
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 30)

[The spoken word for this word-beat (with a beat from my son) is from the April 13, 2014 *Waking Up Radio* show.]

[“151027powerisarapist.mp3”: “...what it’s lusting for is the end of our efforts to even try to be independent... the achievement of their deep longing that we will end all resistance... and become passionately ‘self-regulating’... eagerly offer our allegiance... (Doesn't that sound like the dynamic of the rapist?... Over the ages of 'class'... 'power' is 'power' is 'power'.) [Here’s the relevant paragraph from that story of Lucian's that I bungled... called “Lucius the Ass”: “When we got back, we came upon the old woman dangling at the end of a cord from a rock; obviously she had been so terrified of what her masters would do to her for letting the girl get away that she hung herself and strangled to death. The bandits, admiring the crone's consideration for their feelings, cut her down and heaved her over the cliff, cord and all. Then they tied the girl up, left her inside, and sat down to dinner and a long session with the bottle.” (On the back of the collection of his satires it reads: “Lucian, born in Syria in the second century A.D., came to Greece at an early age and mastered its language and literature. He took up law, left it for public speaking, then turned to full-time writing... A master of the vivid scene, Lucian used his pungent style to ridicule the tyrants, prophets, waning gods, and hypocrite philosophers of his own day and the centuries preceding him.” [*Selected Satires of Lucian*, translated by Lionel Casson]) [From the April 13, 2014 *Waking Up Radio* show.]

[“151108slaverybylaw_1.mp3”:]

November 3, 2015... Sisters and Brothers: Peter Kropotkin begins his essay “Law and Authority” bemoaning our loss of a sense of agency... our increasing passivity... with the deepening Authority of the State... And while the invention of the global-state... the global interstate-system... made 'class' consciously...intentionally... totalitarian (i.e. no matter how we turn and twist... chafing at the bars and bits... no matter how we struggle against it... in the end we find... our cage awaits us... This is accomplished as Peter Kropotkin helps us see... by means of *words* only...

(...and a *whole lot* of violence...it isn't my intent... to trivialize the mind-boggling extent of it... their violence...)

...and by keeping us so 'busy'... and so separated... that we never get to develop our thought process...

Let's listen for a moment to the words of Peter Kropotkin:

We are so perverted by an education which from infancy seeks to kill in us the spirit of revolt, and to develop that of submission to authority; we are so perverted by this existence under the ferrule [a metal encircling band] of a law, which regulates every event in life – our birth, our education, our development, our love, our friendship – that, if this state of things continues, we shall lose all initiative, all habit of thinking for ourselves. Our society seems no longer able to understand that it is possible to exist otherwise than under the reign of law, elaborated by a representative government and administered by a handful of rulers. And even when it has gone so far as to emancipate itself from the thralldom, its first care has been to reconstitute it immediately. “The Year 1 of Liberty” has never lasted more than a day, for after proclaiming it men put themselves the very next morning under the yoke of law and authority....

The confused mass of rules of conduct called law, which has been bequeathed to us by slavery, serfdom, feudalism, and royalty, has taken the place of those stone monsters, before whom human victims used to be immolated...

This new worship has been established with especial success since the rise to supreme power of the middle class – since the great French Revolution. Under the ancient regime, men spoke little of laws; unless, indeed, it were, with Montesquieu,

Rousseau and Voltaire, to oppose them to royal caprice. Obedience to the good pleasure of the king and his lackeys was compulsory on pain of hanging or imprisonment. But during and after the revolutions, when the lawyers rose to power, they did their best to strengthen the principle upon which their ascendancy depended. The middle class at once accepted it as a dyke to dam up the popular torrent. The priestly crew hastened to sanctify it, to save their bark from foundering amid the breakers. Finally the people received it as an improvement upon the arbitrary authority and violence of the past.
...

Relatively speaking, law is a product of modern times. For ages and ages mankind lived without any written law, even that graven in symbols upon the entrance stones of a temple. During that period, human relations were simply regulated by customs, habits and usages, made sacred by constant repetition, and acquired by each person in childhood, exactly as he learned how to obtain his food by hunting, cattle-raising, or agriculture....

Such was law; and it has maintained its two-fold character to this day. Its origin is the desire of the ruling class to give permanence to customs imposed by themselves for their own advantage. Its character is the skilful commingling of customs useful to society, customs which have no need of law to insure respect, with other customs useful only to rulers, injurious to the mass of the people, and maintained only by the fear of punishment....

[“151108lawofresistance_2.mp3”:]

[I love that Nikola Tesla placed his work to establish instantaneous global communication in the context of its bringing about the unity of men and women globally... and ...though not saying so directly... implied that 'power' can manipulate us if we cannot talk to each other directly... share our thoughts directly... – P.S.]

The history of the genesis of capital has already been told by socialists many times. They have described how it was born of war and pillage, of slavery and serfdom, of modern fraud and exploitation. They have shown how it is nourished by the blood of the worker, and how little by little it has conquered the whole world. The same story, concerning the genesis and development of law has yet to be told....

Law, in its quality of guarantee of the results of pillage, slavery and exploitation, has followed the same phases of development as capital. Twin brother and sister, they have advanced hand in hand, sustaining one another with the suffering of mankind. In every country in Europe their history is approximately the same. It has differed only in detail; the main facts are alike; and to glance at the development of law in France or Germany is to know its essential traits and its phases of development in most of the European nations....

