

DOWNLOAD PDF THE GENERAL IDEA OF THE REVOLUTION IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY (THE LIBERTARIAN CRITIQUE)

Chapter 1 : European History/Age Of Revolutions - Wikibooks, open books for an open world

*The General Idea of the Revolution in the Nineteenth Century (French: *L'idée g n rale de la r volution au XIXe si cle*) is an influential manifesto written in by the anarchist philosopher Pierre-Joseph Proudhon.*

Individual national and expansion histories referred to each other in varying degrees at different times but often also reinforced each other. Transfer processes within Europe and in the colonies show that not only genuine colonial powers such as Spain and England, but also "latecomers" such as Germany participated in the historical process of colonial expansion with which Europe decisively shaped world history. In turn, this process also clearly shaped Europe itself. Introduction In world history, no continent has possessed so many different forms of colonies and none has so incomparably defined access to the world by means of a civilising mission as a secular programme as did modern Europe. A similar claim was never staked out in this form by a world empire of Antiquity or a non-European colonial power in the modern period, such as Japan or the USA. The extraordinary continuity of Chinese colonialism or that of the Aztecs in Central America before the Spaniards arrived is indeed structurally comparable to modern European expansion. But similar to the Phoenician and the Roman empires, the phenomenon of expansion usually ended with colonisation and not in colonial development. The imperial expansion since about was not a European invention but its chronological and spatial dimension was as unique as the variety of colonial methods of rule. It is characteristic that the impetus for colonialism was often derived as an answer to European history itself. This includes capitalist striving for profit, the colonies as valves for overpopulation, the spirit of exploration, scientific interest, and religious and ideological impulses up to Social-Darwinistic and racist motives. Colonialist urges of this type do not explain the expansionistic economic, military and other forces in the periphery that compelled the governments of the mother countries into a defensive pressing forward. What is now understood as globalisation has a critical background in the world historical involvement of the non-European sphere from the Early Modern Period up and into the period of decolonisation. No European country remained exempt – all directly or indirectly participated in the colonial division of the world. The Treaty of Tordesillas put global power thinking into words that perceived of colonial possessions as a political, economic and cultural right, last not least even as an obligation to a civilizing mission that was only definitively shaken with the independence of India in 1947. This turns the simultaneity and multitude of European colonialisms and imperialisms into a border-bridging experience. Few transnational specifics of European history illustrate the diversity of a European consciousness this clearly. But what was colonialism? If one looks back at the essential elements in the thought of the Spanish world empire since the 16th century, it was similar to that of the English and Portuguese up to the most recent time because of the often claimed idea that the European nations created their empires themselves without the participation of others. It also revealed the entanglement between Europe and the American continent because the seed had been sown for the independence struggle of the United States as well as the revolutions in Central and South America between and 1800. After human and citizens rights had been fought for during the French Revolution, the first Black republic in world history arose in from a slave revolt in Haiti. Colonialism was by no means a one-dimensional affair with a simply European orientation and European discoverers such as Columbus and Vasco da Gama [1542], who succeeded in making the first East India voyage in less than a decade after 1492. Instead, colonialism should be understood as a dynamic interaction in the context of which the colonial empires and the individual colonies massively influenced the historical development of their European mother countries. Subsequent to da Gama successfully establishing trade relations with the Southwest Indian spice port of Calicut , king Manuel I – not only styled himself king of Portugal, but also lord of Arabia , Persia and India. Like the Portuguese world empire, the Spanish arrived in all of Europe because European and non-European immigrants participated as much as did the natives in the colonies. The Spanish empire can hardly be imagined without Belgians, Italians and Chinese, while commerce and administration in the Portuguese empire was shaped to a significant degree

DOWNLOAD PDF THE GENERAL IDEA OF THE REVOLUTION IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY (THE LIBERTARIAN CRITIQUE)

by Germans, Flemings, Moslems and Jews. It has existed in almost all periods of world history in different degrees of expression. Already in , the Brazilian sociologist Gilberto Freyre stated the thesis that the Portuguese as the oldest European colonial nation had a special gift for expansion in his controversial book *Casa-grande e Senzala The Masters and the Slaves*. It consisted of peacefully intermingling the cultures without racism and colonial massacres. Using the example of Brazil , he rationalized colonial paternalism with the allegedly successful relationship between masters and slaves. But other colonial powers also claimed this for themselves. However, that the colonies became an integral part of the mother country, that therefore the colonial nation is indivisible, at home on several continents and, thus, incapable of doing any fundamental evil, can be shown to be part of the European colonial ideology since its earliest beginnings. Intellectual transfer processes had already taken place at this time, in the Age of Enlightenment most noticeably in the mutual influence of Adam Smith " , Denis Diderot " , Johann Gottfried Herder " [] and their contemporaries. Though slavery and cosmopolitanism could theoretically not be brought to a common denominator, in practice the conquest explained its legitimacy since the 16th century with its own success. The Dutch, English, Portuguese, Spanish, French and Russian colonial enterprises, which each surveyed the world in its own manner with soldiers, scientists, merchants and missionaries, shared the common perception of the "Other" on the basis of the presumed cultural superiority of the "Self". As different as the spread of Christianity proceeded with the nonconformist, dissenting elements of Protestantism in North America and the Catholic forces in South America so, too, was the result different in the end. Spain, for example, was not able to use Latin America for a profitable export economy, but by contrast the British succeeded in monopolising the slave trade as a most lucrative long-distance business. When, during the course of the 19th century, the Italians, Belgians and Germans raised a claim to their share of the world in addition to the old colonial powers, the term "Imperialism" became an ideologically loaded and overall imprecise, but probably irreplaceable historiographical concept. That is what makes this period so unique in European history, though measured against other criteria, such as time and space, it was not more spectacular than previous ones. Thus, the European conquest of North and South America in the 16th and 17th centuries or of India in the 18th and early 19th centuries was no less incisive in its spatial dimension or the number of people brought under European rule as was the "Scramble for Africa" that became synonymous with the unsystematic and overly hasty intervention of Europeans in the entire African continent. But unlike in earlier periods, a broad European public for the first time participated politically, economically and culturally directly in the process of that expansion. It had deep-reaching effects on the historical development of the European societies themselves, which is reflected, for example, in the professional careers of politicians, diplomats and high-ranking military men. After all, it was caused by massive economic and diplomatic rivalries between the European colonial powers and a widespread chauvinism. Likewise, this process was to a significant extent triggered by internal crises in Africa itself. As in the 16th century, the rivalry between Christian and Islamic missions again erupted in the North of Africa. In a classic of the historiography of imperialism, Ronald Robinson and John Gallagher explain that Europe is not the only place for understanding the motives of European expansion. According to Robinson and Gallagher, this motivation was primarily founded in Africa, at least, as far as late Victorian society was concerned. Their lobbying influence on the expansion of the colonial empires was no less than that of political and economic interest groups in the metropole, even though their motivations depended more situationally on the events in the colonies than could be or would be the case in the European centres of power. This can be shown equally for the Asian, the African and the Pacific regions. Colonial sites of remembrance and their culture of monuments recall to this day conflicts and ambivalences of European colonial rule in public memory. Furthermore, it illustrates the critical significance of political and military force in the imperial process. Informal imperialism, often equated with the dominance of free trade over other methods of colonial influence, lost ground to the extent that coercion could only be exercised by violence. This is well illustrated by the war with China over the opium trade " The protection of national economic interests or the defence of prestige later led several German observers to the conclusion that the English were conducting a

DOWNLOAD PDF THE GENERAL IDEA OF THE REVOLUTION IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY (THE LIBERTARIAN CRITIQUE)

commercial imperialism, whereas the French wanted to enhance the respect for their nation in the world. Nevertheless, the "informal empire" was the prevailing model. In the British context, this led to the exaggerated thesis that the nation was not interested in expansion and that in this regard it was characterized by "absentmindedness". Until the recent past, this thesis could be countered by noting that it not only underestimates the scale of the creation of global empires but also their dissolution. In this respect, colonisation and decolonisation were two historical processes referring to each other, comparable to the systole and diastole of the metropolitan heart beat. Only the interaction of these two as well as numerous other factors resulted in the world historical consequences of European expansion. Regions and periods Colonial regions and their limits as well as periods and their caesuras offer two possibilities of approaching European colonialism. For example, the independence of the North American colonies in [] marks one of the most important turning points " from the Atlantic to the Asian aspect of the British empire " and, also, the first experience of decolonization of global significance in the history of European imperialism. The second only began in the s, here especially on the African continent and, offset in time from the freedom movements of Central and South America as well as Asia. In the 18th century, the foremost European colonial powers, led by England , solidified their global hegemonic position. If they did not create overseas empires, they conquered territories in the form of a continental colonialism as the Russian monarchy did in Siberia and the Habsburgs in South-eastern Europe. This continental variant was equivalent in nature to the later westward shift of the American Frontier and the north migration of the South African boundary as well as the subimperialism, e. While the direct penetration of North and South America was almost entirely completed, that of the Asian and African sphere only began on a larger scale after " in Africa, for example, after with the French conquest of Algeria, from which Morocco and Tunis were also to be brought under French influence. The Russian conquest of Siberia, which followed the course of the rivers similar to the American expansion, aimed to acquire the lucrative fur trade. Concurrent with the mining of gold and precious stones in Brazil, silver mines were also found in the Siberian highland and the financial as well as the informational value of a caravan route between Russia and China was recognized. The coastal fort colonies that the Dutch operated in Indonesia and the English on the coasts of India initially were reserved for commercial interests in spices, tea, coffee and cotton. As long as they did not expand inland and develop larger areas, they lacked military value. In , when governor Warren Hastings " [] strove not only for economic but also for the political and administrative development of the hinterland in Bengal and his administration was overshadowed by numerous scandals, his famous critic Edmund Burke " vented his anger on the methods of colonial rule. In this way, he also directed attention to the newly formed field of tension of the competing powers of the administrative centre in London and the "men on the spot", those increasingly more powerful servants of European colonialism who at the same time also pursued their own interests in the periphery. In the 19th century, this would become a fixed topos of mutual accusations when businesses based on shares and founded on the model of the East India Company chartered in , monopoly to , and comparable to the Dutch Vereenigden Oost-Indischen Compagnie " , were raised by Sweden , Denmark , Scotland , Austria , Brandenburg-Prussia and Poland and were partly equipped with sovereign rights. Financially, they were based on the exchanges, which were becoming ever more central to European economic life, and a modern banking system that coordinated the international trade in luxury goods, such as silk, with that in foods novel to Europe, such as potatoes, maize and rice. Only the English company flourished in the long run. Within limits, the Dutch company, which focused on the spice trade and participated in expanding the colonial empire in Southeast Asia, also succeeded. The British created a cotton monopoly. With the trade in goods, for example, coffee from Java and tea from China, Europeans continuously developed new areas, especially Asia, that could be "opened" almost without violence China since The formal use of colonial violence was symbolized in its most illustrative form in the slave trade with the establishment of slave ports on the coasts of West and East Africa as the starting points of slave shipments to the plantations of Middle and South America. South Africa, since the 17th century developed by the Dutch as a settlement colony and since of importance to the British because of its gold and diamond mines, is

