the psychological processes through which some groups of men became single-minded in the rational pursuit of capitalist accumulation. My story takes it for granted that some men became so impelled and focuses instead on the reaction to the new phenomenon by what is called today the intellectual, managerial, and administrative elite. That reaction was favorable, not because the money-making activities were approved in themselves, but because they were thought to have a most beneficial side effect: they kept the

men who were engaged in them “out of mischief,” as it were, and had, more specifically, the virtue of imposing restraints on princely caprice, arbitrary government, and adventurous foreign policies.... [And here we have another prime example of a suppressed book... as... with Hirschman's and Popper's help... had their words been discussed by we commoners... we would long since have seen the flaws in Marxism as an ideological tool to assist in our mobilization for freedom... and... clearly... these Plato's Tribesmen see themselves as the opposite of 'mischief-makers'... and therefore entitled to 'rule us... to see this is false... we need only look around us... – P.S.]

[“150913.mp3”:]

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

After the first revolution had transformed the peasants from semi-villeins into freeholders, Napoleon confirmed and regulated the conditions on which they could exploit undisturbed the soil of France which had only just fallen to their lot and slake their youthful passion for property. But what is now causing the ruin of the French peasant is his small holding itself [...now that strikes me as a really twisted way to describe it... – P.S.], the division of the land, the form of property which Napoleon consolidated in France. It is precisely the material conditions which made the feudal peasant a small-holding peasant and Napoleon an emperor. Two generations have sufficed to produce the inevitable result: progressive deterioration of agriculture, progressive indebtedness of the agriculturist. The “Napoleonic” form of property, which at the beginning of the nineteenth century was the condition for the liberation and enrichment of the French country folk, has developed [...'power' hides in the passive tone... – P.S.] in the course of this century into the law of their enslavement and pauperization. And precisely this law

is the first of the “*idees napoleoniennes*” [“an allusion to Louis Bonaparte's Book *Des idees napoleoniennes*, published in Paris in 1839.” (editor)] which the second Bonaparte has to uphold....

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

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

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

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

As the executive authority which has made itself an independent power, Bonaparte feels it to be his mission to safeguard “bourgeois order.” But the strength of this bourgeois order lies in the middle class. He looks on himself, therefore, as the representative of the middle class and issues decrees in this sense. Nevertheless, he is somebody solely due to the fact that he has broken the political power of this middle class and daily breaks it anew. Consequently, he looks on himself as the adversary of the political and literary power of the middle class. But by protecting its material power, he generates its political power anew. The cause must accordingly be kept alive; but the effect, where it manifests itself, must be done away with. But this cannot pass off without slight confusions of cause and effect, since in their interaction both lose their distinguishing features.... As against the bourgeoisie, Bonaparte looks on himself, at the same time, as the representative of the peasants and of the

people in general, who wants to make the lower classes of the people happy within the frame of bourgeois society.... But, above all, Bonaparte looks on himself as the chief of the Society of December 10, as the representative of the *lumpenproletariat* to which he himself, his *entourage*, his government and his army belong, and whose prime consideration is to benefit itself and draw California lottery prizes from the state treasury. And he vindicates his position as chief of the Society of December 10 with decrees, without decrees and despite decrees.

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

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

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

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

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

[Take this drama to the world stage and you have hidden-'power' today (just think 'ISIS' and drug cartels... 'Boko Haram' and infiltrators-of-police-forces... agent provocateurs of all sorts... etc.... – or in my micro-micro situation: students and the 'low-income'... including immigrants and formerly-incarcerated... and I suppose some bored Plato's

Tribesmen-sympathizers eager for action...) for the human-weaponry Marx names... – plotting and planning behind scenes (they live to scheme – it's the only way they can feel smarter than everyone else... and they definitely need to feel smarter than everyone else...) while keeping us... not just ignorant of their actions – that goes without saying – but... as Marx says... ignorant of the play... ignorant that there *is* a play going on... oblivious that we are the puppets... while the hidden 'adventurers' as Marx termed them – and it that not a good word to use... to describe Plato's Tribe?... out to deceive the world while designing the global-stage as a House of Horrors – hand us sentences drenched in blood... our own... and the blood of our Brothers and Sisters... – P.S.]

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

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

What the national *ateliers* were for the socialist workers, what the *Gardes mobile* were for the bourgeois republicans, the Society of December 10 was for Bonaparte, the party fighting force peculiar to him. On his journeys the detachments of this society packing the railways had to improvise a public for him, stage public enthusiasm, roar *vive l'Empereur*, insult and thrash republicans, of course, under the protection of the police. On his return journeys to Paris they had to form the advance guard, forestall counter-demonstrations or disperse them. The Society of December 10 belonged to him, it was *his* work, his very own idea. Whatever else he appropriates is put into his hands by the force of circumstances; whatever else he does, the circumstance do for him or he is content to copy from the deeds of others. But Bonaparte with official phrases about order, religion, family and property in public, before the citizens, and with the secret society of the Schufterles 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 society

(p. 122 – 132)

... – 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....