[“151108protectionofexploitation_3.mp3”:]

It will perhaps be objected that during the last fifty years, a good many liberal laws have been enacted. But if these laws are analyzed, it will be discovered that this liberal legislation consists in the repeal of the laws bequeathed to us by the barbarism of preceding centuries. Every liberal law, every radical program, may be summed up in these words, – abolition of laws grown irksome to the middle-class itself, and return and extension to all citizens of liberties enjoyed by the townships of the twelfth century. The abolition of capital punishment, trial by jury for all “crimes” (there was a more liberal jury in the twelfth century), the election of magistrates, the right of bringing public officials to trial, the abolition of standing armies, free instruction, etc., everything that is pointed out as an invention of modern liberalism, is but a return to the freedom which existed before church and king had laid hands upon every manifestation of human life.

Thus the protection of exploitation directly by laws on property, and indirectly by the maintenance of the State is both the spirit and the substance of our modern codes, and the one function of our costly legislative machinery. But it is time we gave up being satisfied with mere phrases, and learned to appreciate their real significance. The law, which on its first appearance presented itself as a compendium of customs useful for the preservation of society, is now perceived to be nothing but an instrument for the maintenance of exploitation and the domination of the toiling masses by rich idlers. At the present day its civilizing mission is *nil*; it has but one object, – to bolster up exploitation.

This is what is told us by history as to the development of law. Is it in virtue of this history that we are called upon to respect it? Certainly not. It has no more title to respect than capital, the fruit of pillage. And the first duty of the revolution will be to make a bonfire of all existing laws as it will of all titles to property. (Peter Kropotkin, from “Law and Authority”, *Kropotkin's Revolutionary Pamphlets*, edited by Roger N. Baldwin)

[And what did Shakespeare tell us?... what do we know in our hearts?... about true wealth?... And the cost of coveting the false?: “Those that much covet are with gain so fond [foolish]... that what they have not – that which they possess – they scatter and unloose it from their bond, and so by hoping more they have but less, or gaining more, the profit of excess... is but to surfeit [waste], and such griefs sustain, that they prove bankrupt in this poor-rich gain.” (*The Rape of Lucrece*)]

[“151108usbiggetsourfreedom_4.mp3”:]

Two things stand out as necessary next steps... both from what we just heard... as well as from the progression of our analysis: the need to redesign education... create an education for *us*... for free humans... and the need to find some means of reaching our Sisters and Brothers... some means of making these public discussions...

(Getting suppressed thoughts out into the open air plants seeds... and no one can know where those seeds go... how they might grow... and 'power' don't want those seeds out there... which means that we absolutely must get those seeds out there. I'm thinking of compiling some of these suppressed thoughts in rhyme... which could perhaps be used for a public poetry reading... but voicing suppressed thoughts is not 'nothing'... it's way-something...

I said as the show began that we are honing in on a strategy... and perhaps a short way of summarizing it is that we... each one... must be leaders – that's what it means to say that the basic unit of political organization in our freedom and in our transition to freedom is the individual – no more surrendering our leadership capacities to others... each one of us has to get 'big'... doing so immediately overpowers a system based on coercion and force – it extends their resources too thin... and very shortly then they're ready to cut a 'deal'... And we have to understand... that there are no 'deals' cut when it comes to our freedom. Just like you can't be 'a little bit pregnant'... we can't be 'a little bit free'... It is all or nothing... and we are in the end-game... we are in the time where if we don't claim our freedom then we are setting our children up for chains and leashes... and constant fear... I have got this: these folk only feel safe if we are obviously afraid of them... if we are not afraid of them they don't feel safe... and so then they will 'up' the force... 'up' the coercion... 'up' the clandestine violence. You do the math... where does that lead?... that endless escalation from their endless fear? It ends with our necks in a noose... or our bodies in chains... and that is not a legacy we can leave for our children... or for us... we can do this now... that's what the technology means... it's simply a matter of spreading that good news far and wide... not just planting those seeds... but growing them.

[“151108believeinourgifts_5.mp3”:]

Peter wrote those words over a hundred years ago... those words of encouragement and love... and he wasn't alone... obviously... many many good folks labored long so that we could believe in our right to live free... and see the steps we need to take to realize that right –

...it isn't because the work of establishing... not just the viability and the 'rationality' (no waste...) but the *morality* of *everyone* designing the social arrangement we create on the common earth we live on... it isn't because that work hasn't been done that we are stuck under 'power's thumb... its because we've been denied access to them... to the ancestors who long for our freedom.

The hard work and common sense of our ancestors who long for generalized human freedom (globally) has been suppressed. All states (who participate in the interstate system... whose statesmen want to be 'global players'...) do this – and do this in collaboration – this 'work' of ensuring that the vast many cannot develop our thought... cannot see the obvious: that ten thousand guys who want to be gods must not be allowed to decide for seven billion... must not be allowed to coerce our human energy for purposes which... as Peter says... all end with the object of keeping us as children... dependent on them... *ad infinitum*...

And what of our last-gasping-great-gifts?... the myriad expressions of our common greatness that only live in freedom... when will be finally believe in them?