DOWNLOAD PDF THE GENERAL IDEA OF THE REVOLUTION IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY (THE LIBERTARIAN CRITIQUE)

exempted from this. Similar to Egypt, it played a special role, including with regard to its perception by Europeans. The shipping routes around the Cape and through the Suez Canal were of elementary significance from the perspective of military and commercial politics. Furthermore, a presence in Egypt held great symbolic significance, as manifested in attempts at its conquest from Napoleon Bonaparte to Adolf Hitler. Remarkable in this parallel is the belief that focussed power in Europe and on the Nile as the access to Asia was a condition of concentrated power in the world. A British colonial administrator such as Evelyn Baring, Lord Cromer, who was stationed in Calcutta and Cairo, knew like none other that the survival of the empire depended as much on India, the Jewel in the Crown, as on the Suez Canal. His book *Ancient and Modern Imperialism* is a testimonial of intimate knowledge of the manner in which colonial rule functioned, as they were handed down at various administrative posts. What the British were willing to spend on the defence of their interests some 6,000 miles from London is evident from the, on the whole devastating, South African War also Second Boer War. Volunteers from numerous European countries fought on the side of the Boers against the British, who in turn recruited large military contingents in Australia and Canada. The legend of imperial rule irretrievably lost its legitimacy when in the British and the French armies had to leave the Suez Canal Zone under pressure from the USA and the Soviet Union. Therefore, the Canal as well as the Cape were areas of first rank in the encounters of Europeans and non-Europeans as well as areas of encounter in the sequence of various European colonialisms. Precisely defined dividing lines between periods are impossible in this panorama as a matter of course. For this, the enterprises in which all European colonial powers were more or less involved voyages of discovery, scientific projects such as cartography, construction of mercantilist colonial economies etc. However, there were phases in the overall development of European colonialism that can be separated in analogy to the development of the great power system of the European states: In the beginning, Portugal and Spain in personal union were primarily interested in overseas trade to Brazil and the Philippines and inspired by Christian missionary zeal. With few exceptions, they managed to avoid colonial overlap. By contrast, competition heated up in the 17th century, when the English, French and Dutch pressed forward, initially not in the territories of the Spaniards and the Portuguese, but in neighbouring regions. This is demonstrated in exemplary manner by the North American Atlantic coast between the French possessions in modern Canada and the Spanish claims in the South. The independence of the United States was substituted with supremacy in India, in South Africa and especially on the seas with the almost peerless Royal Navy and modern free trade. Since the origins of a pluralistic colonial system during the course of the 19th century, not only the Europeans were involved in dividing the world but also Japan and Russia. The USA is the prototype for a successful linkage of continental internal colonisation in the form of the westward shift of the Frontier and maritime colonial policy in the Asian sphere, while paradoxically being the most successful model of anti-colonialism.

DOWNLOAD PDF THE GENERAL IDEA OF THE REVOLUTION IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY (THE LIBERTARIAN CRITIQUE)

Chapter 2 : Romanticism and Revolution

General Idea of the Revolution in the Nineteenth Century has 43 ratings and 3 reviews. Javier said: I've been having a faint, nagging urge to read the ma.

An Overview Liberal ideas first became widespread in Latin America due to the influence of the liberal Cadiz constitution which was in force in the Spanish empire for two years until the reestablishment of absolute rule. Since the Cadiz constitution was, in turn, heavily influenced by the political ideas of the French Revolution, the first liberal ideas in Latin America had likewise primarily this origin. Ideas such as popular sovereignty, civil equality, individual representation, the conventional nature of political authority, freedom of thought and of the press, and a division of powers that privileges the legislative became central to early Latin American liberalism. The latter was by no means identical to Spanish liberalism or to the political ideas of the French revolution, but these two are its main initial sources. The crisis of the Spanish and Portuguese monarchies upon the Napoleonic invasion set off the process of independence in most of Latin America and opened the way for the free circulation, for the first time, of modern political ideas in the region the Spanish and Portuguese inquisitions had prohibited freedom of thought and of the press. Though the Cadiz constitution was influential in both Hispanic and Portuguese Americas, liberalism developed in quite different directions in these two regions. The reason for this lies in the two quite different ways in which the Spanish and Portuguese monarchies responded to the French invasion. While the flight of the Spanish king tossed the empire into a political crisis, the Portuguese were able to maintain political stability by transferring the capital of the empire to Brazil. Thus, questions about the source of legitimate political authority became pressing in Hispanic America, but were not as critical in Brazil. Although the initial answers that Hispanic Americans offered were framed in terms of traditional scholastic political thinking, they soon began to appeal to the political ideas of the French revolution, specifically to the idea of popular sovereignty. According to the scholastic traditional view, sovereign authority rested on a pact between the king and its people, and in the absence of the king, sovereignty returned to the people. On this traditional view, the sovereign authority of the king was limited by natural, divine, and teleological law. The transition to the modern conception of unlimited and indivisible popular sovereignty marked a radical break in the political thinking in the Spanish colonies. Similarly new and revolutionary was the related conception of individual representation in a constituent assembly, as opposed to the traditional corporate representation before the king, to which the American subjects were never entitled. The end result of this political process was the independence of all Hispanic America with the exception of Cuba and Puerto Rico within two decades of the Napoleonic invasion through armed revolt. Brazil, by contrast, obtained independence in the same period but without bloodshed when the Portuguese prince-regent proclaimed it. This difference in the sequence of political events accounts for the fact that the liberal ideology in Hispanic America was deeply committed to carrying out a radical break with the colonial past while a salient feature of Brazilian liberalism is the continuity of monarchical rule. While liberals in Hispanic America uniformly rejected monarchism and embraced a republican form of government, Brazilian liberalism remained monarchical until the closing decades of the century. The egalitarianism implicit in republicanism favored the abolition of slavery in the new republics. By mid-century slavery had been abolished in all of them. Brazilian liberals, by contrast, supported slavery, which was only abolished in 1850. After having embraced the doctrine of popular sovereignty and the natural rights language of the French revolution, most liberals followed Benjamin Constant in his critique of the doctrine of popular sovereignty and his defense of a limited government. His writings in constitutionalism were closely followed in the design of Latin American constitutions, both liberal and conservative. Though French liberalism exerted the greatest influence overall, some Latin American liberals were also much influenced by British parliamentarism. Most of them also admired the North American republican experience. Montesquieu and Jeremy Bentham were, along with Constant, among the most cited European authors in the first half of the century. Safford From

DOWNLOAD PDF THE GENERAL IDEA OF THE REVOLUTION IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY (THE LIBERTARIAN CRITIQUE)

Montesquieu, liberals took the idea of separation of powers and his critique of despotism. In the mid-century, the political problem that came into focus and that gave liberals an identity against the conservative opposition was the religious one. The question was how to deal with a powerful Church that, in some regions, posed the most powerful internal challenge to the authority of the newly established republics. Liberals demanded freedom of religious worship and, in some cases, the separation of church and state. After decades of civil unrest, a doctrine that emphasized the maintenance of order in combination with progress appeared highly attractive. Liberalism had ceased to be an ideology in combat against an enemy, either foreign Spain or internal the conservative political faction, and had become the triumphant ideology of national building. In the closing decades of the century, positivism displaced liberalism in Brazil, while some Hispanic American liberals carried out a synthesis of liberal ideas and positivism that has often been considered the decline of liberalism. In the early twentieth century, Hispanic American liberalism became the subject of strong criticisms. Critics argued that Hispanic American societies had not been successfully transformed according to liberal ideas because the former provided a hostile ground for the latter. On this view, liberalism was a foreign ideology that was not adequate for Hispanic American realities. This is a criticism against nineteenth century liberalism that has remained forceful to this date. By mid-twentieth century liberalism had been displaced by the emergence of alternative political movements and ideologies: In the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries, liberalism has experienced a modest revival in political discourse in Latin America. This is manifest in the discourse that affirms the pluralism of forms of life and the demands for protection of the rights of minorities. In the sphere of academia, the works by English speaking liberal scholars, such as John Rawls, Ronald Dworkin, and Joseph Raz, have received much attention and have been amply discussed in academic publications. For the most part there is a sharp divide between current work by historians on nineteenth century Latin American liberalism, on the one hand, and systematic reflection by philosophers and political theorists on recent Anglo-American liberalism, on the other. The Influence of Spanish Liberalism In response to the French invasion in 1808, Spanish liberalism developed as an ideology of liberation against a foreign invader. This was the first powerful liberal movement in the Spanish empire and the very first serious questioning of absolute rule. In a society that had almost no experience in political representation, liberals sought to end despotic rule by replacing it with a parliamentary monarchy. They denied sovereign authority to the King and declared it to lie in the nation, which, in turn, was conceived of as having the faculty to make and remake its own fundamental laws. Traditionally, representation in the Courts was corporate nobility, clergy and the municipalities, while liberals stood for individualistic representation. Against despotism, liberals also favored a division of powers and an independent judiciary. Spanish liberalism was a revolutionary ideology that marked a radical break with the monarchical status quo. Liberals sought to end a corporate society and to create an individualistic one by abolishing corporate privileges and immunities and by replacing them with legal equality and economic freedom. The liberal position was expressed in the Constitution. The most important philosophical influence that shaped the liberal position was the political ideas of the French Revolution and, more specifically, the Constitution of 1791. The Constitution exhibited the influence of Enlightenment rationalism, the rationalist natural rights discourse, and the political ideas of Montesquieu and Rousseau, to name the most salient referred to authors. The liberal deputies embraced the idea of individual rights that were natural and inalienable. They also affirmed the natural equality of all men and the doctrine of national sovereignty. Following the French model, the Spanish constitution established a division of powers that privileged the legislative as the power that represented the nation. The constitution established a unicameral legislature in which there were no special provisions for the traditional preeminence of the clergy and the nobility. While the monarch, as the executive, was subordinate to the legislative, the judiciary was held to be independent, echoing Locke and Montesquieu. However, there are two crucial features that notably distinguish the Cadiz constitution from the French model. The former, by contrast with the latter, was grounded in an appeal to history and it exhibited the weight of Catholicism. As regards the first feature, the Constitution presented itself in its preamble as in continuity with fundamental old

