
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’... as we begin organizing the ‘transition’...” (Part 31)... and... “Facing Fear... Raise Up Love...” (Part 1)

These “Facing Fear... Raise Up Love...” shows continue our focus on ‘occupying’ – consciously... with intention – this transition to freedom by: establishing ‘safe’ places 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’... as we begin organizing the ‘transition’...” (Parts 31 – 43)... or... “Facing Fear... Raise Up Love...” (Parts 1 – 13

The November 15th show – themes and things: “Fleshing out the picture of our alternative global arrangement – our ‘opposite’ to ‘class’...” and... “seeing hidden-‘power’ within and without: lessons from Alice”... and that... “our successful strategy for getting free must have an ethical basis...” (“Love RULES [“Raise Up Love Evolution” shows] Part 1... pages 1 – 6)

[“151115raiseuplove_1.mp3”:]

November 12, 2015... Sisters and Brothers: I beg your patience while I ponder how best to continue posting (in both pdf and html form...) text and audio for these shows... now that my attempts to add text and audio to the “3.7” page have been blocked.) You recall I wrote about the ‘jog circuit’ in the first chapter of *Waking Up*... well... this is a good illustration of it. ‘Power’ likes to break our flows when we got a good one going... and I think we do with this “Embracing Global Goals 3.7” page. Where I’m leaning as I write this (on the 13th) is to leave the unread reading in “3.7” ‘temporarily’ in limbo... with the exception of ‘Alice’. This will mean... when we return to the “3.7” page... that I will be reading her for the second time... but she well deserves extra time. I won’t be typing up any additional of her words for the pdfs until I can also post them to their page with their accompanying audio. So... for now... I’ll write and type up the commentary portion of each subsequent show as a single pdf... such that the result... in conjunction with the “3.7” shows... might serve as practical guidance for working with our Brothers and Sisters... The ‘reading’ section in this (present) document – all that I’ve typed so far – will remain intact in this pdf... but I’ll be transferring the commentary section to this new pdf... which... borrowing from Coleen the title of her song... I’ll call “Facing Fear... Raise Up Love...” The audio from these ‘Facing Fear’ shows I’ll post both on the “Missing Audio” page... as well as on a new page I’ve set up titled: “Facing Fear... Raise Up Love: the Audio-Files for the November 15, 2015 show and beyond.”

Looking over the shows the “3.7” page holds – beginning with the August 23, 2015 show up to the opening of this November 15, 2015 show... which includes the text for our Marx... Wallerstein... and Alice Miller readings – it strikes me that the progression of the analysis is definitive and merits revisiting. For instance... the themes of today’s show: “fleshing out the picture of our alternative global arrangement – our ‘opposite’ to ‘class’...” and... “seeing hidden-‘power’ within and without...” and that “our successful strategy for getting free must have an ethical basis...” were also the themes of our August 23, 2015 show. So today we will be deepening our understanding of these themes... and seeing how it is they necessarily interweave.

[“151115raiseuplove_2.mp3”:]

[And... to reiterate a personal request... it sure would be a big ‘assist’... if I had a way to upload without putting my life at risk... Here’s the pattern: I venture out pre-3-AM and journey to my upload spot... cars with pointing headlights identify the road for the coming drone... I start my upload tasks... and soon overhead the drone passes... I get blasted... I know because my body starts to swell (though I feel it most in my knees... chest... and head...) then either it... or some other one... hovers off at a distance... and plays “Man in the middle” for all my ‘url’ requests (I know because there have been a few glitches...) it seems when I think I’m uploading... they’re intercepting it... who knows why... or what they do with (to) it... but it sure would be sweet to have an upload-alternative...]

["151115raiseuplove_3.mp3":]

November 10, 2015... Sisters and Brothers: I admit to a dream... I don't mean our free future... for that is certainty... each one of us becoming 'big' ends this system... withers 'the state in us...'

...no... the dream I see is all of us singing... "Facing fear... raise up love..." a song written by Sifu Coleen Gragen... the martial arts teacher who has been coming up for me of late. When my son mentioned that one of her students... Kate Hobbs – a woman who is one of my son's teachers – sang a song that Coleen used to sing a lot at demonstrations around the time she founded Hand to Hand Martial Arts Center in Oakland, California... I wanted to hear it... so I went to see Kate with my recorder and she was kind enough to let me record her singing it... the one verse she's committed to memory:

Facing fear... raise up love... raise up love...
Facing fear... raise up love...
Raise up love for women and children...
Raise up love for the homeless and the poor...
Raise up love for human rights...
...for all people...
Raise up love... put an end to war...