[“151108tortureasagame_6.mp3”:]

The education we design must have an *ethical* basis. What is that ethical basis?

My son has been absorbed of late with the martial arts exercise called 'sticky hands'. It came up most recently in a discussion we were having about 'power's tactics... In particular... how 'power' identifies what it concludes are the 'leaders' – 'leaders' in claiming an alternative (to 'power'...) set of allegiances – in order to eliminate these 'leaders' and substitute suitable replacements of their own creation. (Perhaps we should call this 'the Invasion of the Body-Snatchers' tactic.) Now it could take years for even a single replacement... but our guys... these Plato-worshipping deep-schemers... don't mind... they see themselves as weighty 'thinkers'... capable of a degree of intricacy of planning beyond the ken of we-mere-commoners...

(Last week I said that my house feels like a prison... I forgot to add “where they torture you every second...” I think sometimes about these people who do this... who torture their Brothers and Sisters... and I have to think they must be children... teenagers... who have no experience of life... who have no ability to think what they're doing through... – we'll be talking about that: their use of children to do these things... and I say 'children' because I'm sure they're encouraged to think of what they do as a computer game – they're trying to turn everything into a 'game' so that we don't take our lives seriously anymore... or anyone else's... – I imagine these 'children' are sitting in front of a computer screen somewhere and the people they do this to aren't real... You see?... only a child can be satisfied with just fulfilling the task and getting their reward of 'candy'... At some point... the thought process... even in these trained to be obedient... must start to kick in... and I wonder what they do with folk at that point...)

[“151108childrensrighittotheirfeelings_7.mp3”:]

...and as long as they have their EMF-ace-in-the-hole... their secret weapons... they are supremely confident that they will ultimately 'win'... i.e. the replacement is successfully slipped in... be it into a 'job' or some other 'position'. You can imagine how it works: the 'wrong' person won't let go?... pound electrical-magnetic waves into them until they cry 'Uncle'... leave to seek medical treatment... or in some other sense retire to their private garden.

They infiltrate... they manipulate... they identify key leadership... for study (mimicking...) and eventual elimination... How do we see this while it's happening?... intervene and prevent its denouement... support those who are targeted? There are people both in my life and in public life who... now that this electro-magnetic wave 'technique' is being done to me (revealed because I took to my vehicle and they were obliged to follow me...) who I know absolutely this was done to. But only now that I am targeted am I able to recognize it in others... many of whom died from its application. What can we do to prevent this?... hang on to our very-needed resources for our resistance? There's a man and a woman right now that I'm concerned about... because they are in the 'at-risk' population: they model gentle loving strength... tenderness... and they work with children (and this is particularly a dangerous situation for Black men [which the man is one among...]) as the would-be-gods plan a different role for them... in the 'Republic'...) and both are experiencing physical symptoms.

This has been their conscious strategy – in the sense of being pursued relentlessly – for some decades (although 'power' has... since its inception... been determined to eliminate the opposition... 'weed out' the 'intractable brutes'... or those who don't 'fit' with their categorization...) So it should not surprise us when influential existing organizations – 'influential' in terms of influencing thought... or possessing a mission to defend we-the-people) when existing organizations provide false guidance... or fail to provide that defense... by doing the obvious: mobilize us with a vision of a future in which we live freely...

...which brings us back to 'sticky hands'... and the result of our analysis: the need to redesign education... create an education for *us*... for free humans... and then... find ways to disseminate it...

...both derive from the priority of re-engaging our thought process – the thought process of all of us here in the U.S.... and throughout the world of 'class' – by causing that which is not seen (or the sight of which has been suppressed...) to be seen...

We are seeing (in our readings) how that thought process got shut down... in our individual lives... and historically...

This priority of re-engaging our thought process can be expressed in multiple ways... we could describe it as 'breaking a spell'... or establishing a 'new ethics' in a world of our self-conscious creation – based in our children's right to their feelings... their right to honor their bodies' voice... and follow its guidance... honor its living manifestation of love...

...our children's feelings provide 'right guidance'... to follow which... is their inherent right of self-creation. Our children deserve... we deserve... to live their... our... gifts freely... without coercion...

(And toward this end... I put together a suggested 'guidance' for 'working with' elementary-school-age children... with objectives you will see as you read it [please forgive the bureaucratic language in it but it's meant as a tool for 'teachers' – those who provide guidance to our children – of any bent...] I'm posting 'Part 1' here and on the 'Blog' page as a pdf... it's a simple one-page document... called: “Understanding Feelings and the Historical Roots of Violence”, Part 1: “Discussing Feelings”. 'Part 2' is a discussion of *The Talking Tree* – both the book and the CD [there's more info on the 'Tools' page about them... and you can download the mp3 there... or follow a link to the posted YouTube slideshow of it...] they are intended as tools for a process of helping children see and believe in the authentic... the true... their feelings... the root... the ethical basis of our future.)

[“151108raiseupcoleenslove_8.mp3”:]

We are seeing... that the would-be-gods-in-charge want none of this... and in sum... do not want us to live our love... because love – concern about our Brothers and Sisters... poses a direct threat to their Authority: it is an opposing allegiance.