DOWNLOAD PDF THE GENERAL IDEA OF THE REVOLUTION IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY (THE LIBERTARIAN CRITIQUE)

Spanish legislation that had allegedly been subverted by despotism. According to the traditional view, the authority of the monarch rested on a pact with its people from which pact followed the fundamental laws of the monarchy that the king had to observe. The liberal appeal to historical legitimacy was clearly at odds with the doctrine of national sovereignty according to which sovereign authority is unlimited—the ultimate source of authority. In fact, liberals introduced a conventional conception of political power that subverted the traditional scholastic one according to which political power was natural and historical. Nevertheless, the presentation of the Constitution as in continuity with fundamental legislation tempered the break with the past Varela As regards the second feature, the Constitution continued the imperial protection of the Catholic religion to the exclusion of all others despite the fact that it also ended some privileges and immunities that the Catholic Church had traditionally enjoyed. It has been argued, however, that religious intolerance was not a feature of Spanish liberalism, but a concession that liberals had to make to traditionalist political forces in the Courts Varela Nevertheless, the religious language that pervades the constitutional text reveals the influence of Spanish scholasticism according to which there are exterior limits to sovereignty natural, divine, historical, and teleological. This influence was even stronger in Spanish America since the intellectual elite around the time of independence had been educated in Spanish scholasticism. Religious toleration was a matter of bitter disputes even among Latin American liberals themselves and the religious language continued to be present in legal documents throughout the nineteenth century. While the Hispanic American strand was firmly committed to a radical break with the colonial past, the Brazilian one was marked by crucial points of continuity. Let us consider the Hispanic strand first. The mark of the Cadiz constitution was evident in most Hispanic American constitutions in the first half of the century Safford All of them claimed sovereign authority to lie in the people or the nation and protected some basic individual rights such as freedom of thought and of the press that were considered natural. They all maintained protection of the Catholic religion as the official one as well as most of the corporate privileges of the Catholic Church. They also established a separation of powers and departed from the Spanish model by creating bicameral systems. However, there are at least two important points of contrast between Spanish and Hispanic American liberals. The first one is that Hispanic American liberals could not buttress their constitutionalism with appeals to historical legitimacy. They could not present the constitutions that they produced in continuity with the fundamental medieval laws of the Spanish monarchy. Independence from Spain pushed, after three centuries of colonialism, to conceive of the liberal institutions as something completely new that lacked any historical precedent. By contrast with Spanish liberals who looked both to the future and to the past, the Hispanic American ones made a break with the past and looked only to the future where emancipation and progress lied. Liberal constitutions held the promise of a society fully transformed away from the colonial structures and in accordance with the protection of individual freedoms and legal equality. When Hispanic American liberalism emerged as the ideology of a political group in the mid-century, its identity was importantly centered in this forward looking attitude. The second point of contrast is that Hispanic American liberalism was more radically egalitarian. Hispanic American liberals rejected a monarchical option and very early abolished slavery and noble titles. By mid-century slavery had been abolished in all independent countries. Hispanic American liberalism became synonymous with republican government, which meant a commitment to legal equality, representation, and the rejection of monarchism. After three centuries of despotic monarchical rule, Hispanic Americans associated monarchism with despotism. They feared that one-person rule, even when limited by a parliament, would inevitably become despotic—as it in fact happened in the short lived monarchy in Mexico right after independence. This egalitarianism, however, did not translate into the establishment of a rule of law that guaranteed equal legal treatment to all citizens. Nor did the egalitarian discourse translate into the democratic inclusion of all citizens in the exercise of political rights. Most Hispanic American liberals firmly believed in the need of property qualifications for voting and for running for public office. They were consistently skeptical about extending political rights to a population that they regarded as incapable for republican citizenship. While early Hispanic American liberalism defined itself by its rejection of the colonial heritage,

DOWNLOAD PDF THE GENERAL IDEA OF THE REVOLUTION IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY (THE LIBERTARIAN CRITIQUE)

Brazilian liberalism, by contrast, acquired its identity in the internal confrontation with the advocates of monarchical absolutism. Brazilian liberals did not challenge monarchism. Instead, they sought to establish parliamentary limits to monarchical authority Cyril , thus favoring a representative monarchy. Though absolutists and liberals agreed on the need for a written constitution, the protection of some fundamental liberties such as freedom of the press , and a legislative body that represented the nation, the differences between them turned on the extent and limits of the executive authority. Liberals sought to subordinate the king to the legislative authority, while absolutists pushed for the opposite balance of forces. Brazilian liberalism became strongly identified with economic freedom, whereas absolutists favored governmental intervention in the economy along the lines of the late eighteenth century reformist absolutism.

DOWNLOAD PDF THE GENERAL IDEA OF THE REVOLUTION IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY (THE LIBERTARIAN CRITIQUE)

Chapter 3 : The Libertarian Heritage: The American Revolution and Classical Liberalism | Mises Institute

*General Idea of the Revolution in the Nineteenth Century [P. J. Proudhon] on calendrierdelascience.com *FREE* shipping on qualifying offers. The General Idea of the Revolution in the 19th Century was written while Proudhon was serving three years in prison for previous writings.*

Introduction [This article is excerpted from the first chapter of For a New Liberty: An audiobook version of this chapter, read by Jeff Riggenbach, including a new introduction, written and read by Llewellyn H. The book will be out from the Mises Institute this summer. MacBride for President and David P. Bergland for Vice President amassed , votes in thirty-two states throughout the country. The sober Congressional Quarterly was moved to classify the fledgling Libertarian party as the third major political party in America. The remarkable growth rate of this new party may be seen in the fact that it only began in with a handful of members gathered in a Colorado living room. The following year it fielded a presidential ticket which managed to get on the ballot in two states. Even more remarkably, the Libertarian party achieved this growth while consistently adhering to a new ideological creed – "libertarianism" – thus bringing to the American political scene for the first time in a century a party interested in principle rather than in merely gaining jobs and money at the public trough. We have been told countless times by pundits and political scientists that the genius of America and of our party system is its lack of ideology and its "pragmatism" a kind word for focusing solely on grabbing money and jobs from the hapless taxpayers. How, then, explain the amazing growth of a new party which is frankly and eagerly devoted to ideology? One explanation is that Americans were not always pragmatic and nonideological. On the contrary, historians now realize that the American Revolution itself was not only ideological but also the result of devotion to the creed and the institutions of libertarianism. The American revolutionaries were steeped in the creed of libertarianism, an ideology which led them to resist with their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor the invasions of their rights and liberties committed by the imperial British government. Historians have long debated the precise causes of the American Revolution: Were they constitutional, economic, political, or ideological? We now realize that, being libertarians, the revolutionaries saw no conflict between moral and political rights on the one hand and economic freedom on the other. On the contrary, they perceived civil and moral liberty, political independence, and the freedom to trade and produce as all part of one unblemished system, what Adam Smith was to call, in the same year that the Declaration of Independence was written, the "obvious and simple system of natural liberty. This radical libertarian movement, even though only partially successful in its birthplace, Great Britain, was still able to usher in the Industrial Revolution there by freeing industry and production from the strangling restrictions of State control and urban government-supported guilds. This regime had, in the early modern period beginning in the sixteenth century, imposed an absolute central State and a king ruling by divine right on top of an older, restrictive web of feudal land monopolies and urban guild controls and restrictions. The result was a Europe stagnating under a crippling web of controls, taxes, and monopoly privileges to produce and sell conferred by central and local governments upon their favorite producers. This alliance of the new bureaucratic, war-making central State with privileged merchants – an alliance to be called "mercantilism" by later historians – and with a class of ruling feudal landlords constituted the Old Order against which the new movement of classical liberals and radicals arose and rebelled in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The object of the classical liberals was to bring about individual liberty in all of its interrelated aspects. In the economy, taxes were to be drastically reduced, controls and regulations eliminated, and human energy, enterprise, and markets set free to create and produce in exchanges that would benefit everyone and the mass of consumers. Entrepreneurs were to be free at last to compete, to develop, to create. The shackles of control were to be lifted from land, labor, and capital alike. Personal freedom and civil liberty were to be guaranteed against the depredations and tyranny of the king or his minions. Religion, the source of bloody wars for centuries when sects were battling for control of the State, was to be set free from State imposition or