Facing fear... raise up love... raise up love...
Facing fear... raise up love...

Here is the recording of Kate Hobbs singing Coleen's song... followed by the beat my son made of it:

["151105katesingsraiseup_edit.mp3": "Facing fear... raise up love... raise up love... Facing fear... raise up love... Raise up love for women and children... Raise up love for the homeless and the poor... Raise up love for human rights... ...for all people... Raise up love... put an end to war... Facing fear... raise up love... raise up love... Facing fear... raise up love..." (Kate Hobbs singing "Raise Up Love", recorded at her home on November 5, 2015)]

Here is the beat my son made of Kate singing Coleen's song:

["raiseuplove.mp3": "Facing fear... raise up love... raise up love... Facing fear... raise up love..." (Thandiwe's word-beat of Kate singing Coleen's song, posted to the November 15, 2015 *Waking Up Radio* show)]

["151115ourglobalprize_4.mp3":]

When Peter Kropotkin... toward the end of his essay "Law and Authority"... debunks the case made (by 'power' across the ages of 'class'...) for the need for 'criminal law' (the protection racket coterminous with its beginnings: they create the hardship... then blame us for it...):

The third category of law still remains to be considered; that relating to the protection of the person and the detection and prevention of "crime." This is the most important because most prejudices attach to it; because, if law enjoys a certain amount of consideration, it is in consequence of the belief that this species of law is absolutely indispensable to the maintenance of security in our societies. These are laws developed from the nucleus of customs useful to human communities, which have been turned to account by rulers to sanctify their own domination. The authority of the chiefs of tribes, of rich families in towns, and of the king, depended upon their judicial functions, and even down to the present day, whenever the necessity of government is spoken of, its function as supreme judge is the thing implied. "Without a government men would tear one another to pieces," argues the village orator. "The ultimate end of all government is to secure twelve honest jurymen to every accused person," said Burke.

Well, in spite of all the prejudices existing on this subject, it is quite time that anarchists should boldly declare this category of laws as useless and injurious as the preceding ones...

...one of the points he makes is that those who argue that we need the state... to provide the restraint of the 'barbarians' among us... always assume 'class'... *ad infinitum*... never admit into our view a picture of “a society in which a man will receive a better education, in which the development of all his faculties, and the possibility of exercising them, will procure him so many enjoyments that he will not seek to poison them by remorse...”

...the suppressed speech he is identifying: the picture of our new world founded on the opposite (to 'class') operating premises of non-coercion... mutual aid... decentralization... limitless time... freedom from necessity... no hierarchy... fully-developing individualities... and the fulfillment of collective aims through our cooperative associations...

...this suppression of the discussion of the obvious alternative is a fraud located so centrally in the web of lies 'power' spins to ensnare us... that it may be the best way in... to begin breaking the spell... to help ourselves out of the trance of 'class'... begin the erosion of the belief in 'rule'... 'hierarchy'... and the supposed 'necessity' of the forfeiture of our unique earth-given gifts...

Among the myths exposed in our discussions of 'the alternative' are: the myth of 'progress'... the notion that we are 'workers' (i.e. servants of a 'system' of 'power'...) that we are the source of the problems that plague us (as opposed to 'hidden' 'power'... the global-state-statesmen...) that 'the state' is 'out there' instead of in us... that 'class' is 'inevitable' and so we must accept it... that the planning frame is the nation-state... that the definitions we are handed are the ones we must take: 'freedom' being life outside an actual prison cell... 'happiness' a transitory condition that shifts with the mood we happen to be in... that 'leadership' qualities are scarce commodities... and 'decision-making' must be held in few hands as a monopoly.

The process of naming the qualities we need to be healthy living things... in conjunction with the discussion of the dis-ease of the world we see around us... the world 'power' has made – its wastefulness... destructiveness... contempt for us... irreverence... – necessarily calls into question the motives of 'statesmen'... exposes their opposite destination for us... the fact that they have an opposite 'vision'.