Each generation is tempted by this 'threat' (from 'power's perspective...) to a 'power'-allegiance... and must (from 'power's perspective...) be conquered. 'Sticky hands' describes both the strategy they use to accomplish this... and... once we become conscious... our 're-engaging thought' response to it: i.e.... our resistance.

'Sticky hands' is an exercise done in the martial arts with a partner...

(I'm hoping to obtain video of Coleen Gragen... the woman who started Hand to Hand Martial Arts Center in Oakland... singing this song that she wrote: “Facing fear... raise up love... raise up love... Facing fear... raise up love...” – and also video of Coleen in motion – to share... because it strikes me that they tried to silence her voice... and I find it to be... necessary... in this moment... to raise her love... an enormous love.)

[“151108walkingwiththedeath_9.mp3”:]

(Harrison Sims... died of 'congestive heart failure'... I know they did this to... He is the man I think of when I say those words: “a gentle Black man”... none more gentle... I fear for the psychic safety of his son... because I know they've done their homework on him... keep tabs on him... insinuate false folks around him... because that's their m.o.... that's what they do... I've learned in the course of the past six years... that's what they do... I had no idea... which is why it works... no one has any idea... until they find themselves in the crosshairs... and usually those people don't last too long... It is really important that we start mobilizing... these folk are so deadly serious... and so damaged... and it's difficult for us to believe that such folk exist because we tend to judge others by ourselves... but I've learned they definitely do exist... They are a shadow-state... they operate as a shadow-state with enormous resources... and absolutely no rules... no rules apply... they do what they want... and they are supremely obsessed with knowing what we think... at all times... in particular those who are challenging their world-view with another... putting another way out there... or simply just... as we've been doing here... returning to discussion suppressed ancestors that they don't want discussed... It really surprised me how little it takes for them to get 'upset'... and then orchestrate like a military campaign against it... It is so surreal... they get away with it... no one believes it.

I apologize for being so emotional today. Please check out *The Talking Tree*... I wrote it as a resource... please let me know if you find it to be so.)

[“151108cultivatedchildrenofpower_10.mp3”:]

'Sticky hands' is an exercise done in the martial arts with a partner in which (in my son's words) “the object is to stay connected to your partner from your wrist to your forearm... and... with your partner... move your arms around while staying connected. It's almost like a dance but the object is to get inside your partner's defense... without forcing or muscling your way in... in order to either off-balance their center line or touch their center line – you're 'working with' your partner's energy... 'staying connected' means there is a sense of 'ebb and flow'... a 'following' and 'leading' at any given moment... The object is always to get inside their defense and off-balance their center-line... but what is 'success' changes depending on the partner and what you are exploring in each other's energy. Sometimes it can be a lesson in seeing where that person will take you. It's essential to have an open curious mind about what is going on with yourself and with your partner.”

But it cannot be an exercise for mutual benefit... if one of the partners is ignorant of it... doesn't realize they're in an 'exercise'... assumes that the people around him or her are honest... when actually some of those people view him or her as a

subject... as a 'sheep' to be herded... manipulated... because this is how their mentors taught them to view us... and to see themselves as our 'shepherds.'

How can the Miniscule Few control the Vastness of Us?... is the question that 'occupied' Jeremy Bentham... and the 'Panopticon' was the answer he presented to statesmen... a prison design which... you'll recall... kept us from working together and developing our thought... as it required us to not 'see' each other... but rather to only look up.

But to control us globally – the seven billion of us – required more than just hierarchical organization. And so the 'solution' 'power' settled upon was to intentionally multiply its 'children'... a simple matter when the structure of 'class' rests on the basis of child abandonment... how easy it was to lure our lost children with the message lodged in them of their 'specialness'.

These cultivated children span the globe... and 'Sticky Hands' is their m.o. The strategy illustrates perfectly how trained intention 'bests' the uninitiated... manipulates the honest... and as a bonus sows despair and mistrust... when eventually we conclude we don't know what's true... and what isn't.

(There was a likely illustration of this strategy this week here in Berkeley... at Berkeley High School... racist incidents have been happening there this year: a noose was hung on school grounds... Just before going to print yearbook text was altered to refer to of-color students in an academy at the school as “trash collectors of tomorrow”... and on Wednesday... a screenshot of a library homepage... altered with racist messages... was left on a library computer for other students to see... the next day student 'leaders' organized a walkout... a math teacher provided signs... and thousands walked... Were these children organizers part of the recent influx of Plato's Tribesfolk I encountered as I walked and hawked my books?... or not?... But you can see how easy it would be to orchestrate it... You can read about this incident in the *San Francisco Chronicle* of November 6, 2015.)

Taking the Panopticon global meant its decentralization... Every statesman... no matter how lowly placed in the hierarchy of states... is expected to keep his (or her) 'Panopticon' in order... regularly inspect the cells for chinks... ensure there are no confabs between inmates...

...but the practical means of achieving this... in the absence of a physical structure... is 'Sticky hands' – all those 'hands' ('agents') are there to hold our eyes... keep our focus... give us our ideas... and ultimately to lead us.

But as we become people 'knowledgeable about energy'... as our awareness grows about the 'Sticky hands' strategy... we become aware that we are being guided to an end not of our choosing... and we can decide how we will reply.