DOWNLOAD PDF THE GENERAL IDEA OF THE REVOLUTION IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY (THE LIBERTARIAN CRITIQUE)

interference, so that all religions "or nonreligions" could coexist in peace. Peace, too, was the foreign policy credo of the new classical liberals; the age-old regime of imperial and State aggrandizement for power and self was to be replaced by a foreign policy of peace and free trade with all nations. And since war was seen as engendered by standing armies and navies, by military power always seeking expansion, these military establishments were to be replaced by voluntary local militia, by citizen-civilians who would only wish to fight in defense of their own particular homes and neighborhoods. Thus, the well-known theme of "separation of Church and State" was but one of many interrelated motifs that could be summed up as "separation of the economy from the State," "separation of speech and press from the State," "separation of land from the State," "separation of war and military affairs from the State," indeed, the separation of the State from virtually everything. The State, in short, was to be kept extremely small, with a very low, nearly negligible budget. The classical liberals never developed a theory of taxation, but every increase in a tax and every new kind of tax was fought bitterly "in America twice becoming the spark that led or almost led to the Revolution the stamp tax, the tea tax. John Locke set forth the natural rights of each individual to his person and property; the purpose of government was strictly limited to defending such rights. In the words of the Lockean-inspired Declaration of Independence, "to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it. This task was accomplished by radical Lockeanism in the eighteenth century, who wrote in a more popular, hard-hitting, and impassioned manner and applied the basic philosophy to the concrete problems of the government "and especially the British government" of the day. While Locke had written of the revolutionary pressure which could properly be exerted when government became destructive of liberty, Trenchard and Gordon pointed out that government always tended toward such destruction of individual rights. Therefore, Cato declared, Power must be kept small and faced with eternal vigilance and hostility on the part of the public to make sure that it always stays within its narrow bounds: We know, by infinite Examples and Experience, that Men possessed of Power, rather than part with it, will do any thing, even the worst and the blackest, to keep it; and scarce ever any Man upon Earth went out of it as long as he could carry every thing his own Way in it. This seems certain, That the Good of the World, or of their People, was not one of their Motives either for continuing in Power, or for quitting it. It is the Nature of Power to be ever encroaching, and converting every extraordinary Power, granted at particular Times, and upon particular Occasions, into an ordinary Power, to be used at all Times, and when there is no Occasion, nor does it ever part willingly with any Advantage. Power encroaches daily upon Liberty, with a Success too evident; and the Balance between them is almost lost. Tyranny has engrossed almost the whole Earth, and striking at Mankind Root and Branch, makes the World a Slaughterhouse; and will certainly go on to destroy, till it is either destroyed itself, or, which is most likely, has left nothing else to destroy. Such a deep-seated attitude led to what the historian Bernard Bailyn has aptly called the "transforming radical libertarianism" of the American Revolution. More important, for the first time in history, Americans hedged in their new governments with numerous limits and restrictions embodied in constitutions and particularly in bills of rights. Church and State were rigorously separated throughout the new states, and religious freedom enshrined. Remnants of feudalism were eliminated throughout the states by the abolition of the feudal privileges of entail and primogeniture. In the former, a dead ancestor is able to entail landed estates in his family forever, preventing his heirs from selling any part of the land; in the latter, the government requires sole inheritance of property by the oldest son. The new federal government formed by the Articles of Confederation was not permitted to levy any taxes upon the public; and any fundamental extension of its powers required unanimous consent by every state government. Above all, the military and war-making power of the national government was hedged in by restraint and suspicion; for the eighteenth-century libertarians understood that war, standing armies, and militarism had long been the main method for aggrandizing State power. Bernard Bailyn has summed up the achievement of the American revolutionaries: The modernization of American Politics and government during and after the Revolution took the form of a sudden, radical

DOWNLOAD PDF THE GENERAL IDEA OF THE REVOLUTION IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY (THE LIBERTARIAN CRITIQUE)

realization of the program that had first been fully set forth by the opposition intelligentsia in the reign of George the First. Where the English opposition, forcing its way against a complacent social and political order, had only striven and dreamed, Americans driven by the same aspirations but living in a society in many ways modern, and now released politically, could suddenly act. Where the English opposition had vainly agitated for partial reforms American leaders moved swiftly and with little social disruption to implement systematically the outermost possibilities of the whole range of radically liberation ideas. In the process they infused into American political culture the major themes of eighteenth-century radical libertarianism brought to realization here. The first is the belief that power is evil, a necessity perhaps but an evil necessity; that it is infinitely corrupting; and that it must be controlled, limited, restricted in every way compatible with a minimum of civil order. Written constitutions; the separation of powers; bills of rights; limitations on executives, on legislatures, and courts; restrictions on the right to coerce and wage war all express the profound distrust of power that lies at the ideological heart of the American Revolution and that has remained with us as a permanent legacy ever after. Thus, while classical liberal thought began in England, it was to reach its most consistent and radical development and its greatest living embodiment in America. For the American colonies were free of the feudal land monopoly and aristocratic ruling caste that was entrenched in Europe; in America, the rulers were British colonial officials and a handful of privileged merchants, who were relatively easy to sweep aside when the Revolution came and the British government was overthrown. Classical liberalism, therefore, had more popular support, and met far less entrenched institutional resistance, in the American colonies than it found at home. Furthermore, being geographically isolated, the American rebels did not have to worry about the invading armies of neighboring, counterrevolutionary governments, as, for example, was the case in France. After the Revolution Thus, America, above all countries, was born in an explicitly libertarian revolution, a revolution against empire; against taxation, trade monopoly, and regulation; and against militarism and executive power. The revolution resulted in governments unprecedented in restrictions placed on their power. But while there was very little institutional resistance in America to the onrush of liberalism, there did appear, from the very beginning, powerful elite forces, especially among the large merchants and planters, who wished to retain the restrictive British "mercantilist" system of high taxes, controls, and monopoly privileges conferred by the government. These groups wished for a strong central and even imperial government; in short, they wanted the British system without Great Britain. These conservative and reactionary forces first appeared during the Revolution, and later formed the Federalist party and the Federalist administration in the s. During the nineteenth century, however, the libertarian impetus continued. The Jeffersonian and Jacksonian movements, the Democratic-Republican and then the Democratic parties, explicitly strived for the virtual elimination of government from American life. It was to be a government without a standing army or navy; a government without debt and with no direct federal or excise taxes and virtually no import tariffs that is, with negligible levels of taxation and expenditure; a government that does not engage in public works or internal improvements; a government that does not control or regulate; a government that leaves money and banking free, hard, and uninflated; in short, in the words of H. Horrified at the results, a retired Jefferson brooded at Monticello, and inspired young visiting politicians Martin Van Buren and Thomas Hart Benton to found a new party the Democratic party to take back America from the new Federalism, and to recapture the spirit of the old Jeffersonian program. When the two young leaders latched onto Andrew Jackson as their savior, the new Democratic party was born. The Jacksonian libertarians had a plan: After twenty-four years of a triumphant Jacksonian Democracy, the Menckonian virtually no-government ideal was to have been achieved. It was by no means an impossible dream, since it was clear that the Democratic party had quickly become the normal majority party in the country. The mass of the people were enlisted in the libertarian cause. Jackson had his eight years, which destroyed the central bank and retired the public debt, and Van Buren had four, which separated the federal government from the banking system. But the election was an anomaly, as Van Buren was defeated by an unprecedentedly demagogic campaign engineered by the first great modern campaign chairman, Thurlow Weed, who pioneered in all the

DOWNLOAD PDF THE GENERAL IDEA OF THE REVOLUTION IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY (THE LIBERTARIAN CRITIQUE)

campaign frills — catchy slogans, buttons, songs, parades, etc. Van Buren, of course, was supposed to resume the triumphal Jacksonian march. But then a fateful event occurred: Slavery, the grave antilibertarian flaw in the libertarianism of the Democratic program, had arisen to wreck the party and its libertarianism completely. The Civil War, in addition to its unprecedented bloodshed and devastation, was used by the triumphal and virtually one-party Republican regime to drive through its statist, formerly Whig, program: The Democratic party resumed its libertarian ways after the war, but it now had to face a far longer and more difficult road to arrive at liberty than it had before. We have seen how America came to have the deepest libertarian tradition, a tradition that still remains in much of our political rhetoric, and is still reflected in a feisty and individualistic attitude toward government by much of the American people. There is far more fertile soil in this country than in any other for a resurgence of libertarianism. Resistance to Liberty We can now see that the rapid growth of the libertarian movement and the Libertarian party in the s is firmly rooted in what Bernard Bailyn called this powerful "permanent legacy" of the American Revolution. But if this legacy is so vital to the American tradition, what went wrong? Why the need now for a new libertarian movement to arise to reclaim the American dream? To begin to answer this question, we must first remember that classical liberalism constituted a profound threat to the political and economic interests — the ruling classes — who benefited from the Old Order: Despite three major violent revolutions precipitated by the liberals — the English of the seventeenth century and the American and French of the eighteenth — victories in Europe were only partial. Resistance was stiff and managed to successfully maintain landed monopolies, religious establishments, and warlike foreign and military policies, and for a time to keep the suffrage restricted to the wealthy elite. The liberals had to concentrate on widening the suffrage, because it was clear to both sides that the objective economic and political interests of the mass of the public lay in individual liberty. It is interesting to note that, by the early nineteenth century, the laissez-faire forces were known as "liberals" and "radicals" for the purer and more consistent among them, and the opposition that wished to preserve or go back to the Old Order were broadly known as "conservatives. Led by two reactionary French thinkers, de Bonald and de Maistre, conservatism yearned to replace equal rights and equality before the law by the structured and hierarchical rule of privileged elites; individual liberty and minimal government by absolute rule and Big Government; religious freedom by the theocratic rule of a State church; peace and free trade by militarism, mercantilist restrictions, and war for the advantage of the nation-state; and industry and manufacturing by the old feudal and agrarian order. And they wanted to replace the new world of mass consumption and rising standards of living for all by the Old Order of bare subsistence for the masses and luxury consumption for the ruling elite. Hence, the "right wing" a label based on an accident of geography by which the spokesmen for the Old Order sat on the right of the assembly hall during the French Revolution decided to shift their gears and to update their statist creed by jettisoning outright opposition to industrialism and democratic suffrage. The new conservatives wooed the masses with the following line: But, to accomplish such ends, we must regulate industry for the public good; we must substitute organized cooperation for the dog-eat-dog of the free and competitive marketplace; and, above all, we must substitute for the nation-destroying liberal tenets of peace and free trade the nation-glorifying measures of war, protectionism, empire, and military prowess. And so, in the late nineteenth century, statism and Big Government returned, but this time displaying a proindustrial and pro-general-welfare face.

DOWNLOAD PDF THE GENERAL IDEA OF THE REVOLUTION IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY (THE LIBERTARIAN CRITIQUE)

Chapter 4 : Lecture The Age of Ideologies (1): General Introduction

The General Idea of the Revolution in the Nineteenth Century (partial revision).