It's particularly urgent that we begin to claim this turf of 'the world we want' given the speed with which 'power' is rushing to con us back into our boxes... at the very moment when more and more of us are determined to get out of them... and the scales have tipped toward our freedom. 'Power' cannot provide the 'jobs' globally and we are beginning to see that other option called 'freedom' – defined by us as 'freedom from necessity... and so freedom to grow our gifts limitlessly' – opening up before us... thanks to our intercommunications globally... and the recognition of the power of the technology we have created. It's up to us now to flesh out that picture of 'freedom' with our Brothers and Sisters... continuously extend the results of those discussions to others... and begin organizing the transition – the key elements of which we've been discussing.

It's important that we have a standard by which to judge the 'deals' 'power' advances to attempt to con us... yet again. Kropotkin's point that the obvious alternative of 'health' – to oppose to the intentionally sown (by 'power') mistrust-laden shortages and divisions... the poison of imposed hardship infecting our relations... – is never mentioned when 'power' rolls out one of its 'deals'... can be seen in all 'power's' propaganda campaigns. One such was discussed in a recent *East Bay Express*:

He [John Curl... a chronicler of cooperatives] said he thinks we have reached a turning point, in which “the larger economic structures are no longer providing for people, and people are inventing their own structures.” This has been the context both for a resurgence in cooperatives and the new platforms of the sharing economy; people have turned to both when the traditional economy fails to meet their needs.... [One example is] the platform-based sharing [model... which serves as an exchange connecting services with customers and] does not collect a commission on each service, so there would be no mark-up.... [This] kind of business... has a small band of proponents across the country who have named it “platform cooperativism.” Earlier this year, [Janelle] Orsi [a 'sharing economy' lawyer] wrote in an article for *The Nation*, “We have a choice: Keep using platforms that widen the wealth gap, or build tech platforms as commons.” (Zoe Oja Tucker, “The True Sharing Economy”, *East Bay Express*, November 4 – 10, 2015)

The 'power'-guys who orchestrate campaigns like this intend for us to think as we read it: “So... this is a structural shift we're seeing... but it could be a good thing... potentially... if we stretch our skills and use our gifts... unlike with that 'nine-to-five'-oppressiveness... We could by default make a whole new economy!... even a new world perhaps... in the wake of 'capitalism's' waning influence... just by everyone seizing the opening... venturing into the gap... and growing into it!”

What's wrong with that?

How do we reply without our vision in mind?

—

["151115infinitehubris_5.mp3":]

'Power' justifies itself with the myth that it provides 'Progress'...

...no person of careful observation could believe this myth for a second... of the waste of our lives... and all the earth's resources... the spoliation of the planet... the evidence is abundant...

In reality... the only case for 'progress' this evidence makes... is 'power's 'progress' 'in hardening our chains... This train's in motion... and it's got a speed to it... with our global human energy providing the fuel for it... and Plato serving the 'statesmen' as guide... to a future in which we're just... as usual... along for the ride... and to pay the price... with the loss of our gifts... of their bottomless arrogance... and their infinite hubris.

—

["151115thechiefdifficulty_6.mp3":]

"Reflections of '3.7': the August 23, 2015 Show":

The difficulty facing us... we who are determined to get our freedom... is that the difficulty facing us has been intentionally misidentified throughout the course of our lives...

We live our lives enshrouded in fog... a thick set of blankets... that 'power' layers on us... causing us to sleep... and binding our hands when we seek... to fight our way out of it...

What is this fog?... that we are 'workers'... and that there are no conscious actors... a tiny few... whose sole purpose is to keep us believing that the function assigned us by 'the market'... has legitimacy... and serves the collective purpose... of the larger society...

And what are they concealing with this fog?

...that they know what they want – that they have a vision... and that they are steadily guiding our feet to it...

...and how do we know this?... because only by knowing what they want can they prevent our thought from latching on the obvious...

And how do we know they exist?... this tiny few?... because the critical... seminal... thinking denied us... is so obvious... that only conscious intent could keep it from us...

What is this 'thinking'?...

...that we are trained to obey... that this 'work' the parent does for the state... out of a misguided hope that doing so will help their children to be 'successful'...

...that a clear picture of an alternative to a society premised on force and obedience exists...

...that we are prevented from discussing it... by vetting 'education'... and by vetting the media... and by structuring the world to keep us separate... never knowing each other's lives...

...that we ourselves... we who are determined to get our freedom... manifest 'the system'... when we fail to address... the 'state-in-us'... that 'state' first implanted by the parent... and later on by 'education'...

...that our successful strategy to achieve our freedom comes from an ethical stance... not 'science'...

...but to achieve the ethical stance for our freedom... necessarily means seeing that these tiny few act consciously... in concert... and in secret...

...that these 'tiny few' are newly-minted... that the 'nation-state' is their invention... achieved in the aftermath of the French Revolution...

...and it means seeing that the tactic of 'hiding' is much more savvy (from the perspective of 'power'...) than what first strikes the eye...

...as it means that the difficulty facing us... is kept intentionally from us... throughout the course of our lives...

["151115unconsciousdamage_7.mp3":]

Turning to Alice: Our Alice Miller Readings:

Turning to Alice Miller... We are reading Alice for at least three things: to see how 'the state' gets made in us... to see the deep conditioning of the Plato's tribesmen... when they were children... and to hear what suggestions Alice has... for 'de-conditioning' ourselves – dismantling 'the state-within' – breaking free of the trance...

["151115alicemillerpt1_8.mp3":]

["151115alicemillerpt2_9.mp3":]

["151115alicesummary_10.mp3":]

These 'power'-mad Few eliminate anyone they want on a whim... [the current state of things is hideous... we could not be in more need of Alice... Notice the close correspondence between what was done to them... and their stance toward us...]:

These passages teach us that:

1. Adults are the masters (not the servants!) of the dependent child.
2. They determine in godlike fashion what is right and what is wrong.
3. The child is responsible for [the parent's] anger.
4. The parents must always be shielded.
5. The child's life-affirming feelings pose a threat to the autocratic adult.
6. The child's will must be "broken" as soon as possible.
7. All this must happen at a very early age, so the child "won't notice" and will therefore not be able to expose the adults.

["151115aliceexposesliespowertells_11.mp3":]

Further...

It is also a part of "poisonous pedagogy" to impart to the child from the beginning false information and beliefs that have been passed on from generation to generation and dutifully accepted by the young even though they are not only unproven but are demonstrably false. [We could add to this list: "...that you are part of a superior 'master race'... destined to become 'philosopher-king-statesmen'..." – P.S.] Examples of such beliefs are:

1. A feeling of duty produces love.

2. Hatred can be done away with by forbidding it.
3. Parents deserve respect simply because they are parents.
4. Children are undeserving of respect simply because they are children
5. Obedience makes a child strong.
6. A high degree of self-esteem is harmful.
7. A low degree of self-esteem makes a person altruistic.
8. Tenderness (doting) is harmful.
9. Responding to a child's needs is wrong.
10. Severity and coldness are a good preparation for life.
11. A pretense of gratitude is better than honest ingratitude.
12. The way you behave is more important than the way you really are.
13. Neither parents nor God would survive being offended..
14. Children are undeserving of respect simply because they are children
15. Strong feelings are harmful.
16. Parents are creatures free of drives and guilt.
17. Parents are always right.

When we consider the major role intimidation plays in this ideology, which was still at the peak of its popularity at the turn of the century, it is not surprising that Sigmund Freud had to conceal his surprising discovery of adults' sexual abuse of their children, a discovery he was led to by the testimony of his patients....

...For now I must limit myself to stressing how important it is that we all be aware of the effect of the commandment to refrain from placing blame on our parents. This commandment, deeply imprinted in us by our upbringing, skillfully performs the function of hiding essential truths from us, or even making them appear as their exact opposites. The price many of us must pay for this is severe neurosis.... What becomes of all those people who are the successful products of a strict upbringing?... What becomes of [their] forbidden and therefore unexpressed anger?

[The significance of the command to not place blame on one's parents is due... not only to the fact that challenging it is key to our healing – key to our healing from the abuse of child-rearing to recognize that our parents were wrong – but also to understanding – through Bentham... and through our own observations... the larger political reality – that the parent is indeed the deputy of the state... – P.S.]

[The November 15, 2015 show ends here.]

[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 a couple weeks back (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... it's 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: "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 *obligent* man in France because he had turned all his estates into his partisans' obligations to him, so Bonaparte would fain be the most *obligent* 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 boheme 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” (Chlepnier, 1926, 238; see also 1931), which caused the state to come to the aid of the bank and end the period of agitation. Belgium thus was able to avoid the revolutionary upsurge and could then move to a more truly liberal system, eliminating the semiofficial character of the Societe Generale in 1851.

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....