Handing our lives over to a 'system' so it can 'make use of' us for purposes not of our creation... drains our energy off uselessly – so far as 'the people's priorities' are concerned: love... beauty... balance... sharing... honesty... caring... self-creation... tenderness... empathy... independence... deep understanding of all life... mutual aid and respect... health... wholeness... cooperativeness... continuous growth of our gifts... good fellowship...

...as far as these things are concerned... we... our energy... gets burned... thrown away... sucked into the service of opposite ends to what we would intend... were we consciously demanding that *our* priorities live.

[November 8, 2015 show ends here... we didn't get to the reading in this show.]

[Returning now to the conclusion of *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*... by Karl Marx... and our excerpts from Immanuel Wallerstein's *The Modern World-System IV: Centrist Liberalism Triumphant, 1789 – 1914*... Chapter 3: “The Liberal State and Class Conflict”... before returning to the chapter “Poisonous Pedagogy” in Alice Miller's *For Your Own Good*...

'Progress' has been equated with the deepening of 'class' – which... practically speaking... means... 'let the statesmen lead'... But having seen the horrors unleashed by leaving our earth in the hands of heart-and-thought-dead very-stuck-in-their-abandonment... adult abandoned children... having seen that they are leading us to on-going-lost-gifts... dying oceans... displaced populations... and early deaths that they 'profit' by with their 'investments'... we must... each one of us... claim our gifts of leadership... and meld them with love... to preserve ourselves... our earth... our expansiveness... and establish an *honest* world for our children...

What Marx will be calling our attention to... as did Wallerstein last week (and will again today...) is a very aggressive use of this new tool – the centralized state – to hammer in the new script for 'ruling us': a retooled machinery of 'law' designed to insinuate 'discipline' (obedience) throughout and within all aspects of our lives... by means of its installation in the 'new'... 'modern'... totalitarian... centralized... global... nation-state... For while the 'traditional' weapon of 'power'... a *whole lot* of violence... had 'worked' for them for millennia... its cost was great... and the new crop of 'power'-mad... thought they had a better plan. Recall our poisoned pedagogue (I paraphrase): “Force can compel the behavior... but not the will... of another.” Or... as Wallerstein said last week: “Cavaignac could repress; he could not relegitimize the state...” and while they – the 'power'-guys – initially thought this through openly (per Bentham's advice to fling your ideas wide so they could get discussed ... tried... and revised...) with their conditioned belief in secrecy and subterfuge... they hid in the shadows... where they've been ever since...

Returning now to the conclusion of *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte* by Karl Marx... after which... we take a step back... with Wallerstein as guide... to see that this is a world they – the 'power'-guys – were determined to organize... – P.S.]

Bonaparte would like to appear as the patriarchal benefactor of all classes. But he cannot give to one class without taking from another. Just as at the time of the Fronde it was said of the Duke of Guise that he was the most *obligeant* man in France because he had turned all his estates into his partisans' obligations to him, so Bonaparte would fain be the most *obligeant* man in France and turn all the property, all the labour of France into a personal obligation to himself. He would like to steal the whole of France in order to be able to make a present of her to France or, rather, in order to be able to buy France anew with French money, for as the chief of the Society of December 10 he must needs buy what ought to belong to him. And all the state institutions, the Senate, the Council of State, the legislative body, the Legion of Honour, the soldiers' medals, the washhouses, the public works, the railways, the *etat major* [General Staff] of the National Guard to the exclusion of privates, and the confiscated estates of the House of Orleans – all become parts of the institution of purchase. Every place in the army and in the government machine becomes a means of purchase. But the most important feature of this process, whereby France is taken in order to give to her, is the percentages that find their way into the pockets of the head and the members of the Society of December 10 during the turnover. 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'etat 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 – as they are for Kropotkin – and why... rather... our advocates help legitimate... and obscure... 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” (Chlepner, 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 semi-official character of the *Societe Generale* in 1851.

The banking controversies in Great Britain, previously discussed, created a situation in which the banks were unable to play a direct role in promoting economic growth. These controversies culminated in the Bank Act of 1844, whose objective, from Peel's point of view, was primarily to "make more solid the foundations of the gold standard" and secondarily to remove the use of gold as an internal political weapon (Fetter, 1965, 192). Perhaps Great Britain could afford, better than other countries, not to have a banking policy that would promote economic growth. Cameron (1961, 58 – 59) calls this "inefficient" but notes that "paradoxically,... the very obstacles placed in the way of a rational banking and monetary system stimulated the private sector to introduce the financial innovations necessary for realization of the full benefits of technical innovation in industry."

What the British state had promoted by its failures – an adequate supply of credit for the midcentury economic expansion – the French state under Napoleon III would create deliberately. The decree of February, 1852 authorizing the formation of mortgage banks, the *Credit Foncier* of Emile Pereire being one of the first, provided the financial underpinning for the reconstruction of Paris by Haussmann. "From a laggard, France became a leader and innovator in mortgage credit" (Cameron, 1961, 129). The Rothschilds were not happy. James de Rothschild argued that this change in structure would concentrate too much power in untried hands. It seems a case of the pot calling the kettle black. In any case, the rise of the great corporate banks of the Second Empire took the monopoly away from what had been called the *haute banque*, a "powerful group of private (unincorporated) bankers" (Cameron, 1953, 462). But the *haute banque* had not provided sufficient credit to *French* business enterprises.