It contains a critique of existing society and its institutions, a vision of a free society based on equality and justice, and a detailed strategy for revolutionary change. Despite its ambivalent position regarding government initiated reforms, it set the tone for subsequent anarchist propaganda as anarchism began to emerge as a significant force on the revolutionary left. His parents were poor and republican, but due to the determination of his mother and a modest bursary he was able to attend school for a time, where he regularly won the class prize despite being too poor to afford his own books. Eventually he was forced to quit school in order to support himself and his family. He became a printer. Religious tracts formed the bulk of the material he worked with, and they had the unintended effect of eroding his religious belief. An Inquiry into the Principle of Right and of Government was a forceful critique of private property and government. But he went further. Besides declaring that property is theft, he proclaimed himself an anarchist. Proudhon was the first person to adopt the label with enthusiasm. What Proudhon really objected to with respect to private property was the earning of income from the labour of others through such means as rent, interest and wage labour. After paying employees their wages, the capitalist retains the remaining profit without contributing any productive labour himself. Associated together, the workers create a productive capacity greater than the sum of their individual powers, but it is the capitalist who reaps the benefit. The workers acquiesce in their own exploitation because their only alternatives are starvation and misery. To this basic scheme he was later to add proposals for free credit and a system of mutual guarantees of service and markets, for example. As we shall see, in place of a scientific academy regulating society, he came to adopt voluntary contract as the primary means of economic and political coordination. Proudhon saw individual contracts, freely entered into between parties of roughly equal bargaining power, as the surest safeguard of liberty. But What Is Property? At this time Proudhon lacked any real strategy for revolutionary change. He looked to the government to enact measures which would render property powerless, but believed that once this was achieved government itself would become unnecessary. He rather naively believed that the state could be used as a means to its own end, a view still present in General Idea of the Revolution. Max Stirner, who was soon to publish his classic work of anarchist individualism and nihilistic egoism, *Der Einzige und sein Eigentum* The Ego and its Own , objected to its moralism. He spent much of his time during that decade in Paris, where he met a number of prominent revolutionaries, including Marx and Bakunin. Marx later claimed the dubious distinction of having infected Proudhon with Hegelianism. While working in Lyon he became acquainted with a group of revolutionary workers who called themselves the Mutualists. The Lyon workers emphasized the need for the workers themselves to take control of their destiny by associating together into a network of cooperative organizations. Each association would be controlled by a council elected by its members. The association would provide sickness and pension benefits to its members, who would share in the profits of the association in proportion to their labour. Each worker would receive a polytechnic education, and jobs would be rotated to avoid a stupefying division of labour. Economic transactions between associations and individuals would be based on the principle of equivalent exchange. Similar proposals are contained in the General Idea of the Revolution. The Workers, organized among themselves, without the assistance of the capitalist, and marching by Work to the conquest of the world, will at no time need a brusque uprising, but will become all, by invading all, through the force of principle. He argued that the existing economic system inevitably produces exploitation and misery due to its own internal contradictions. It is in General Idea of the Revolution that Proudhon presents his most detailed picture of this mutualist alternative. A provisional government was formed which declared itself in favour of the Republic. Shortly thereafter it proclaimed universal male suffrage. On its masthead the paper proclaimed: What should he be? Proudhon feared that universal suffrage, without far-reaching social reforms, would merely serve as a device for legitimizing the status quo. He

DOWNLOAD PDF THE GENERAL IDEA OF THE REVOLUTION IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY (THE LIBERTARIAN CRITIQUE)

ridiculed the claims of proponents of representative democracy that an assembly of elected representatives could fairly represent the widely diverging and often conflicting interests of the people as a whole. He thought it self-evidently absurd that questions of right could be decided by a majority vote. The Bank was to issue exchange notes to its members representing the value of the goods produced by them. By limiting its function to ensuring equivalent exchange, the Bank would merely facilitate the pursuit of individual ends, instead of imposing a particular ideological vision in the name of the people. It would create the context for the free interplay of economic forces without the poverty and exploitation that characterize laissez-faire capitalism, or so Proudhon believed. In his proposals for a Bank of Exchange, Proudhon was attempting to elaborate the institutional structure of a free and egalitarian society, a project which he continued in *General Idea of the Revolution*. In the same month he stood as a candidate in the elections for the Constituent Assembly, after having denounced representative democracy only a few weeks earlier. He took his defeat, and the poor showing of the other socialist candidates, as further evidence of the counter-revolutionary nature of universal suffrage. This time he was successful, and as Robert L. He proposed various reforms of the legal system but was in favour of retaining the death penalty. In place of conscription he suggested one or two years of militia service for each citizen. He championed the patriarchal family and disapproved of divorce. He again distinguished between property and possession; he wanted all property other than personal possessions and instruments of work to be redistributed on an egalitarian basis. It was a programme which could not but appeal to radical working men disenchanted with the policies of the Republican government. Although Proudhon had been very critical of the workshops, which he regarded as a kind of welfare state-socialism, he opposed their abolition in the absence of alternative measures for the workers dependent on them. The workers themselves responded to the abolition by rising up against the government. Barricades were erected in the working-class areas of Paris where armed workers battled troops loyal to the government. Over 1, people were killed, and thousands more imprisoned. Proudhon was caught unawares by the uprising, isolated as a representative of the people in the National Assembly. At first he thought it was some kind of provocation, but after visiting the strife-torn areas of Paris he became convinced that the workers had been inspired by broader social ideals. He condemned the government for the savagery of its repression, which resulted from its own fear of the people. He publicly identified himself with the workers and blamed the Assembly for inciting the rebellion through its own ill-will and indifference. He published a manifesto demanding immediate economic relief for the working class and appealed directly to the National Guard for support. As a result, his paper was temporarily suppressed. He put his economic proposals before the National Assembly, which passed a special motion of censure condemning both Proudhon and his proposals. During the debate Proudhon was accused of fomenting social warfare. He was supported by only one representative, a socialist worker from Lyon. It was an act of true courage. Proudhon voted against the new constitution approved by the Assembly in November, not only on the anarchist ground that it was a constitution, but also because it gave far too much power to the president. Proudhon believed that with such sweeping powers the presidency would become nothing more than a democratically elected form of personal dictatorship. Subsequent events were to prove him right. His actions were approved by an overwhelming majority in a national referendum. At the time Proudhon was in prison for having attacked Bonaparte as the personification of reaction. In the face of an all but triumphant reaction, Proudhon had increasingly come to moderate his political stance. He came to the support of the constitution he had earlier voted against, seeing it as one of the last safeguards against dictatorship. He favoured parliamentarianism over direct action, opposing insurrection as inconsistent with support for the constitution. He forged an electoral alliance with other members of the left and preached reconciliation of classes. He made compromise after compromise, all to no avail as the juggernaut of reaction proceeded to crush any gains made by the workers in the February Revolution. Unable to obtain the sponsorship of the government, Proudhon sought the necessary funds through voluntary subscription, a method which at least had the advantage of being more consistent with his self-avowed anarchism. Seriously undercapitalized, the Bank was liquidated by Proudhon after his conviction for sedition in March, ostensibly to prevent it from falling into the hands of the

DOWNLOAD PDF THE GENERAL IDEA OF THE REVOLUTION IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY (THE LIBERTARIAN CRITIQUE)

authorities. Proudhon began serving his three-year prison sentence in June , after having been betrayed to the police by an informer. His term of imprisonment was to be intellectually very productive. He wrote his classic analysis of the Revolution, *Confessions of a Revolutionary*, and continued to contribute to various newspapers under his personal direction, enabling him to engage in a running polemic with his political opponents, despite his imprisonment. In October , his last surviving paper was suppressed. It is against this background that *General Idea of the Revolution* must be read. Published in July , it quickly sold out its first edition of 3, copies. A second edition was printed that August. Proudhon had almost a year of his prison sentence left to serve. There are a number of important themes running through the book. It also illustrates his aversion to violent revolution. By winning over the bourgeoisie to the revolutionary cause, Proudhon hoped to avoid further bloodshed. One of his central arguments is that not only is there sufficient reason for revolution, it is virtually an historical necessity. To refuse to embrace the revolution would be as futile as it would be reprehensible. Attempts to halt the progress of the revolution only succeed in making the revolution more conscious of itself. Proudhon portrays the forces of reaction as having to resort to more and more desperate and brutal measures as they vainly attempt to forestall the revolutionary triumph. One cannot help but think that this is as much intended to inspire dispirited revolutionaries after a long string of defeats as it is supposed to be a warning to the bourgeoisie. Proudhon is especially concerned to persuade his fellow revolutionaries to embrace the cause of the social revolution. He repeatedly emphasizes the underlying economic basis of current unrest. It is the exploitative and chaotic capitalist system which makes government necessary. The task for revolutionaries, therefore, is not to overthrow the existing political order but to transform the economic basis of society.

DOWNLOAD PDF THE GENERAL IDEA OF THE REVOLUTION IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY (THE LIBERTARIAN CRITIQUE)

Chapter 5 : conservatism | History, Ideology, & Examples | calendrierdelascience.com

The General Idea of the Revolution in the Nineteenth Century is one of the classics of anarchist literature.[1] Written in the aftermath of the French Revolution, it sets forth a libertarian alternative to the Jacobinism which at that time still dominated the republican and revolutionary movements in France.

Lecture 23 The Age of Ideologies 1: General Introduction It must. Thus only is he fully conscious; thus only is he a partaker of morality -- of a just and moral social and political life. For Truth is the unity of the universal. The state is the Divine Idea as it exists on Earth. Hegel, The Philosophy of History When we review the intellectual history of the 19th century in panorama, we cannot help but be struck by the enormous profusion of ideologies that century managed to produce: Liberalism, conservatism, Marxism, Darwinism, Positivism, idealism, Hegelianism, socialism, Owenism, anarchism, communism, Romanticism and the list seems to go on and on. I would suggest that the proliferation of these -isms, of these grandiose systems, was the product of an age in which intellectual life had become much more complex and intense. And there are several reasons for this complexity and intensity. First, the area concerned was larger than ever. For instance, American and Russian thinkers were beginning to make important contributions. Historically, western intellectual life had been confined to the European Continent. Now, it seemed, intellectual life had become more global. At the same time, European thinkers were becoming more aware of ancient thought. This development has a great deal to do with the development of anthropology as well as Darwinian evolutionary theory and the geological discoveries of Charles Lyell Eastern thought began to pervade western ideas during the 19th century. Many of the British Romantic poets were quite taken with eastern ideas as was the midth century German thinker Arthur Schopenhauer , whose ideas were to later influence Friedrich Nietzsche In general, new ideas and with them, a new vocabulary, entered into European intellectual discourse Second, science, which had been chiefly a novelty throughout the 18th century, now made new conquests. This was especially so in the fields of geology, biology, botany and organic chemistry. The newest developments in the sciences were primarily in the physical and life sciences, all founded in the early part of the 19th century. Another way of looking at science in the 19th century is to say that whereas the 17th and 18th centuries were keen on investigating Nature from the standpoint of what was inorganic and heavenly, the 19th century discovered and took a lively interest in what was organic, vital and living. Third, machine production, the factory system and the cash nexus profoundly altered the social structure first of England and then, by the end of the century, throughout Europe and eventually the world. This revolution in industry -- the Industrial Revolution -- gave man a new conception of power in relation to his physical environment see Lecture The Industrial Revolution was indeed revolutionary -- never before had the mode of production been so forcefully altered in such a short space of historical time. The Industrial Revolution, furthermore, was not simply some backdrop to other, more important events. It was the event itself, and such an event profoundly transformed all men and women directly and immediately. As Raymond Williams once remarked: The changes that we receive as record were experienced, in these years, on the senses; hunger, suffering, conflict, dislocation; hope, energy, vision, dedication. The pattern of change was not background, as we may now be inclined to study it, it was, rather, the mould in which general experience was cast. Culture and Society , New York, , p. And with industrialization and the development of industrial capitalism, a whole new set of social, political, cultural and intellectual problems entered the European mind at all levels. No one was left untouched by this revolution in industry. Fourth and lastly, there was also a profound revolt, a revolt both philosophical and political, against traditional systems of thought. This revolt had two faces -- one was Romantic and stressed the irrational and unreason, the other was rationalistic and stressed the human capacity of reason and rationality. The 18th century Age of Enlightenment was firmly entrenched in the capacities of Human Reason. But by the end of the century and into the early part of the 19th century, a reaction set in. Man was not a disembodied brain, a thinking machine, but an emotional and organic individual. The man of reason became the new man of

DOWNLOAD PDF THE GENERAL IDEA OF THE REVOLUTION IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY (THE LIBERTARIAN CRITIQUE)

feeling. Of course, the Romantic reaction was short-lived, only to be superseded by the positivism of the mid-to-late 19th century. To repeat the above argument, the 19th century witnessed a proliferation of total systems of thought. One of the most important systems of thought to emerge in the period actually took place outside the confines of the 19th century by a man usually associated with the 18th century Enlightenment. But keep in mind what I said several lectures ago -- thinkers lead two lives. One occurs during their lifetime. The other occurs long after their death as a new series of thinkers take up their ideas anew, making modifications and stressing one set of values over another. Born in , Kant completed his most creative work in the s against the backdrop of a general crisis in Enlightenment thought. The major force in this crisis was David Hume. Hume denied the idea, popularized by Rene Descartes , that man has innate ideas. He also denied the existence of the self because we have no sense impression of it. Hume was bothered about the idea of cause and effect. Where did it come from? Where do we obtain the idea of cause and effect? Just because the sun rose in the east, and has for a long time, does not necessarily mean it will do so tomorrow. What Hume had done, it seems, was to cast his umbrella of doubt on scientific inquiry itself. The effect on Kant was profound. So profound, that Kant admitted that it was Hume who awakened him from his "dogmatic slumber. Kant wanted truth, verifiable truth. He wanted to rescue knowledge from the grips of the skeptic and thus restore human confidence. Kant was an Aufklärer, he was a spokesman for the Enlightenment see Lecture 9. But in his philosophy, often called the "critical philosophy," he went beyond the Enlightenment. It was Kant, after all, who had initiated what has often been called a "Copernican revolution" in philosophic thought -- a revolution in knowledge. His primary objective was to rescue science from the skepticism of Hume. As an empiricist, Hume, like John Locke , believed that all human knowledge comes from the senses -- sense impressions reveal the unrelated data of experience. But, according to Hume, the principle of cause and effect cannot be derived from experience. We simply assume it exists. It is, as Hume put it, an accident of human thought itself. Kant replied that the human mind contains organizing principles or categories that impose order on our sense impressions. These categories are not to be found in nature, but in the human mind. These fundamental categories are apriori, that is, they exist prior to experience. Kant specified these forms and categories: So, for Kant, the human mind conditions and determines knowledge -- it synthesizes experience, it "works it up. There is MIND itself -- a mind which sorts, classifies, relates and works up the raw material of the phenomenal world thus making it intelligible to us. The mind is creative -- not passive. And Reason is apriori, it exists prior to experience. Yet reality does exist -- things are out there. The point is that we could not understand reality if we did not have minds equipped with a rational structure. The world appears rational not because the world is rational -- the world appears rational because the mind is rational. The mind, in a sense, creates knowledge. The first fifty years of the 19th century were full of change. It was an Age of Change. It was a hopeful half century. There is an exuberance in the literature of the period that reflects this basic optimism. There was an explosion of hopeful solutions to the problems of humanity, problems which had been exacerbated by the uncontrolled and unregulated effects of the Industrial Revolution. Liberalism, like Romanticism, is a complex term. It is broad and narrow, vague and clear, all at one and the same time. England has always been associated with this word, although the word itself did not enter popular discourse until the s. England had its Magna Carta and its Bill of Rights. The English seemed to be a freer people than anywhere else on the Continent. So too did Voltaire. In his Letters on England, published in , Voltaire wrote: Although Voltaire used such a comment to condemn the failure of the French government to permit religious toleration and liberty of opinion what he also says is that the English are the most tolerant and liberal people in Europe. Voltaire aside, English liberalism was associated with two notable intellectual modes of thought characteristic of the early 19th century: Having done most of his work in the s, Bentham was an old man in when his ideas began to increase in influence. He belonged to the Enlightenment -- there is nothing at all Romantic about Bentham the man, or Benthamism the system. He was a thoroughgoing rationalist, a man who scoffed at religion, a man without poetic instinct -- a disembodied brain. John Stuart Mill , educated as he was in the Benthamite tradition, suffered a mental crisis as a result of his early education, an education solidly

DOWNLOAD PDF THE GENERAL IDEA OF THE REVOLUTION IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY (THE LIBERTARIAN CRITIQUE)

based on Benthamite utilitarianism. In his Autobiography , Mill recounts his mental crisis for us. Would you then be happy? Such a response sent the young Mill into profound despair, only to be rescued by the poetry of Samuel Taylor Coleridge But there was one thing in which he was not instructed -- life itself.

DOWNLOAD PDF THE GENERAL IDEA OF THE REVOLUTION IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY (THE LIBERTARIAN CRITIQUE)

Chapter 6 : Liberalism - Liberalism in the 19th century | calendrierdelascience.com

The early 19th-century monarchy was unable to inspire national unity. Indeed, it was part of the problem. The claim that Britain came close to revolution in is by no means fanciful.

Syndicalism During the last decades of the 19th century the socialist movement progressed well while anarchism became marginalised and generally reduced to terrorism and sabotage. The conflict between Rosa Luxemburg and Eduard Bernstein and between Lenin and Kautsky illustrate the divergence between reformist and revolutionary wings of socialism. Doctrinaire socialists such as Henry Hyndman also criticised the mass socialist parties from the left. At the same time, a dynamic new movement grew in the working class, particularly in the trade unions, which merged features of Marxist theory with the best traditions of anarchism. This current became known as Anarcho-Syndicalism. Participants in this movement included both anarchists and Marxists, and others somewhere in between. The founders of Anarcho-Syndicalism in the English-speaking world were socialists before they were anarchists, and looked to Marx not Bakunin for their theory. However, their focus on the independent development of the trade unions and their suspicion of parliamentarians provided the stimulus for the development of the vibrant and anarchic Industrial Workers of the World. His history of anarchism and anarcho-syndicalism is an excellent resource for the anarchism of the early 20th century. Industrial Workers of the World IWW The IWW was a powerful movement that engaged both socialists and anarchists in the early years of the 20th century, especially in the English-speaking world. No revolutionary class is ever ripe for success before it has itself well in hand. It is one of the missions of the Trades Union to drill its class into the discipline that civilization demands. Solidarised with the Russian Revolution, but did not join the Communist Party. With the education they will have received in the Industrial Workers they will be drilled and disciplined, trained and fitted for Industrial Mastery and Social Freedom. Among the Marxists who fought against the syndicalist anti-party disposition of the workers, and in favour of the formation of a socialist party, in the early 20th century was John Maclean. Maclean argued for a single revolutionary socialist party and was made Soviet Consul in Scotland after the October Revolution. When the Anarchist International held their Congress in London in , the four English delegates who attended were not actually anarchists and listened in silence. Until the s, anarchism, in the forms known on the Continent, never took on in England; the English anarchists were either anarcho-syndicalists or better described as ultra-left or anti-parliamentarian socialists. The Social Democratic Federation split between pro- and anti-parliamentary groupings, and Joseph Lane was an archetype of the English anti-parliamentary socialist agitator, and people like William Morris , Frantz Kitz and Sam Mainwaring were sympathetic to his position. See also the Communist Left Subject Archive. Unfortunately we do not currently have material on the Spanish and Italian anarchist movements of this period. The Anarchist History Archive [external link] says of the Italian anarchist movement: By , it was fairly sizeable though dispersed through multiple regions. Anarchism and the Russian Revolution Anarchism has a long history in Russia dating back to Bakunin and peasant struggles against the Czarist autocracy and the landowners.

DOWNLOAD PDF THE GENERAL IDEA OF THE REVOLUTION IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY (THE LIBERTARIAN CRITIQUE)

Chapter 7 : Colonialism and Imperialism, " EGO

The ideas of the French Revolution were partly explained by the slogan "Liberty! Equality! Fraternity!" More specifically, French Revolutionary ideas were shaped by the Enlightenment, the American Revolution and specific grievances of the French people.