Toward the end of the Second Empire, in 1867, the largest of the new banks, *Credit Mobilier*, failed. The Rothschilds, however, were still there, and are still there today. Nonetheless, the liberal state, by its intervention, had changed the worldwide credit structure of modern capitalism: "The banking system of every nation in Continental Europe bore the imprint of French influence" (Cameron, 1961, 203). The creation of larger numbers of banks oriented to the international market may have diminished the power of the *haute banque*. This was not necessarily a great virtue for the weaker state structures in tight financial situations. Jenks (1927, 273) discusses the perverse effect of greater competition in the field of loans to governments [The more complicated it reads... the more hidden the scheming... What it sounds like is the creation of a – at broadest view – a two-tiered banking system in which the weaker banks got used to extend the internationalization of debt... in order to subject all nations to the new totalitarian regimen... – P.S.]:

Competition simply augmented the risks of marketing the loan in the face of efforts of the unsuccessful banker to cry it down.... What the competition did encourage, however, was the pressing of more money upon frequently "bewildered" borrowers.... In a word, the loan business was monopolescent.

The collapse of *Credit Mobilier* gives credence to this analysis. It formed part of a sequence that led to the drying up of loans to weak governments and hence the accentuation of what was to become the Great Depression after 1873.

The liberals had achieved what they had hoped to achieve in midcentury. The long upswing of the world-economy and the actions of the governments of the core zone – in particular, of Great Britain and France – secured a steady process of worldwide relocations., until at least the end of the twentieth century. We may call this the "strong market,: one of the three pillars of the liberal world order that was to be the great achievement of the capitalist world-economy in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. But there were two further pillars for a liberal world order: the strong state, and the strong interstate system. It is to the process of securing them that we now turn.

The absolute monarchies had not been strong states. Absolutism was merely the scaffolding within which weak states sought to become stronger. It would only be in the post-1789 world-system's atmosphere of normal change and popular sovereignty that one could build truly strong states – that is, states with an adequate bureaucratic structure and a reasonable degree of popular acquiescence (which in wartime could be converted into passionate patriotism).... [This strikes me as upside-down...]

[This might be a good moment to revisit our earlier question:

"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 – as they are for Kropotkin – and why... rather... our advocates help legitimate... and obscure... these unmistakable motives by employing the ideology of 'economic development'?"

Elsewhere on this webpage [listed in the menu] we posted comments on Chapter 1 of our Good Three's *Antisystemic Movements*... "Rethinking the Concepts of Class and Status-Group in a World Systems Perspective":

All to say... consider this... that 'war' is not to reinvigorate dead markets... but to suppress our uprisings against injustice. In the *Waking Up Radio* show of March 9th, 2014 we said that...

"140309econtool.mp3": "The machinations of states is theater... with two tightly interwoven objectives: first... 'work steadily to conquer the people... according to "the laws" of hierarchy... i.e.... ensuring there are "winners" and "losers"...' This is key overall strategy... And by the way... when we said that "the responsibility of 'the intellectual' is to stand with the people and renounce the privilege of standing apart..." – this is not a national project... a national Left is useless... it effectively means you stand with 'power'... agree to its terms... agree to betray your Brothers and Sisters who happen to be the designated 'losers'... globally speaking... So... ensuring that there are "winners" and "losers" is key strategy both for maintaining the undergirding ideology "merit rises" – the notion that there's some legitimate reason in this gross unfairness – behind the hideousness – and it's necessary for maintaining 'power's invisibility – the notion that there's just these "natural forces" at play... And... according to the "laws of PR-chest-pounding-posturing"... this must be on-going... And the second key objective: 'play the game of "Supremacy" successfully... using quantifying means to keep score... – otherwise known as "the economy"... while maintaining the chest-pounding to draw from the people the requisite energy...' We've said that the definition of "the economy" that's most authentic is "eating the earth..." controlling the resources of the planet... the most key one strategically being us... But... looking at Europe before the spread of fascism across it... 'socialism'... which in the people's minds simply meant 'freedom'... sweeping across Europe... 'infecting' the colonies even... So... that resource which is absolutely key was at risk of being lost... So 'economy' geared up... for 'destroying' is also 'consuming': removing resources from *our* use... so 'eating the earth' can be destroying the earth by means of war... or destroying the earth by means of what's called 'growing the economy'... 'development'. The book *Savage Continent* (by Keith Lowe) provides prodigious illustration of resources being removed from our use... and... turned back over to 'power'... Keith Lowe describes... an orgy of destructiveness. This systematic attack on 'economic life' was itself the 'economic system' working at a clip (because the point is privatization plus privatization equals control of us... manufactured 'scarcity'...) racing at a pace unequalled since... The 'economic system' is not 'capitalism'.... It's called 'power'... and they invent a tool called 'the economy' to keep us confused... War is an expression of this 'economic system'... and 'the economy' is war by other means... i.e.... it's about controlling the energy of the majority... the goal being... to beat us into submission... and... in the 'normal' course of events... overt violence is (as Solozzo said...) "too expensive..." in terms of maintaining legitimacy... as a means of controlling. And so they 'normally' rely on Bentham... whose Panoptic guidance says: "wage war by other means... i.e. be 'economic'... and 'efficient'..." "Let the weight of scarcity weigh on their minds..." Bentham advised..." [From the March 9, 2014 *Waking Up Radio* show... and discussed as well during the October 18, 2015 show.]

But when the people arise... 'economy'... 'efficiency'... and all that jazz... flies out the door...

...and in walks war.

'Economy' is just a tool... like any other technology.

So 'war' is always war on us... whether they spill our guts with guns... or markets.

The economy is just war by other means... and war is the profligate failure of 'breeding'... to control the energy of the majority (the true point of the 'education' we're all given.)

What they (the 'power'-guys...) hate most... is resistance. What they love most... is obedience – (From our commentary on Chapter 1 in *Antisystemic Movements*... "Rethinking the Concepts of Class and Status-Group in a World Systems Perspective") – P.S.]

... The absolute monarchies had not been strong states. Absolutism was merely the scaffolding within which weak states sought to become stronger. It would only be in the post-1789 world-system's atmosphere of normal change and popular sovereignty that one could build truly strong states – that is, states with an adequate bureaucratic structure and a reasonable degree of popular acquiescence (which in wartime could be converted into passionate patriotism). And it was the liberals, and only the liberals, who could construct such states in the core zones of the world-system. Bureaucratic growth was the essential pendant of economic growth, at least of economic growth at the scale that capitalists now hoped for and that was not technologically possible.

Of course, the construction of a strong bureaucratic state was a long process that had begun in the late fifteenth century. Resistance to such construction is what we really mean when we refer to an *ancien regime*, which of course existed quite as much in Great Britain as in France, as indeed it did throughout Europe and most of the world. What we may call generically Colbertism was the attempt to overcome this resistance by taking real power from the local level and concentrating it in the hands of the monarch. It was at best partially successful. Jacobinism was nothing but Colbertism with a republican face. It died in its original form in 1815. After 1815, it would be liberalism that took up the battle to create a strong state. Whereas Colbertism and Jacobinism had been brutally frank about their intentions, the fact that liberals refused to acknowledge that building the strong state was their intention – in many ways, their priority [... 'power' had gone undercover... where they remain to this day... and may they so remain even when we have reclaimed our lives from them... – P.S.] – was perhaps precisely why they were able to succeed better than the Colbertists and the Jacobins. Indeed, they succeeded so well that the enlightened conservatives took up this same objective, largely effacing in the process any ideological distinction between themselves and the liberals.

Of course, there are many reasons why capitalists find strong states useful. One is to help them accumulate capital; a second is to guarantee this capital [I much prefer the way Kropotkin puts it: “The State was established for the precise purpose of imposing the rule of the landowners, the employers of industry, the warrior class, and the clergy upon the peasants on the land and the artisans in the city. And the rich perfectly well know that if the machinery of the State ceased to protect them, their power over the laboring classes would be gone immediately.” – Precisely... to impose 'rule' by the Infinitesimal Few... but not for simple 'gain'... but rather to make of Society... a 'Perfect Order'... a mission they use to excuse an unimaginable hubris... and brutality... – P.S.]. But after 1848, capitalists fully realized, if they had not before, that only the strong state – that is, the reformist state – could buffer them against the winds of worker discontent. Pireire put his finger on it: “The 'strong' state became the welfare state of large-scale (*grand*) capitalism” (cited in Bouvier, 1967, 166). Of course, “welfare state” here has a double connotation – the welfare of the working classes to be sure, but the welfare of the capitalists as well.

We think of Victorian Great Britain as the locus of antistatism in its heyday, and it is quite true that “in general, [most Englishmen] were suspicious of the State and of centralization” at this time (Burn, 1964, 226). But in the jostle of conflicting interests between those (largely the “liberals”) who wanted the state to cease propping up the agricultural interests and those (largely the “conservatives”) who were inclined to favor local and more traditional authority, combining it with a rhetoric of social concern for the poor, it was easy for the latter to find compensation for every victory of free commerce by pushing forward some project of state intervention in industry. Brebner calls it the “mid-century dance... like a minuet”: parliamentary reform in 1832, the first Factory Act in 1833; Peel's budget in 1841; the Mines Act in 1842; Repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846; the Ten Hours Bill in 1847. “The one common characteristic [of the political initiatives of 1825 – 1870] is the consistent readiness of interested groups to use the state for collectivist interests (Brebner, 1948, 64, 70).

Before 1848 much of the argument among the middle classes for state social reform had been based on “widespread philanthropic enthusiasm and the uneasy conscience... at the spectacle of the poverty in which the workers were condemned to live” (Halevy, 1947, 218). However, the revolutions of 1848, which Britons could not help but feel they had averted by the beginnings of social intervention, added to mere guilt a sense of the political importance of reformist legislation. Thus it was that, at the very height of the classical age of English liberalism, “the growth of the *central* government was staggering” (Katznelson, 1985, 274) These foundations of modern government may have been, as Evans (1983, 285) said, “laid in the teeth of a gale.” But Gladstonian liberalism was “a restless, reforming creed” (Southgate, 1965, 324), albeit without the least semblance of any commitment to economic equality.

The origins of Gladstonian reformism were in Benthamism, as we have seen [Wallerstein's note on this are quotes from Coates (1950, 358): "It was by the unrestricted use of the legislative power of the state that Bentham sought to effect his reforms..." and Checkland (1964, 411): "Benthamism meant identifying the urgent tasks of society and prescribing the means for their discharge: it meant specific legislation, with inspectors in the field and administrators in centralized offices. It meant Members of Parliament who thought, as Bentham did, in terms of 'agenda'." Wallerstein adds: Between 1852 and 1867, this agenda included the police force, prisons, endowed schools, doctors, and veterinary medicine – all regulated and promoted by the state. See Burn (1964, 167 – 226)]. The result was the so-called administrative revolution, which transformed the functions of the state in the direction of a "new and more or less conscious Fabianism" (MacDonagh, 1958, 60). Bit by bit, "the disciples of Smith and Ricardo [came to promote a series of] social reforms which brought a strong paternalistic state" (Roberts, 1958, 335). And then, in the last twist, English liberalism redefined in this fashion "found a complementary expression in the Conservative Party which... actually realized certain Liberal principles which the other... was in danger of obscuring" (Ruggiero, 1959, 135).

The situation in France was remarkably similar. There, too, laissez-faire had become "the dominant watchword." But there, too, "practice was rather different from theory." And there, too, "those in power were conscious of the industrial factor in the world struggle for preponderance, peaceful but then tending to become warlike" (Leon, 1960, 182). And there, too, the nineteenth century was the century in which the strong state was constructed. To be sure, this creation had been and would continue to be a continuous process – from Richelieu to Colbert to the Jacobins to Napoleon to the *monarchies censitaires* to the Second Empire to the Third Republic to the Fifth. But in many ways the Second Empire marked a crucial step forward. Or perhaps the way to put it is that the Second Empire marked the locking in of the structure by laying the basis for popular acquiescence. Louis Napoleon was able to do this because, as Guizot (cited in Pouthas, 1983, 144) said, with what sounds like grudging admiration, he incarnated at one and the same time "national glory, a revolutionary guarantee, and the principle of order."

What Napoleon III instituted was a welfare-state principle from the top down. The Second Republic had brought the "social question" to the fore of the agenda, arguing that the sovereignty of all the people contrasted with, was belied by, the "tragic inferiority in the conditions of some of the people." From this observation, two conclusions seemed possible: a definition of popular sovereignty that would lead to "unlimited political power," or an "absolute rejection of political authorities (*pouvoir*) that risked making society "ungovernable" (Donzelot, 1984, 67, 70). Bonapartism represented the former definition, without ever forgetting that it had to use the power to provide a response to the "social question."

In his first decade in power, Napoleon III represented reestablished order, used the state to build public works [it unfortunately validates 'power's position when we accept – and employ uncritically ourselves – 'power's definitions and world-view... In this instance what is implied by Wallerstein's use of the word 'order'... particularly associated as it is with what we are told is 'economic development'... plants the impression that it is 'power' that is 'innovative'... 'creative'... and energetic... while we... so the story goes... best serve ourselves by serving them... – P.S.] used the state to build public works and modernize the banking system, and concluded the 1860 free-trade treaty with Great Britain. In this period, Napoleon III was primarily concerned with creating an "environment favourable to industrial capitalists," and therefore one in which the working class was "held in check" (Kemp, 1971, 181). Once this was assured, he would then turn to integrating the working classes into the political process. He became quite popular with the workers in the years after 1858. They were years of great prosperity, years of political reform, years in which France was supporting oppressed nationalities in Italy and elsewhere. A pro-Bonapartist workers' group came into existence (Kulstein, 1962, 373 -375; also 1964). In this atmosphere, there was a growing competition among republicans, royalists, and Prince Napoleon for the favor of the workers. They were all encouraging cooperatives on the grounds that such organizations were not "incompatible with the free economy in which they all believed" (Plamenatz, 1952, 126).

In various ways, Napoleon III sought to "become closer to the new social left" (Duverger, 1967, 156) In 1864, he legalized trade unions and strikes, which consisted, in the words of Henri See (1951, 2: 342), "an act of major importance in the social history of France," Indeed, the regime used its attempt to "ameliorate the conditions of the workers and the needy" as a central theme of its propaganda, boasting of its "cradle to the grave" assistance to the needy (Kulstein, 1969, 95, 99). What Napoleon III, as the first among the "democratic Bonapartists," sought was a program [the operative words here are "giving them"... i.e. we have been stripped of "our own things"... our own earth beneath our feet – our own earth-given capacities of sharing and-regeneration... and without them we must go... hat-in-hand... to the statesmen... who in this instance... taking the lead of the new Napoleon... condescend... since we are bootless (made so by them) – ... to be gracious... – P.S.] What Napoleon III, as the first among the "democratic Bonapartists," sought was a program that would "render the masses conservative... by giving them something to conserve" (Zeldin, 1958, 50). In this way, he made it possible to complete the project of transforming France into a liberal state – a project that would be consecrated

in the constitution of 1875. Furthermore, France was not only a liberal state but a national state, and it was France that had sealed the identification of the two in nineteenth century Europe.

(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....