The result was an age of revolutions. A distinctive feature was the manner in which waves of revolutions could sweep through Europe, most notably in and , when popular revolt in France influenced the people of other states to rebel against their rulers. Belgium[edit] Prior to the nineteenth century the southern part of the Netherlands had been dominated by foreign powers, most notably the Hapsburg states of Spain and Austria. However, the critical geographical position of the area led the major powers of Europe, in the Treaty of Vienna, to cede the territory to the Dutch Republic in , to create the United Kingdom of the Netherlands. This caused resentment within the region; local liberals resented the autocratic nature of the Dutch king, whilst conservative Catholics disliked the dominance of Dutch Protestantism. These tensions were to lead to the revolution of , when the region declared itself independent, taking the name Belgium in reference to the Celtic tribes who had lived in the area in ancient times. It was very successful, as the Dutch army pushed into the heart of Belgium within just a few days, also capturing the key city of Antwerp. However, after a desperate Belgian appeal for French help, French troops crossed the border into Belgium. With Russia too busy to guard the Dutch back, both sides agreed to a ceasefire. It was not until April 19, however, that the Treaty of London signed by the European powers including the Netherlands recognized Belgium as an independent and neutral country. An autocratic ruler, Charles passed a number of acts that stripped away power promised by Louis to the people. This concluded in the July Ordinances, which dissolved Parliament. The Revolution and Louis Napoleon[edit] Louis Bonaparte In February , the citizens revolted again, this time forming a provisional government led by two men, Lamartine, a political republican who advocated freemarket, and Blanc, a social republican, who advocated socialism. Blanc created a system known as the national workshops that provided employment to the masses in France. The National Assembly of established universal male suffrage, and the people that year elected virtually no socialists. The new government threw out the national workshops, resulting in a revolt by the people. The people, looking to the former glory of France, installed Louis Napoleon Bonaparte, relative of Napoleon Bonaparte, the throne. President Louis Napoleon Bonaparte rebuilt central Paris, installing new apartments, straight, long, and wide streets, sewage, and sanitation. He also widened the streets in Paris, in an attempt to subvert future revolution, since in the past, revolutionaries in France had used the streets to barricade themselves. Emperor Napoleon III is often referred to as the socialist emperor because he gave many socialized programs to the citizens. He gave hospitals, socialized medicine, the right to unionize and strike, shorter hours, injured worker homes, a revamped prison system, and more. However, Napoleon III was also militarily inept. He was defeated in his involvement in the Italian unification movement where he sent troops to Rome to protect the Pope, in his involvement with the Mexican Empire from " , and in the Franco-Prussian War from " , during which he was actually captured by the Prussians. Great Britain[edit] Whilst reform in many European states was only achieved with the aid of bloody revolution, British parliamentary democracy meant that Great Britain managed to reform and modernise relatively peacefully. The most notable instance of this is the Reform Act of , which reallocated seats in the House of Commons to address the new industrial cities of Britain, and increased suffrage from , men to , men. By , 2 to 4. Britain saw other reforms, such as the Factory Act, which outlawed the employment of children under the age of 9 and limited the workdays of all children. The Mines Act of was a similar piece of reformist legislation, formally prohibiting women and children from working underground. British Corn Laws[edit] British Prime Minister Robert Peel One of the most entertaining pieces of political reform during this era was not related to working life, but to the economic management of Britain. They forced the British people to buy the more expensive and lower quality British grain by putting a tariff on French grain, which tended to be less

DOWNLOAD PDF THE GENERAL IDEA OF THE REVOLUTION IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY (THE LIBERTARIAN CRITIQUE)

expensive and higher quality. The goal was to keep British money in Britain, rather than being spent on importing French grain. The Corn Laws were passed by the members of the Tory party in Parliament. The Tories were populated by the Landed Gentry. The Whigs, which represented the working class, merchants, factory owners, and so forth in Britain, were opposed to the Corn Laws, but because the Tories controlled Parliament, they were unable to stop the passage of the Corn Laws. The expensive price of British grain necessitated a rise in wages, and factory owners such as David Ricardo were forced to pay higher wages so that their workers could afford the food. Ricardo thus concluded that the Corn Laws simply redistributed wealth from the industrialists to the landowners. In 1819, 80,000 people gathered in Manchester demanding the repeal of the Corn Laws. British soldiers opened fire, killing 11 demonstrators, in what became known as the Peterloo Massacre. As a result, the Anti-Corn Law League was established in Manchester, and used pamphlets, mass demonstrations, and torchlight parades to protest the Corn Laws. The government was still led by Tories, but the Irish Potato Famine led to the repeal, demonstrating the new power of the industrialists in England.

Spain[edit] Spain was a country in turmoil during the age of revolutions. Occupied by Napoleon from 1808 to 1814, a brutal "war of independence" was waged against the occupiers that led to an emergent Spanish nationalism. An era of reaction against the liberal ideas associated with revolutionary France followed the war, personified by the rule of Ferdinand VII and his daughter Isabella II. A series of civil wars then broke out in Spain, pitting Spanish liberals and then republicans against conservatives, culminating in the Carlist Wars between the moderate Queen Isabella and her uncle, the reactionary Infante Carlos. The brief rule of the liberal king Amadeo I of Spain ended in the establishment of the First Spanish Republic, only to be replaced in 1874 by the popular, moderate rule of Alfonso XII of Spain, which finally brought Spain into a period of stability and reform. King Charles Albert led a military campaign against Austria, while Mazzini attempted to organize a republic in Rome. The movement largely failed, however, because different groups of nationalists could not agree on goals. The Austria defeated the campaign, and Napoleon Bonaparte sent troops to Rome. In Germany revolts started in order to achieve more liberal rights, but the goals were soon replaced with nationalistic sentiments. However, this movement failed as well, as the Constituent Assembly had no actual power and Frederick would not accept a crown "from the gutter". Prussian troops put down revolts in Berlin as well as other revolts throughout Germany. In Austria, demands for political reform and nationalism created demands for autonomy. Revolts occurred in Vienna, Prague, and Hungary. A Slavic congress was set up in Prague, Hungarians demanded autonomous rule. Eventually, with the aid of Russia, Austria was able to suppress the revolutions. However, after 1848, the concept of Realpolitik and action arose. This new toughness of mind rejected high-minded ideology for action, and marked the end of the Enlightenment. Emperor Napoleon III also did so, widening the streets of Paris during his reconstruction of Paris in order to prevent barricading in the case of revolution. On the left, Marx and Bakunin were practitioners of Realpolitik, advocating violent revolution among the proletariat in order to install a new communist system.

Industrial Revolution[edit] The shift that precipitated many of the conflicts of the early nineteenth century was the industrial revolution. The growing industrial base of many European countries was to encourage urbanization, often at the expense of the living conditions of the workers. This was coupled with new agrarian technologies which required fewer people to work the land, whilst producing greater agricultural yields. In some countries this precipitated an industrial revolution, where urban industry played an increasingly dominant role in the economy. This process was first seen in Britain, Prussia and the Netherlands in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century whilst other countries, such as France, Italy and the United States of America were to industrialize in the late nineteenth century. Some states, such as Russia and Austria, failed to industrialize significantly in this period, a factor that would lead to later difficulties during the First World War. The Prefiguration of Industry[edit] The first evidence of industrial production can be found in the large cities of early modern Europe. Even the modest size of European capitals at the beginning of the modern period allowed for a specialization of trade and, as the cities grew, production increasingly took place in specialist workshops. Tradesmen, who had previously taken only one or two apprentices, began to take larger teams of workers, a process that

DOWNLOAD PDF THE GENERAL IDEA OF THE REVOLUTION IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY (THE LIBERTARIAN CRITIQUE)

transformed itself into the paid employment of labor in industrial enterprise. A similar shift took place in rural areas, with what was known as "putting out" or "cottage industry", where agricultural workers would take raw materials from contractors and use them to produce finished goods. Despite these developments little could be done without a proper transportation system, which would allow goods to be moved and marketed. At the beginning of the eighteenth century the cost of transporting goods overland was prohibitively expensive for all but the shortest journeys. Beginnings of Industry[edit] The age of industry for Europe began with slow progress in the s. Western Europe tended to advance more quickly than the east. Britain initially led the way. Progress remained slow until the s, because most people continued to use old methods, and population increases reduced the benefits of industrialization. As a result, the industrial age did not start in continental Europe until after , and was not complete in Britain until In , Britain was only slightly ahead of France in its industrial production. By , its industrialization was at twice the level of France, and by , three times. Industrialization also was limited by lack of transportation, reluctance to cease traditional business practices, and lack of technology. Population increased rapidly across Europe. Finally, the steam-powered engine was invented and improved, allowing for mechanization in industry. By , continental Europe had started to see progress. Its industrialization was facilitated by a large skilled labor force, strong governments, and no need to develop new ideas as Britain had already set a precedent for other nations to follow. European governments became much more involved in industrialization, building an infrastructure of railroads and canals. The German government created the Zollverein , a customs-free trade union, which allowed goods to move freely within the German states without being hampered by tariffs. By , Britain was the "workshop of the world. Centers of continental industrialization included Belgium, France, and Germany. Shows the densely populated and polluted environments created in the new industrial cities The Industrial Revolution resulted in poor urban living conditions with no sanitation. Public drunkenness as a reaction to the dismal lifestyle became prominent, and the cities were filthy and living conditions tight. Life expectancy was very short, and disease was rampant. New social classes, particularly the industrial middle class and urban workers, emerged as well. The standard of living decreased for many, with low wages and high prices, as well as horrible working conditions and the employment of children. Noticing the poor crowded city conditions and impoverished workers in industrial Europe, several economists expressed their pessimistic predictions on the future of the industrial society. Thomas Malthus " [edit] Thomas Malthus was an English economist with a grim prediction for the future. An Essay on the Principle of Population stated that the population was outgrowing the food supply, and that this would inevitably cause a "great hunger," or massive food shortage. Malthus suggested, as a solution to this problem, marrying later in life to slow the population growth, but he was not optimistic that this plan would ever come to fruition. David Ricardo [edit] David Ricardo , in his Iron Law of Wages , predicted that the income of wage-earning workers would remain below or just near subsistence levels, despite any attempts to raise wages. British Working Class Responses to Industrialisation[edit] Luddism[edit] The Luddites were a group of workers opposed to the effects of the mechanisation of industry, particularly in textiles. The advent of large scale spinning and weaving machines meant that textiles could be produced at lower costs than previously, undercutting the prices of the traditional cottage industry of handloom weavers.

DOWNLOAD PDF THE GENERAL IDEA OF THE REVOLUTION IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY (THE LIBERTARIAN CRITIQUE)

Chapter 8 : The ideas of the French Revolution

Which of the following early nineteenth century political figures were most closely identified with the concept of "the concert of Europe" Metternich The main factor as to why the British government accelerated the repeal of the Corn Laws in was the.

The Revolutionary Ideas of Bakunin Undoubtedly, Bakunin is one of the key anarchist thinkers and activists of the 19th century. Building upon the federalist and libertarian socialist ideas of his friend Pierre-Joseph Proudhon as well as those in the European labour movement, Bakunin shaped anarchism into its modern form. His revolutionary, class struggle based anarchism soon became the dominant form of anarchism in the First International. He combated the state socialism of Marx and Engels and laid the foundations for both communist-anarchism and anarcho-syndicalism. His predictions about Marxism have been confirmed and his critique of capitalism, the state and religion as just as valid as when they were first expounded. Both the Russian and Spanish revolutions have confirmed the power of his ideas on revolution. This is due to the fact that Marxists hate him while liberals cannot understand him. Their combined distortions of his ideas have ensured that many radicals have failed to read him and see for themselves the power of his theories. So why should we be interested in what a dead Russian had to say in the 1840s and 1850s? For him, "facts are before ideas" and the ideal was "but a flower, whose root lies in the material conditions of existence. Rejecting the abstract individualism of liberalism and other idealist theories, he saw that real freedom was possible only when economic and social equality existed: My freedom is the freedom of all since I am not truly free in thought and in fact, except when my freedom and my rights are confirmed and approved in the freedom and rights of all men who are my equals. Liberty is therefore a feature not of isolation but of interaction, not of exclusion but rather of connection. Abstract individualism cannot help but justify authority over liberty. Anarchism, however, "denies free will and ends in the establishment of liberty. For Bakunin, "the principle of authority" was the "eminently theological, metaphysical and political idea that the masses, always incapable of governing themselves, must submit at all times to the benevolent yoke of a wisdom and a justice, which in one way or another, is imposed from above. Power is diffused to the collectivity and becomes the true expression of the liberty of everyone, the faithful and sincere realisation of the will of all. How a group organises itself determines whether it is authoritarian or libertarian. By the term "principle of authority" Bakunin meant hierarchy rather than organisation and the need to make agreements. He rhetorically asked "does it follow that I reject all authority? Similarly, he argued that anarchists "recognise all natural authority, and all influence of fact upon us, but none of right. In essay "God and the State" Bakunin argued the necessity of atheism, arguing that "if God is, man is a slave; now, man can and must be free, then, God does not exist" for the "idea of God implies the abdication of human reason and justice; it is the most decisive negation of human liberty, and necessarily ends in the enslavement of mankind, both in theory and in practice. The state, he argued, is an instrument of class rule. It "is the organised authority, domination and power of the possessing classes over the masses" and "denotes force, authority, predominance; it presupposes inequality in fact. Under capitalism "the worker sells his person and his liberty for a given time" and "concluded for a term only and reserving to the worker the right to quit his employer, this contract constitutes a sort of voluntary and transitory serfdom. He opposed sexism and supported the equality and liberty of women. His opposition to imperialism is well known. Unlike Marx and Engels, who happily supported imperialism against "backward" peoples, for Bakunin "every people, like every person,. In his eyes there were three methods to escape the misery of capitalism: The first was "debauchery of the body," the second "of the mind. He opposed the participation of radicals in bourgeois elections, correctly predicting that when "the workers. The worker-deputies, transplanted into a bourgeois environment. Instead of political action, Bakunin argued for "the social and therefore anti-political organisation and power of the working masses of the cities and villages. It will certainly be forced to involve itself insofar as it will be forced to struggle against the bourgeois class. It only rejects bourgeois politics.

DOWNLOAD PDF THE GENERAL IDEA OF THE REVOLUTION IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY (THE LIBERTARIAN CRITIQUE)

Firstly, if taken literally, the term at the time meant a dictatorship by a minority. As Marx himself admitted, the peasantry and artisans made up the majority of the working masses in every European country bar the UK. Bakunin objected that this was "nothing more or less than a new aristocracy, that of the urban and industrial workers, to the exclusion of the millions who make up the rural proletariat and who. Rather "by popular government" the Marxists "mean government of the people by a small number of representatives elected by the people. So-called popular representatives and rulers of the state elected by the entire nation on the basis of universal suffrage. Bakunin was well aware of the need for both after destroying the state and abolishing capitalism. For him, the anarchist abolition of the state did not mean the workers to quote Marx "lay down their arms. If working class emancipation was to be genuine, the state had to be destroyed. For if "the whole proletariat. The very process of collective class struggle would, for Bakunin create the basis of a free society. And these, not a ruling party, would make the decisions: A free society was based on "the land, the instruments of work and all other capital" becoming "the collective property of the whole of society and be utilised only by the workers, in other words by the agricultural and industrial associations. The new, free, society would be organised "from the bottom-up," as a "truly popular organisation begins from below, from the association, from the commune. Thus starting out with the organisation of the lowest nucleus and proceeding upward, federalism becomes a political institution of socialism, the free and spontaneous organisation of popular life. For the anarchist "takes his stand on his positive right to life and all its pleasures, both intellectual, moral and physical. He loves life, and intends to enjoy it to the full. The Paris Commune was a striking confirmation of many of his ideas, as were the soviets of the Russian Revolution and the collectives of the Spanish. His critique of Marxism has been proven right: Social democracy became as reformist as he predicted while Bolshevism was as authoritarian. Not, though, to mindlessly repeat but to build on and development. His bigotry against Jews and Germans are examples of the latter, as is his fondness for secret societies. For all that, Bakunin is rightfully considered a key anarchist thinker. This is because anarchists are not "Bakuninists" and can reject the personal flaws and failings of any important anarchist thinker. Anarchists agree that in many aspects of his ideas and life Bakunin was wrong. This does not detract from the positive ideas he contributed to the development of anarchist theory and practice. Those looking for a more substantial account of his life and ideas then "Bakunin: The Philosophy of Freedom" by Brian Morris is highly recommended. Volume one of the anarchist anthology "No Gods, No Masters" contains a representative collection of his key anarchist works.

DOWNLOAD PDF THE GENERAL IDEA OF THE REVOLUTION IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY (THE LIBERTARIAN CRITIQUE)

Chapter 9 : Age of Enlightenment - Wikipedia

In the nineteenth century, most European believed that permanent progress would produce a future utopia of peace and prosperity. This Age of Progress belief, or faith, resulted from the material progress exemplified by the Scientific Revolution and especially the Industrial Revolution.

The ideology of the French Revolution was broader and more complex than mere slogans, however. French revolutionary ideas drew heavily on the political philosophy of the Enlightenment and the writings of the philosophes. They also borrowed from other political systems. Many French revolutionaries had studied British government and society. They came to admire its constitutional basis, its separation of powers and its tolerance for individual rights and freedoms. The American Revolution provided French reformers with a working example of revolution and a successfully implemented constitution. The ideas of the French Revolution were also shaped by grievances that were specific to 18th century France. Some of the key ideas of the French Revolution are summarised below. In the context of the 18th century, liberty was freedom from oppression, and particularly oppression by the state or government. These lettres had several functions but their most common use was to detain and imprison individuals without trial or due process. Several notable figures were imprisoned by lettres de cachet, including Honore Mirabeau for disgracing his family and Voltaire for defamatory writings. Equality also underpinned the ideas of the French Revolution. The citizens of the Third Estate wanted equality, though some wanted greater levels of equality than others. The rising bourgeoisie wanted political and social equality with the nobility of the Second Estate. They favoured a meritocracy: For this, they looked to the newly formed United States, where a revolution had transferred government to men of talent and ability. But the bourgeoisie was more reluctant about sharing political equality with the lower ranks of the Third Estate. They did not support universal voting rights, believing voting to be a privilege of the propertied classes. In theoretical terms, many of the ideas were ill worked out. For example, the revolutionaries proclaimed the rights of man but women were largely excluded from the process. In practical terms, revolutionary zeal turned to fanaticism and the Revolution turned on itself. Fraternity was the most abstract, idealistic and unachievable of all revolutionary ideals. It was more prevalent in the early phase of the revolution when the new government was churning out positive reforms like the August Decrees and the Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen. Many visual sources from show the Three Estates cooperating and working together to improve the nation. As the revolution progressed and political divisions emerged, this focus on unity and brotherhood quickly evaporated. Until the modern era, most kings and governments claimed their authority came from God, a concept called divine right monarchy. This idea was challenged in the Enlightenment by the emergence of popular sovereignty. Popular sovereignty is the idea that governments derive their authority from the consent and support of the people, not from God. A corollary of popular sovereignty is that if a government fails or mistreats its people, the people have the right to replace it. This principle was used to justify the American and French revolutions. They believed a constitutional government would spell the end of absolutism and arbitrary decision making. It would prevent abuses of power and create a government that worked for the benefit of all. For a working example, the French revolutionaries looked to the United States Constitution, which was drafted in and enacted the following year. This Constitution created a democratically elected republic, with the branches of government and their powers clearly articulated. It also embodied Enlightenment political concepts like popular sovereignty, natural rights and the separation of powers. Also emerging from the Enlightenment, particularly in the writings of John Locke, was the concept of natural rights. As the name suggests, natural rights are rights and freedoms bestowed on all people, regardless of whatever laws or governments they live under. According to John Locke, there were three natural rights: All individuals were entitled to live in safety, to be free from oppression, to acquire property and have it safe from theft or seizure. It is the responsibility and the duty of government, Locke wrote, to uphold and protect the natural rights of individuals. The role of the Catholic

DOWNLOAD PDF THE GENERAL IDEA OF THE REVOLUTION IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY (THE LIBERTARIAN CRITIQUE)

church in society and government was a divisive issue of the French Revolution. Most of those who criticised the church and its higher clergy were not atheists, nor were they opposed to religion. They were anti-clericalists who wanted to reform the clergy and limit its social and political power. Anti-clericalism shaped several revolutionary policies including the seizure of church lands, the Civil Constitution of the Clergy July and attempts to create a state religion. The ideas of the French Revolution were drawn from the Enlightenment, influenced by the British political system, inspired by the American Revolution and shaped by local grievances. The early part of the revolution was motivated by Enlightenment political concepts such as popular sovereignty and constitutionalism, which aimed to create a more effective system of government. Another key revolutionary idea was the codification and legal protection of natural rights: Another important revolutionary idea was anti-clericalism, which sought to reform the Catholic church, particularly the actions of its clergy, reducing political influence, interference and corruption. Content on this page may not be republished or distributed without permission. For more information please refer to our Terms of Use. This page was written by Jennifer Llewellyn and Steve Thompson. To reference this page, use the following citation: