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1. Introduction to the History of Political Thought papers

For several decades now, Cambridge has been an international centre for teaching and research on the history of political thought, a subject which has formed a substantial component of the undergraduate degrees in both History and HSPS. On the Politics side, there is a widespread view among those who teach the subject here that the study of political ideas in their historical contexts offers an invaluable training for thinking critically and flexibly about politics more generally.

Much of the teaching for this paper is organised by the History Faculty (where the paper is known as Part IB T2/ Part II Paper 4). It is responsible for the production of the reading lists and will have arranged the lectures that will be delivered throughout the academic year. Sometimes Politics students feel intimidated by the lectures—they worry that they don’t know enough about modern European history, for example, and they come to believe that the History students are better placed than they are to benefit from what’s being said. But if you have thoughts like this, it’s worth exploring the other side of the coin. It’s true that Historians may initially be more familiar with some aspects of the subject than Politics students. But Politics students (especially if they have taken the Part I paper, POL1) usually have considerably more experience at handling political argument at a decent level of sophistication by the time they come to study for this paper, and that gives them a very useful platform on which to build their engagement with the syllabus here—since taking political argument seriously is ultimately what this paper is about.

2. Introduction to the period

Beginning with the Enlightenment and extending from the American, French and Haitian revolutions to the wave of revolutions in 1848 and the challenge to capitalism in the thought of Karl Marx, this paper explains the formation of the fundamental concepts of modern society and politics. The line between the state and civil society, the relation between liberty and commerce, the transformations in the principles of political legitimacy which led to the notion of the modern representative republic, the political and civil status of women, the mounting challenge to slavery, the modern concept of empire: all these and more form the content of this paper.

Like POL 7, this paper offers two kinds of intellectual exploration. In Part A, you will focus on a close reading of major texts within their political and intellectual contexts. This enables you to explore how political argument was articulated in texts by the greatest political philosophers of the period. In Part B, you will focus on groups of texts which are thematically and historically connected, developing your ability to understand the way that a given political language is inflected in different directions according to different demands of national and international debate in the modern period. For those who have done other papers in the history of political thought or are thinking of taking them, this paper provides an essential introduction to the understanding of all aspects of political thought, including the foundations of modern politics in a global setting.
3. How to study for this paper

**Lectures**: because the material to be covered spans a wide chronological and thematic range, and also because many students will not have studied the history of political thought before, a comprehensive array of lectures is offered. This need not cause you alarm since you are not required or expected to attend them all. Lecturers are encouraged to place their outlines, bibliographies and other material on the paper’s Moodle site in advance of the lecture. Your ID will be added to the list of site users by the course organiser at the start of the academic year, based on information received from the administrative offices of History and POLIS. If you have been omitted, you should contact the course organiser.

**Supervisions**: for this paper, the norm is to have six paired supervisions for the paper spread over the Michaelmas and Lent terms. In these supervisions, you should cover six of the twenty-one named authors (section A) and thematic topics (section B) that make up the syllabus, in preparation for answering three questions in the examination (including at least one question from each of sections A and B). What you need to do, therefore, is to construct, in conjunction with your supervisor and supervision partner, your own intellectual pathway through this paper. Before you start, you should make an initial choice of, say, authors and topics; these will preferably have thematic or historical connections between them. You may change your choice as you proceed, but identification of a pathway is the key to making the most of this paper.
4. Structure of the paper

The paper is divided into two sections. Section A focuses on some of the most prominent political thinkers of the period, and you will study their major texts in depth, to gain a detailed, contextual understanding of their thought. Section B offers a range of thematic topics, for which you will be expected to read across a range of primary texts and reflect on the broader problems of historical and philosophical interpretation that confront historians of political thought and political theorists in studying this period. You will need to cover at least one topic from each section in the exam, but the precise balance you strike between the two sections is a matter for you to decide with your supervisor and supervision partner, although most students prefer to take a majority of their topics from Section A.

Section A

A1 Hume
A2 Montesquieu
A3 Rousseau
A4 Smith
A5 Burke
A6 Wollstonecraft
A7 Kant
A8 Hegel
A9 Tocqueville
A10 John Stuart Mill
A11 Marx

Section B

B12 History, Progress and Enlightenment
B13 Theorists of the Condition of Women
B14 Revolutions
B15 Constitutions
B16 Culture and Politics in Germany
B17 Liberty, Law and the State
B18 Political Economy and its Critics
B19 Socialism before 1848
B20 Slavery, Free Labour and Citizenship
B21 Empire and Civilization in Nineteenth-Century Political Thought
5. Introduction to the topics

Section A

A1 Hume
David Hume (1711-1776) is perhaps best known for his attempts to establish a truly empirical study of human nature, and for the sceptical challenge he thus posed to the Christian worldview, along with its supporting metaphysical systems and its influence on prevailing moral and political ideas. In his own time, however, he was equally (if not more) celebrated as an historian and political essayist. His Scottish background gave him an unusual sense of distance from the partisan politics of eighteenth-century England, and in his essays we find a notably clear-sighted appreciation of the political and economic changes reshaping European politics in his time.

A2 Montesquieu
Montesquieu (1689-1755) was a nobleman from southwest France whose *The Spirit of the Laws* of 1748 established him beyond question as the touchstone of eighteenth-century political science. Its careful attempt to work out the relations that linked such apparently diverse phenomena as manners, religion, commerce, climate and territory to law and politics, represented an extraordinary attempt to grapple with the diversity of political societies without abandoning the hope of achieving some insight into the general principles that might operate in all of them. But he is equally well-known for some of his more specifically political arguments, notably his account of the separation of powers, worked out through comparison between ‘modern’ (i.e. post-feudal) monarchies such as France and the hard-to-classify British system of government. This was among the developments that made his constitutional theories an important point of reference for the American and French revolutionaries and later liberal thinkers.

A3 Rousseau
Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778) launched an excoriating critique of inequality in 1755 that reshaped subsequent debate on the character of the human psyche and its relationship with social life, civil government and property. His subsequent writings, including the *Social Contract* (1762) offered an important reworking of ideas about the relationship between popular sovereignty and government and the basis of republican government. The political debates of the French Revolution might be seen as an argument about his intellectual legacy, but his influence stretched further, and he was a key point of reference for thinkers in the German Idealist tradition as well.

A4 Smith
Adam Smith (1723-1790) is best known as the author of the *Wealth of Nations* (1776) a text subsequently taken up by nineteenth-century economists as the foundation of their discipline (B18). This topic looks at his earlier *Theory of Moral Sentiments* (1759). Many nineteenth-century readers found the idea of writing on moral philosophy and writing a work of economics grounded on self-interest so puzzling that they assumed Smith must have contradicted himself. More recent studies have found in the *Theory of Moral
**Sentiments** a rich investigation into the moral foundations of social life that sheds fascinating light on Smith’s hopes and fears for modern commercial societies.

**A5 Burke**
Edmund Burke (1729-1797) is undoubtedly best known for the scathing and prescient critique of the French Revolution that he published in 1790. In the late nineteenth century, he was adopted as a kind of figurehead by British and later American conservatives, an appropriation that complicates understanding him in his own context. A Whig statesman from an Irish background, Burke was a proponent of political and religious reform in Britain and Ireland, a critic of the government’s mishandling of the crisis in the American colonies, and an avowed enemy of the British East India Company’s rule on the Indian subcontinent. Should this change the way we read the *Reflections on the Revolution in France*?

**A6 Wollstonecraft**
Mary Wollstonecraft (1759-1797) was a religious radical as well as a moral and political philosopher, best known for her analysis of the condition of women in modern society. She treats the problem of the status of women as inseparable from that of ‘the understanding of human relations within a civilization increasingly governed by acquisitiveness and consumption’ (Tomaselli, 2016). Her response to this challenge remains enduringly controversial within later feminist commentary, but repays close attention, both to her own texts and to the ways in which she engages with philosophers such as Rousseau (A3), Smith (A4) and Burke (A5), as well as with the debates stimulated by the French Revolution. Her life was cut short by death in childbirth, but her legacy fed not only into later discussions of the condition of women, but into early British Romanticism.

**A7 Kant**
The publication of Immanuel Kant’s (1724-1804) *Critique of Pure Reason* in 1781 established him, in the eyes of his many followers, as the preeminent philosopher of modern times. In addressing the problem of the conditions of possibility for our knowledge of the world around us, his ‘critical’ philosophy sought to navigate between the rationalism of Leibniz and Wolff and the ‘sceptical’ position associated with Hume. This has tended until relatively recently to overshadow his contributions to moral and political philosophy, but this has changed dramatically in recent decades. We will be looking at both the foundations of his moral philosophy, and at his contributions to political philosophy, including his discussion of the nature of the republican state and his influential analysis of federalism as a means of resolving international conflict.

**A8 Hegel**
G.W.F. Hegel (1770-1831) is among the most influential thinkers of the modern age. Building especially on the thought of Rousseau (A3) and Kant (A7), he placed freedom at the centre of society and politics. While his language is certainly difficult, reliant upon a vocabulary that takes some time to get to grips with, his ideas were nonetheless transformative. In his main political treatise, the *Philosophy of Right* (1820), he launched a powerful critique of (Kantian) moral consciousness and set about demonstrating that the value of liberty lay in its practical realization in the institutions of family, society and state. A dominant influence on a generation of younger German philosophers, including Marx.
reflection on his philosophy has been central to many later philosophical movements such as Marxism, British Idealism and Existentialism.

**A9 Tocqueville**

Alexis de Tocqueville (1805-1859) may be best known for his seminal *Democracy in America* (1835-1840). That text was intended to answer many of the fears that continued to haunt France after the catastrophic experience of the Revolution. Was democracy compatible with liberty? What forms of government could serve to minimize its dangers? This topic focuses on his later *Ancien Régime and the Revolution* (1856), written after the 1848 Revolution and the advent of the Second Empire under Napoleon III. In this book he sought in the development of the pre-revolutionary French state and society answers to the question of why France seemed fated to alternate between revolutionary excess and dictatorship. It is a seminal contribution to the understanding of the problem of revolution and of the nature and genesis of modern egalitarian politics, widely influential among later historians and social and political scientists.

**A10 Mill**

John Stuart Mill (1806-1873) was a dominant figure in the intellectual life of Victorian Britain. His father, James Mill, was one of Bentham’s’ closest collaborators, and the young J.S. Mill, something of a prodigy, was raised as a paladin for the utilitarian cause. The pressure led to a breakdown in his early adulthood, and he subsequently sought to nourish himself on a more varied intellectual diet. His *System of Logic* (1843) examined not only the foundations of philosophical logic, but the possibility of a science of society. The *Principles of Political Economy* (1848 – see B18) became a standard textbook on the subject for a generation. Marriage to Harriet Taylor (B13) spurred him to more direct interventions in social and political debate, in the essays *On Liberty* (1859), *Considerations on Representative Government* (1861), *Utilitarianism* (1863) and *The Subjection of Women* (1869). He has long enjoyed the status of the classic representative of British liberalism. In recent decades, his views on empire have come under increasing scrutiny, as have the equivocations of his views on the British working classes. He is a fascinatingly complex thinker.

**A11 Marx**

Michel Foucault once wrote that ‘Marxism exists in nineteenth-century thought like a fish in water: that is, it is unable to breathe anywhere else.’ (*The Order of Things*, 1966). Many would demur, but it has certainly been an over-riding ambition of much recent scholarship to return Karl Marx (1818-1883) to the context in which he lived and wrote. This has reminded us, amongst other things, that we are dealing with a German philosopher deeply steeped in political debates about the future of the Prussian state, the radical potential of Hegelian philosophy (A8), the promise of French socialist thought (B19), the capacity of the British state to work through the problems of industrialization, and the relationship between the international order and the revolutionary potential of the working classes. The twentieth-century Marx can, for the moment, be left to students of twentieth-century political theory. What we are left with is a more interestingly creative thinker that we do not need to force into conformity with hackneyed expectations of ‘what Marx says’ or ‘what Marxism is about’.
Section B

B12 History, Progress and Enlightenment
The idea of ‘Enlightenment’, whether conceived as a process of moral and political progress, or as defining an era in the cultural and intellectual life of western civilization, has played an important role in historical and political reflection on the period covered by this paper. Central to thinking about the concept is the emergence of new ways of understanding the history of civil societies and of humanity at large. This topic looks at a range of major contributions to debates about the nature of historical change and progress, including works by Vico, Herder, Kant (A7) and Hegel (A8). We will be looking at the role of divine and human agency, of reason and the imagination, of property and law, of culture and politics in explanations of the genesis and development of human societies, and at the implications of these theories for thinking about the future.

B13 Theorists of the Condition of Women
This topic spans the entire time period covered by this paper, which makes it a particularly rewarding way to get to grips with many of the overarching developments of political thought in this period. In the eighteenth century, we begin to find probing questions about marriage, education and the place of women within civil society posed by writers such as Mary Astell, Catharine Macauley, Mary Wollstonecraft (A6) and Olympe de Gouges (B14). At the same time, the rise of new modes of historical thought, and the transformations wrought by the advent of commercial society, prompted questions about the evolution of modern social forms and the changing status of women. The French Revolution sharpened the expectations of those who sought a fundamental transformation of relations between the sexes in domestic, social and political life. The status of women was a central concern of socialist thinkers in France, Britain and Germany (B19), as it was for radical liberals such as Harriet Taylor and her husband, John Stuart Mill (A10). Through this lens we are thus led directly into reflection on the central themes of this paper.

B14 Justifying Revolution in the Eighteenth-Century Atlantic World
The concept of ‘revolution’ underwent a transformational change in the late eighteenth century, coming to denote not merely a change of government, but a profound rupture in political and social life. The American Revolution of 1776 could not easily be presented as a restoration of pre-existing political norms. Many of its leading actors, such as Thomas Jefferson (B20) and Thomas Paine, were keen to stress the novelty of the undertaking, arguing that the Revolution had created a new society founded on the unshakeable principles of natural law. For European reformers this was a seductive vision. This topic looks at the ways in which this new language of revolutionary politics shaped the politics of the French Revolution through the writings of Condorcet (B15, B20), Sieyès (B15) and Robespierre (among others), and at the ways in which the American and French examples informed the efforts of revolutionaries in the French colony of Saint-Domingue (afterwards known as Haiti) to destroy slavery, and ultimately colonial rule. In these revolutions of the eighteenth-century Atlantic world, we find the origins of the nineteenth- and twentieth-century tradition of revolutionary thought.
B15 Constitutions
One legacy of the American and French Revolutions was the elevation of the notion of popular sovereignty to a central place in nineteenth-century political thought. Covering the founding of the American republic; the rise, fall and rise again of ideas of representative government in France; the development of the principle of nationality as a complement to the idea of popular sovereignty in the Italian Risorgimento; and the attempts to accommodate new ways of thinking about sovereignty to the practices of British parliamentary government, this topic looks at the emergence of the modern representative republic. We will look at debates over the nature and origins of sovereignty and its proper limits; over federalism and centralization; on representative government; on the idea of nationality as a political principle; and at the evolution of thinking about parliamentary models of government.

B16 Culture and Politics in Germany
The debates generated by the Kantian ‘revolution’ in philosophy, combined with the political upheavals in France created a somewhat febrile atmosphere of intellectual excitement in Germany in the 1790s. Kant himself was known to be sympathetic to the aims of the French Revolution, and his legal philosophy could be read in this light (A7). Johann Gottlieb Fichte, building on Kant’s *Critiques*, began to sketch a position in which a forthright emphasis was placed on self-activity and the self’s ‘recognition’ of others as the foundation of ethical obligation. Fichte would exercise a commanding influence over the young Schelling, Hegel (A8), and the Romantic circle that formed around Friedrich Schlegel and Novalis. For this last group, the takeaway message from Kant and Fichte was that our freedom lay in our ability to act and to shape ourselves and the world around us; to be free was to be a kind of artist. There were parallels here with the position outlined by the playwright and philosopher, Friedrich Schiller; whilst Wilhelm von Humboldt offered a staunch defence of the intrinsic value of individual diversity. Many of the seeds of nineteenth-century liberalism, radicalism, conservatism and nationalism can be found in these debates.

B17 Liberty, Law and the State
In a celebrated lecture of 1819, Benjamin Constant outlined what he took to be a fundamental distinction between the idea of liberty to be found in the republics of the ancient Greece and Rome, and that which characterized modern commercial societies. In the former, the individual was, he argued, subsumed within their membership of the citizen-body; liberty was conceived as a function of participation in political life. In the modern world, such an all-consuming idea of political life was neither possible nor desirable. Individuals wished to be free to define the parameters of their own moral, intellectual and religious lives and to pursue their own social and economic projects. This topic looks at the development of the idea of modern liberty in Britain, France, Switzerland, and the United States from the 1780s onwards. We will look at the development of a liberal tradition in France in the writings of Constant, Staël and Guizot; at sharp mid-century polemics over the role of the state and the moral and economic burdens it placed on the individual in the works of Bastiat, Spencer and Thoreau; at the evolution of utilitarian ideas of liberty in Bentham and Mill (A10); and at reactions to Mill’s thought from J.F. Stephen and T.H. Green.
B18 Political Economy and its Critics

Adam Smith opened Book IV of the *Wealth of Nations* (1776) by defining ‘political economy’ as a ‘branch of the science of a statesman or a legislator’ concerned with the enrichment of ‘both the people and the sovereign’. Political discussion of public finance had already a long history; speculation on the proper management of a household (in Greek, the oikos) one longer still. The eighteenth- and nineteenth-century discourse of ‘Political Economy’ was born of their conjunction. This topic is concerned with the transformative effect this had and continues to have on political thought. Choosing from among four major contributors to the genre – Smith (see also A4), Malthus, Mill (A10) and Marx (A13) – we will look at the ways in which Political Economy became a vehicle for discussions of progress and its limits, distributive justice, the role of individual agency, the limits of governmental action, the politics of class relations, problems of international competition and the politics of empire.

B19 Socialism before 1848

Nineteenth-century socialism has often been approached through the distorting lens of the later history of Marxism. Marx (A11) and Engels (B13) were keen to establish their distance from near contemporaries to whom they owed much, and distinguished between their own ‘scientific’ socialism and the ‘utopian’ aspirations of their ‘predecessors’. We will be less interested in this kind of proleptic judgement than in studying early socialist authors on their own terms. The key figures are Robert Owen, Henri Saint-Simon, Charles Fourier, Louis Blanc, Pierre-Joseph Proudhon and Flora Tristan. There are notable differences of preoccupation and approach between all these figures, but recurring themes will include: the legacy of the French Revolution; the problem of education; the role of the passions in creating social harmony/disharmony; the role of religion in socialism; the significance of sexual difference to socialist visions of social life, and the link between feminism and socialism; the emergence of an analysis of class conflict and its link to property; the role (or lack thereof) of the state in early socialist theory; and the rejection or embrace of political democracy as a component of socialist society.

B20 Slavery, Free Labour and Citizenship

The expansion of the Atlantic slave trade over the eighteenth century stimulated an increasingly sharp debate in Europe and its colonies over the moral and political status of the institution of slavery and over the enslavement of Africans in particular. Existing European frameworks for thinking about slavery, primarily derived from the Roman law tradition, came under critical scrutiny and novel critiques were launched in the name of slavery’s incompatibility with Christian religious duty, natural law, or republican political values. The independence of Haiti and the abolition in the British Empire of first the slave trade (1807) and then slavery itself (1833) transformed the context of these debates and would have a deep impact on the increasingly fraught confrontation between defenders and opponents of slavery in the USA in the run-up to the American Civil War of 1861-5. This topic looks at a range of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century contributions to this debate, covering both critics and defenders of slavery and the slave trade from Britain, France, the United States, Haiti and the Transatlantic African diaspora. For supervision essays, it is suggested that students may like to concentrate in the first instance on either the French and British debates or on the American debates.
By the early nineteenth century, the global map of European overseas empire was shifting dramatically. The independence of Britain’s American colonies was followed by revolts in French Saint-Domingue (Haiti), and Spain’s American colonies. Portuguese Brazil soon followed its neighbours into independence. Though slave-holding interests remained significant in the Caribbean, and British territory would expand rapidly in Canada; European attention was increasingly focused on Asia, Africa and the Pacific. The British defeat in America seemed to many compensated by its rise to military dominance in India. Following the Indian Rebellion of 1857, the territories governed by the East India Company would be placed under direct Crown government. Settler colonies were established in Australia, New Zealand, and amongst the Dutch colonists of the Cape Peninsula, South Africa. Other European states sought to rival the British, with the French investing greatly in the conquest and colonization of Algeria after 1830. The Ottoman and Chinese empires came under sustained pressure, whilst after 1881 almost the entire African continent was divided amongst European colonial states. This topic, focusing on debate within the British Empire, is intended to get to grips not only with the changing ways Europeans justified or criticised overseas empire, including arguments about civilizational ‘backwardness’, theories of racial hierarchy, and ideas about international security, law and trade; but also with the ways in which they envisaged the role of empire in future international order. Was ‘empire’ thought of as a permanent fixture of international order, or as a transitional phase in the emergence of a more ‘civilized’ world? What should be the relationship between the metropole and its colonies? Was the ideal of representative government compatible with settler colonialism, and if it was, how would that change the nature of empire? From the perspective of those who found themselves under colonial rule, particularly in India, different questions emerged. How could the success of European imperial conquests be explained? How was British rule to be judged? Was there anything to be hoped for from the evolving systems of government in British India? Was resistance desirable or possible, or was the lesson of 1857 and its aftermath that the path to self-government ran instead through the mobilization of reforming interests in Britain and India?
6. Lectures

For guidance as to which lectures will be most relevant to your course of studies, you are advised to get in touch with your supervisor as early as possible in Michaelmas term. It is not expected that students will attend all the lectures advertised, but you are strongly encouraged to attend lectures on the topics that you are covering.

Lecture handouts and announcements are made available through Moodle.

Lectures are organized by the History Faculty. The Lecture List can be found here.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Michaelmas</th>
<th>Lent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timetable to follow</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. The examination

POL8 and POL10 are examined separately, so second-year students will sit a different exam paper to third-year students. Both papers are marked by examiners in POLIS; students taking the History versions of the paper will sit the same exams, but they will be marked by examiners from the History Faculty. Students taking the History and Politics or History and Modern Languages Tripos are also examined by the History Faculty.

Sample supervision questions will be found listed by topic in the guide below. Examiners’ reports for the last few years will be found in the Appendix to this course guide.

Candidates can expect that a question will be set on each of the prescribed authors in Section A and topics in Section B. But you should be aware that the guarantee of a question on each author and topic does not mean that examiners will set lowest common denominator, generic questions, open to a pre-prepared answer. They are much more likely to ask specific questions, approaching the author/topic from a particular perspective. Candidates are therefore strongly advised to prepare more than the minimum of required authors and topics.

The Exam rubric is: Answer **three questions**, at least **one** from each section. (Overlap between answers should be avoided.)
8. Sample examination paper

SECTION A

1. What role does the concept of convention play in Hume’s social and political thought?
2. What, for Montesquieu, distinguished despotism from other forms of government?
3. Why did Rousseau think that republican citizens had reason to fear the ambitions of republican governments?
4. Why did Smith distinguish justice from other virtues?
5. How did Burke reconcile the existence of distinctions of rank and wealth with the idea of moral equality?
6. What did Wollstonecraft understand by virtue?
7. Is there a role for prudence in Kant’s account of political judgement?
8. How did Hegel justify the claim that we can be at once free and dependent on others?
9. How did Tocqueville explain the failure of eighteenth-century efforts to reform the French monarchy?
10. What role, if any, do rights play in Mill’s thinking about liberty?
11. Does Marx provide a moral justification for revolution?

SECTION B

12. What role did the idea of ‘decline’ play in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century debates about progress?
13. To what extent did eighteenth- and nineteenth-century theorists of the condition of women believe it could be explained by the pretensions of men?
14. What was the relationship between the ideas of revolution and moral progress in late eighteenth-century political debate?
15. Did the idea of popular sovereignty complement or compete with the idea of constitutional government in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century political thought?
16. To what extent were German theories of culture around the turn of the nineteenth century theories of republican politics?
17. To what extent was the defence of modern liberty a defence of the primacy of self-interest in politics?
18. What was political about political economy in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries?
19. How did socialist thinkers before 1848 explain human sociability?
20. To what extent did eighteenth- and nineteenth-century critics and defenders of the institution of slavery believe it to be compatible with the existence of republican government?
21. How did nineteenth-century political thinkers propose to reconcile the idea of representative government with the existence of empire?
9. The reading lists

For Section A, you are assigned one or more set texts for each topic. It is expected that you will be familiar with all of the set texts assigned for a given topic by the time you sit the exam, but for the supervision your supervisor may advise you to concentrate in the first instance on one text in particular, or on certain sections of a longer text. Your primary goal should be to engage carefully and analytically with the set texts.

The aim of Section B is to allow you to consider the general context in political thought within which the ideas of major political thinkers developed. The primary texts suggested in Section B therefore have a different status from the set texts in Section A. You need not master every one of the Section B primary texts but need to show evidence of engagement with texts relating to each topic. A good rule of thumb is to have engaged with 2-3 primary texts ahead of the supervision, but with shorter texts your supervisor may advise you to tackle more than this. Discuss with your supervisor which texts you will read ahead of the supervision.

Secondary reading lists are designed to indicate some useful introductory works or major interpretations of thinkers or themes, as well as offering pointers for further reading on particular aspects of a topic. They are not intended as a checklist, and there is no expectation that you will read every text on a given topic. Your supervisor will guide you in your reading for supervisions. You may then return to the reading list for further reading on any aspect of an author or topic that particularly interests you, and for revision reading. Though you may sometimes find it useful to begin by reading an introductory secondary text, make sure to prioritize the primary texts if pushed for time.

Works marked with an asterisk * are suggested as helpful introductions or as particularly important interpretations of the author or topic.

(E) = e-book available from iDiscover
(M) = Available via Moodle (see under ‘Library Resources’)
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A1 Hume

(E) = e-book available from iDiscover

Set text:


Essays Moral, Political and Literary, ed. E.F. Miller (Indianapolis, 1985) (E), esp. Part I 2-8, 12, 14, 21; Part II 1-9, 11-13, 16.

Secondary Readings:

General and Introductory:
*J.A. Harris, Hume: An Intellectual Biography (Cambridge, 2015) (E)  

Morals, politics and history:  
*A.C. Baier, A Progress of Sentiments: Reflection on Hume’s Treatise (Cambridge MA, 1991) chapters 7-12. (E)  
D. Forbes, Hume’s Philosophical Politics (Cambridge, 1975)  
*J. Moore, ‘Hume’s Theory of Justice and Property’, Political Studies, 24 (1976), 103-19 (E)  
Paul Sagar, The Opinion of Mankind: Sociability and the theory of the state from Hobbes to Smith, (Princeton, 2018) (E)  

Politics and political economy:  
J. Robertson, The Case for the Enlightenment (above), Ch 7, pp. 360-76. (E)

Suggested Supervision Questions:

1. Does Hume’s political philosophy ultimately favour authority over liberty?

2. Why did Hume reject the idea that allegiance to government had a contractual basis?

3. According to Hume, what was required to establish large and lasting societies?

4. What, for Hume, is the advantage of a republican over a monarchical form of government?

5. In what sense might Hume be described as a sceptic about politics?
A2 Montesquieu

(E) = e-book available from iDiscover
(M) = available on Moodle

Set text:


Secondary Readings:

General and Introductory


*N.O. Keohane, _Philosophy and the State in France: The Renaissance to the Enlightenment_, (Princeton NJ, 1980), Chapters 10-14 (E)


J.N. Shklar, _Montesquieu_, (Oxford, 1987) (M – chapter 1 only)


Governments and Politics


P.A. Rahe, _Montesquieu and the Logic of Liberty_ (New Haven CT, 2009) (E)

Commerce, Luxury, and the Distinction of Ranks

P. Cheney, _Revolutionary Commerce: Globalization and the French Monarchy_ (Cambridge MA, 2010), chapter 2, pp. 52-86. (E)

Suggested Supervision Questions:

1. Why was Montesquieu confident that modern monarchies could adapt to commerce?

2. Why did Montesquieu suggest that the English needed to be particularly jealous of their liberty?

3. Why did Montesquieu distinguish the forms of government from the principles that animated them?

4. Why did Montesquieu consider modern monarchy to be the best form of government?

5. Why did Montesquieu give women such a prominent place in his works?
A3 Rousseau

(E) = e-book available from iDiscover
(M) = available on Moodle

Set text:


Secondary Readings:

General and introductory


M. Sonenscher, *Jean-Jacques Rousseau: The division of labour, the politics of the imagination and the concept of federal government*, (Leiden, 2020) (E)


*Discourse on the Origins of Inequality*


*R. Neuhouser, Rousseau’s critique of inequality: reconstructing the Second Discourse* (Cambridge, 2014) (E)

R. Wokler, *Rousseau, the Age of Enlightenment and their Legacies* (Princeton, 2012), ch. 1. (E)

*Of the Social Contract*


J. Hope Mason, “Forced to be Free”, in R. Wokler, ed., *Rousseau and Liberty* (Manchester, 1995), 121-38. (M)


**Rousseau’s contexts**

R. Whatmore, “‘A lover of peace more than liberty”? The Genevan rejection of Rousseau’s politics’, in Avi Lifschitz (ed), *Engaging with Rousseau. Reaction and Interpretation from the Eighteenth Century to the Present* (Cambridge, 2016), 1-16. (E)

**Suggested Supervision Questions:**

1. What is the role of artifice in Rousseau’s social theory?

2. Why was the notion of perfectibility so important to the argument of Rousseau’s Second Discourse?

3. Why is the general will always right, according to Rousseau?

4. What is the role of historical conjecture in Rousseau’s moral and political thought?

5. How does Rousseau reconcile freedom with sovereignty?
A4 Smith

(E) = e-book available from iDiscover
(M) = available on Moodle

Set text:


Secondary Readings:

Major interpretations:
*N. Phillipson, Adam Smith: An Enlightened Life (London, 2010) (E)
*D. Winch, Adam Smith’s Politics, (Cambridge, 1978) (E)

The Theory of Moral Sentiments
F. Forman-Barzilai, Adam Smith and the Circles of Sympathy: Cosmopolitanism and Moral Theory (Cambridge, 2010) (E)
C. Griswold, Adam Smith and the Virtues of Enlightenment (Cambridge, 1999) (E)
R.P. Hanley, Adam Smith and the Character of Virtue (Cambridge, 2009) (E)
D. Kelly, The Propriety of Liberty: Persons, Passions, and Judgement in Modern Political Thought (Princeton, 2010), chapter 3 (E)
P. Sagar, ‘Beyond sympathy: Smith’s rejection of Hume’s moral theory’, British Journal for the History of Philosophy 25 (2017), 681-705 (E)

Suggested Supervision Questions:

1. Why was Adam Smith confident that moral values stemming from the human capacity for sympathy would be compatible with economic relations based on self-interest?

2. What is the role of sympathy in Smith’s account of the relationship between social ranks in The Theory of Moral Sentiments?

3. What is the relationship between beauty and utility in Smith’s social thought?

4. ‘Beneficence, therefore, is less essential to the existence of society than justice’ (SMITH, Theory of Moral Sentiments). How does Smith justify this claim?

5. ‘It has been objected to me that as I found the sentiment of approbation, which is always agreeable, upon sympathy, it is inconsistent with my system to admit any disagreeable sympathy’ [SMITH, Theory of Moral Sentiments]. How does Smith defend himself against this charge?
A5 Burke

(E) = e-book available from iDiscover
(M) = available on Moodle

Set text:


Secondary Readings:

**General and Introductory**


**Reflections on the Revolution in France**


Reason of State, Conquest and Empire

Suggested Supervision Questions:

1. Is Burke’s Reflections an attack on moral equality?

2. Are there natural rights according to Burke?

3. What, according to Burke, were the benefits conferred on European society by the ‘age of chivalry’?

4. What follows, for Burke, from the idea that ‘Society is indeed a contract’ (BURKE, Reflections on the Revolution in France)?

5. If Burke is a critic of revolution, why does he defend the right of resistance?
A6 Wollstonecraft

(E) = e-book available from iDiscover
(M) = available on Moodle

**Set text:**


**Suggested additional primary texts:**


**Secondary Readings:**

**General and Introductory:**

* C.L. Johnson (ed), The Cambridge Companion to Mary Wollstonecraft (2006), esp. chapters 2, 3,4 and 7 (E).
* S. Tomaselli, ‘The Most Public Sphere of all: The Family’, in E. Eger, C. Grant, C. Gallchoir and P. Warburton (eds), Women, Writing and the Public Sphere 1700-1830 (Cambridge, 2001), pp. 239-56. (M)

**Contexts and Concepts:**

* W. Gunther-Canada, ‘The politics of sense and sensibility: Mary Wollstonecraft and Catharine Macaulay Graham on Edmund Burke’s Reflections on the Revolution in


**Suggested Supervision Questions:**

1. What was Wollstonecraft’s ultimate ambition for women?

2. If Wollstonecraft believed that humans were naturally benevolent, how did she explain what she thought of as the ills of her society?

3. If property was such a great evil, according to Wollstonecraft, why did she not call for its abolition?

4. Did Wollstonecraft privilege reason over emotion?

5. Are women powerless according to Wollstonecraft?
A7 Kant

(E) = e-book available from iDiscover

Set text:


Political Writings, ed. H. Reiss, (2nd edn., Cambridge, 1991) (E)

Secondary readings:

General and Introductory
*P. Guyer, Kant (London, 2006)
A. Wood, Kant (Oxford, 2005)

On Moral Theory:
C. M. Korsgaard, Creating the Kingdom of Ends (Cambridge, 1996). (E)
S. Sedgwick, Kant’s Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals: An Introduction (Cambridge, 2008) (E)
*A. Wood, Kant’s Ethical Thought (Cambridge, 1999), ‘Introduction’ and chaps. 1-5 (E)

On Kant’s Political Theory:
*E. Ellis, Kant’s Politics (New Haven, 2005), chapters 1-3
R. Maliks, Kant’s Politics in Context (Oxford, 2014) (E)
*A. Ripstein, Force and Freedom: Kant’s Legal and Political Philosophy (Cambridge MA, 2009) (E)

On Revolution:
R. Maliks, Kant and the French Revolution (Cambridge, 2022). (E)
On Cosmopolitanism, Colonialism and War:


C. Meckstroth, ‘Hospitality, or Kant’s Critique of Cosmopolitanism and Human Rights,’ *Political Theory*, 46 (2018), 537-59. (E)


Further readings:


**Suggested Supervision Questions:**

1. In what ways, according to Kant, is the human race progressing?

2. Why did Kant’s moral and political theory place freedom above other values?

3. Why did Kant argue that no state should forcibly interfere in the constitution and government of another state?

4. Why, according to Kant, was revolution always immoral, and how did this matter for his political thought?

5. ‘So act that you use humanity, in your own person as well as in the person of any other, always at the same time as an end, never merely as a means’ [KANT, *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*]. What did Kant mean by this?
Elements of the Philosophy of Right, ed. A. Wood (Cambridge, 1991) (E)

Secondary readings:

General and Introductory

Hegel's Social and Political Theory
S. Avineri, Hegel's Theory of the Modern State, (Cambridge, 1972) (E)
*R. Bourke, Hegel’s World Revolutions (Princeton, 2023).
*Elias Buchetmann, Hegel and the Representative Constitution (Cambridge, 2023). (E)
D. Knowles, Routledge Philosophy Guidebook to Hegel and the Philosophy of Right (London, 2002) (E)
C. Taylor, Hegel and Modern Society, (Cambridge, 1979) (E)
*A. Wood, Hegel’s Ethical Thought, (Cambridge, 1990) (E)
R. B. Pippin, Hegel’s Practical Philosophy: Rational agency as ethical life (Cambridge, 2008) (E)

Further readings:
Suggested Supervision Questions:

1. What is the difference between civil society and the state in Hegel?

2. ‘It is the march of God in the world, that there be a state’ [Hegel, Philosophy of Right]. What did Hegel mean by this?

3. How does Hegel distinguish between morality and ethical life?

4. Which was more important to Hegel, the freedom of the individual or the freedom of the community?

5. According to Hegel, why is a modern constitutional monarchy better than a democracy?
(E) = e-book available from iDiscover

Set text:


Recommended additional primary readings:


Secondary readings:

General and biographical studies:


C.B. Welch, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Tocqueville* (Cambridge, 2006), esp. ch.2 (Elster) and ch. 8 (Gannett) (E)


*Tocqueville, the Ancien Régime, and the French Revolution*


S. Drescher, “Why great revolutions will become rare”: Tocqueville’s most neglected prognosis’, *Journal of Modern History*, 64 (1992), 429-54 (E)


Contexts: Tocqueville and Liberal Thought in Nineteenth-Century France
A. de Dijn, French Political Thought from Montesquieu to Tocqueville: Liberty in a Levelled Society? (Cambridge, 2008), chap. 6 (E)
J. Pitts, A Turn to Empire: The Rise of Liberal Imperialism in Britain and France, chap. 7, ‘Tocqueville on the Algeria Question’, (Princeton, 2005), 204-239 (E)
M. Richter, ‘Tocqueville and Guizot on Democracy: From a Type of Society to a Political Regime’, History of European Ideas 30 (2004), 61-82. (E)

Suggested Supervision Questions:

1. Why did Tocqueville argue that the French Revolution had created governments ‘more fragile, but a hundred times more powerful than those that it toppled’ [Tocqueville, The Ancien Régime and the Revolution]?

2. What role did class divisions play in Tocqueville’s account of the end of the Ancien Régime in France?

3. What, for Tocqueville, distinguished the French Revolution from all previous political revolutions?

4. Explain Tocqueville’s contention that governments are at their most vulnerable when they attempt to reform themselves.

5. In The Ancien Régime and the Revolution, did Tocqueville intend to critique the idea of equality or to vindicate it?
A10 Mill

(E) = e-book available from iDiscover

Set text:


Secondary Readings:


General and Introductory
D.O. Brink, Mill’s Progressive Principles (Oxford, 2013) (E)

Mill and Utilitarianism

On Liberty
G. Claeys, Mill and Paternalism (Cambridge, 2013) (E)
Representative Government
G. Conti, Parliament the Mirror of the Nation: Representation, Deliberation, and Democracy in Victorian Britain, (Cambridge, 2019), esp. parts 3-5. (E)
W. Selinger, Parliamentarism from Burke to Weber, (Cambridge, 2019), ch. 6. (E)
N. Urbinati, Mill on Democracy: From the Athenian Polis to Representative Government (Chicago, 2002).

On the Subjection of Women:

Suggested Supervision Questions:
1. How did Mill understand the relation of liberty to utility?
2. Why was Mill’s distinction between ‘true’ and ‘false’ democracy important for his larger theory of the connection between liberty and representative government?
3. How did Mill distinguish duties to the self from duties to others?
4. Is Mill’s political thought better understood as paternalistic or as a critique of paternalism?
5. ‘What J.S. Mill called “true democracy” was not democracy at all, but something entirely different.’ Discuss.
A11 Marx

(E) = e-book available from iDiscover

Set text:


Secondary Readings:

General and introductory
*T. Carver, Marx* (Cambridge, 2018) (E)
J. Elster, *An Introduction to Karl Marx* (Cambridge, 1986). (E)


*A. Wood, Karl Marx, 2nd ed. (Abingdon, 2004) (E)

Marx before 1848
D. Losurdo, *Class Struggle: A political and philosophical history*, (New York, 2016) (E)
D. Moggach and G. Stedman Jones, eds, *The 1848 Revolutions and European Political Thought*, (Cambridge, 2018), chs 9 (by Moggach) and 11 (by Siclovan) (E)
Marx after 1848


G.C. Comninel, M. Musto, V. Wallis, eds, The International after 150 Years: labor vs capital, then and now, (Abingdon, 2015), chs 2-4.

M. Musto, ed., Workers Unite! The International 150 Years Later, (London, 2014) (E)


Themes in Marx’s Political Thought


S. Lukes, Marxism and Morality (Oxford, 1987).


Suggested Supervision Questions:

1. Why did Marx distinguish political emancipation from human emancipation?

2. ‘Communism is for us not a state of affairs to be established, an ideal to which reality must conform. We call communism the real movement that supersedes the present state of affairs’ [MARX, The German Ideology]. What did Marx mean by this?

3. ‘Under the current bourgeois relations of production freedom means free trade, freedom to buy and sell’ [MARX & ENGELS, Manifesto of the Communist Party]. Why was this concept of freedom inadequate for Marx?

4. Why did Marx reject the Gotha Programme’s demand for a ‘just distribution’ of the return to labour, and what does this show about his view of emancipation?

5. ‘The chief defect of all hitherto existing materialism is that the thing, reality, sensuousness, is conceived only in the form of the object or of contemplation’ [MARX, ‘Theses on Feuerbach’]. How did Marx’s conception of ‘materialism’ differ, and how was this important to his thought?
B12 History, Progress and Enlightenment

(E) = e-book available from iDiscover

**Suggested primary reading:**


Immanuel Kant, ‘Idea for a Universal History with a Cosmopolitan Purpose’ (1784) and ‘Conjectures on the Beginning of Human History’ (1786) in *Political Writings*, ed. H. Reiss, (2nd ed., Cambridge, 1991) (E)


**Secondary Readings:**

*Abbr.*


**General and Introductory**


**Vico:**


Kant:
Y. Yovel, Kant and the Philosophy of History (Princeton, 1980).
A. Wood, Kant’s Ethical Thought (Cambridge1999), Chapter 7. (E)

Herder:
*E. Piirimäe, Herder and Enlightenment Politics (Cambridge, 2023) (E).
F.M. Barnard, Herder on Nationality, Humanity, and History (Montreal, 2003) (E)

Hegel:

Suggested Supervision Questions:

1. How did eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century philosophical histories account for human diversity?

2. Did cosmopolitan history compete with or complement histories of civil government in the eighteenth and early nineteenth century?

3. How did eighteenth- and nineteenth-century philosophers account for the progress of Enlightenment?

4. To what extent did eighteenth- and nineteenth-century thinkers argue that history had a purpose?

5. To what extent did eighteenth- and nineteenth-century philosophies of history give rise to opposing narratives of historical development?
B13 Theorists of the Condition of Women

(E) = e-book available from iDiscover

Suggested primary reading:

Eighteenth Century

Mary Astell, Political Writings, ed. P. Springborg (Cambridge 1996) (E)


Catharine Macaulay, Selections from Letters on education with observations on religion and metaphysical subjects (1790), in Political Writings, ed. by M. Skjönsberg, (Cambridge, 2023), pp. 175-250. (E)


Nineteenth Century


Flora Tristan, The Workers Union (1843), ed. by B. Livingston (Urbana, IL, 2007)

Margaret Fuller Ossoli, Woman in the Nineteenth Century, ed. by L.J. Reynolds, (New York; London, 1998); or, ed. by A. B. Fuller, (Boston, 1855): https://www.gutenberg.org/files/8642/8642-h/8642-h.htm


Secondary Readings:

**General and Introductory**


H. Guest, Small Change: Women, Learning, Patriotism, 1750-1810 (Chicago, IL, 2000)

N.J. Hirschmann, Gender, Class & Freedom in Modern Political Theory (Princeton, NJ, 2008) (E)

*S. Knott and B. Taylor (eds), Women, Gender and Enlightenment (Basingstoke, 2005), Part 2, Sections 6, 8, 9 and 10 (E).


K. Offen, European Feminisms, 1700-1950: A Political History (Stanford, CA, 2000) (E)


---

**Mary Astell and the early eighteenth century**


W. Kolbrener and M. Michelson, eds, Mary Astell: Gender, Reason, Faith (Aldershot, 2006), chs 1, 3, 5, 13 (E).


---

**The Enlightenment**


Aarianne Chernock, Men and the Making of Modern British Feminism (Stanford, California, 2010) (E)


---

**The Revolutionary period**


Nineteenth-century Britain and America
B. Bailey, K.P. Viens, C.E. Wright, eds, Margaret Fuller and her Circles, (Durham, NH, 2012) (E)
C. Capper, C. Giorecelli and L.K. Little, eds, Margaret Fuller: Transatlantic Crossings in a Revolutionary Age, (Madison, WI, 2007), chs 3-4. (E)

Feminism, Socialism and Anarchism in the Nineteenth Century
M. Cross and T. Gray, The Feminism of Flora Tristan (Oxford; Providence, RI, 1992)
C.G. Moses and L.W. Rabine, eds, Feminism, Socialism and French Romanticism (Bloomington, IN, 1993) (E)

Suggested Supervision Questions:

1. Did eighteenth- and nineteenth-century theorists of the condition of women think of women as history’s victims?

2. From what did eighteenth- and nineteenth-century theorists of the condition of women argue women should be freed?

3. To what extent did the arguments of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century commentators on the condition of women rest on the natural equality of the sexes?

4. Did eighteenth- and nineteenth-century theorists of the condition of women share a conception of freedom?

5. Were eighteenth- and nineteenth-century theories of the condition of women class-specific?
B14 Justifying Revolution in the Eighteenth-Century Atlantic World

(\textit{E}) = e-book available from iDiscover

\textbf{Revolution in America (1776)}


\textbf{Revolution in France and Saint-Domingue, 1789-1794}


Secondary Readings:

*Abbr.*

**General and Introductory**


*K.M. Baker*, ‘Political Languages of the French Revolution’ in CHPT C18, pp. 626-59 (E)


I. Hampsher-Monk, ‘British Radicalism and the Anti-Jacobins’ in CHPT C18, pp. 660-67 (E)


**The American Revolution**


The French Revolution
M. Forsyth, Reason and Revolution: The Political Thought of the Abbé Sieyes, (Leicester, 1987)
M. Gauchet, Robespierre: The man who divides us the most, (Princeton, NJ: 2022) (E)

The Haitian Revolution

Suggested Supervision Questions:

1. What role did the idea of popular sovereignty play in justifying revolution in the eighteenth century?

2. What was the role of natural rights in the political thought of the late eighteenth-century revolutions?

3. To what extent did eighteenth-century justifications of revolution rest upon appeals to the idea of natural equality?

4. How similar was the concept of liberty for the thinkers of the different Atlantic Revolutions?

5. To what extent was revolutionary thought in the eighteenth-century Atlantic world a reaction against monarchism?
Suggested primary reading:


Emmanuel-Joseph Sieyès, ‘What is the Third Estate?’ (1789) and ‘Controversy between Mr. Paine and M. Emmanuel Sieyès’ (1791) in *Sieyès: Political Writings, including the debate between Sieyès and Tom Paine in 1791*, ed. by M. Sonenscher, (Indianapolis, 2003), pp. 92-162, 163-173.


Suggested additional primary reading:


Secondary reading:

Abbr.

General and Introductory
J. Breuilly, ‘On the Principle of Nationality’ in CHPT C19, pp. 77-109. (E)
*J. Jennings, ‘Constitutional Liberalism in France: from Benjamin Constant to Alexis de Tocqueville’, in CHPT C19, pp. 349-73. (E)
*J. Thompson, ‘Modern Liberty Redefined’ in CHPT C19, pp. 720-47. (E)

The Constitutional Debate in America
T. Ball and J.G.A. Pocock, eds, *Conceptual Change and the Constitution* (Lawrence, Kansas, 1988)

French Revolutionary Constitutional Debates
Suggested Supervision Questions

1. What was meant by ‘representative government’ in late eighteenth- and nineteenth-century constitutional theory?

2. To what extent did the concept of ‘nationality’ transform understandings of popular sovereignty?

3. What limits, if any, did constitutional theorists in the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries believe could be placed on popular sovereignty?

4. To what extent did the American constitutional model inform constitutional debates in late eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Europe?

5. Did constitutional theorists prize stability over individual liberty?
Suggested primary reading:


Johann Gottlieb Fichte, ‘Some Lectures concerning the Scholar’s Vocation’ (1794), in *Early Philosophical Writings*, ed. D. Breazeale (Ithaca, 1993), 144-84.

Johann Gottlieb Fichte, *The Vocation of Man* (1800), ed. by P. Preuss, (Indianapolis, 1987)


Secondary Readings:

General and Introductory


*A. Wood, Fichte’s Ethical Thought* (Cambridge, 2016). (E)

*D. James, Fichte’s Social and Political Philosophy: Property and Virtue* (Cambridge, 2011) (E)


*D. Moggach, ‘Schiller’s Aesthetic Republicanism’, History of Political Thought* 28 (2007), 520-41. (E)


*Eva Piirimäe, Herder and Enlightenment Politics* (Cambridge, 2023) (E).


Humboldt:

Fichte:
A.J. La Vopa, *Fichte, The Self and the Calling of Philosophy, 1762-1799* (Cambridge, 2001)

Novalis

Schiller:

Suggested Supervision Questions:

1. To what extent were German theories of culture at the turn of the nineteenth century also theories of progress?

2. What role did the notion of ‘individuality’ play in German theories of culture and politics around the turn of the nineteenth century?

3. Did the late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century German thinkers who emphasized the political role of culture reject reason?

4. What did German theorists of culture at the turn of the eighteenth to the nineteenth century see as the greatest threat to freedom?

5. Which was more important to German theorists of culture and politics at the turn of the nineteenth century, the individual or the community?
B17 Liberty, Law and the State

(E) = e-book available from iDiscover

Suggested primary reading:


Germaine de Staël, *Considerations on the Principal Events of the French Revolution* (1818), ed. by A. Craiutu (Indianapolis, 2008), Part VI. (E)


Frédéric Bastiat, ‘The State’ (1848) and ‘The Law’ (1850) in *“The Law,” “The State,” and Other Political Writings, 1843-1850*, ed. by J. de Guenin et al., (Indianapolis, 2012), pp. 93-104; 107-146. (E)


Secondary Reading


General and Introductory


J. Jennings, ‘Constitutional Liberalism in France: from Benjamin Constant to Alexis de Tocqueville’, in G. Stedman Jones & G. Claeys (eds), CHPT C19, pp. 349-73. (E)
*M. Sonenscher, After Kant: The Romans, the Germans, and the Moderns in the History of Political Thought, (Princeton, NJ, 2023) (E)
*J. Thompson, ‘Modern Liberty Redefined’ in CHPT C19, pp. 720-47. (E)

Liberalism in France
A. Craiutu, Liberalism under Siege: The political thought of the French Doctrinaires, (Lanham, MD, 2003). (E)
A. de Dijn, French Political Thought from Montesquieu to Tocqueville: Liberty in a Levelled Society? (Cambridge, 2008). (E)
B. Fontana, Germaine de Staël: A political portrait, (Princeton, NJ, 2016) (E)
J. Jennings, Revolution and the Republic: A history of political thought in France since the eighteenth century, (Oxford, 2011). (E)

Benthamite Utilitarianism [See also readings for A10 Mill]
R. Harrison, Bentham, (London, 1983) (E)

Thoreau and American Transcendentalism
D.S. Malachuk, Two Cities: The Political Thought of American Transcendentalism, (Lawrence, KS, 2016). (E)
N. Rosenblum, Another Liberalism: Romanticism and the Reconstruction of Liberal Thought, (Cambridge, MA, 1987), ch. 5 ‘Heroic Liberalism and the Spectacle of Diversity’. (E)

Late Victorian Liberalism
M. Francis, Herbert Spencer and the Invention of Modern Life, (Stocksfield, 2007), Part IV. (E)
Suggested Supervision Questions:

1. From what threats did defenders of modern liberty seek to protect it?

2. Where did theorists of modern liberty believe the individual’s obligation to obey the state ended?

3. What was ‘modern’ about modern liberty?
B18 Political Economy and Its Critics

(E) = e-book available from iDiscover

Suggested primary reading:


Secondary Readings:


General and Introductory


Smith
S. Muthu, ‘Adam Smith’s Critique of International Trading Companies’, Political Theory 36 (2008), 185-212. (E)
K. Tribe, ‘Natural Liberty and Laissez Faire: How Adam Smith became a Free Trade Ideologue’, in S. Copley and K. Sutherland (eds), Adam Smith’s “Wealth of Nations”: New Interdisciplinary Essays (Manchester, 1995), 23-44. (M)

Malthus
R.J. Mayhew, Malthus: The life and legacy of an untimely prophet, (Cambridge, MA, 2014) (E)

Mill
D.E. Miller, Mill’s “Socialism”, Politics, Philosophy & Economics 2 (2003), 213-238. (E)

Marx
M. Heinrich, An Introduction to the Three Volumes of Marx’s Capital, (New York, 2012). (E)
M. Heinrich, How to Read Marx’s Capital: Commentary and Explanations on the Beginning Chapters, (New York, 2021)

**Suggested Supervision Questions:**

1. To what extent were eighteenth- and nineteenth-century political economists concerned with questions of distributive justice?

2. What was the relationship between the interests of government and the interests of the governed, for eighteenth- and nineteenth-century political economists?

3. What role does the concept of ‘class’ play in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century political economy?

4. How did eighteenth- and nineteenth-century political economists explain disparities in wealth between nations?

5. In what sense was political economy in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries a discourse about power?
B19 Socialism before 1848

(E) = e-book available from iDiscover

Suggested primary reading:


[https://archive.org/details/universitycinci06cincgoog/page/n8/mode/2up]


Flora Tristan, *The Worker’s Union* (1843), ed. by B. Livingston, (Urbana, IL, 2007).

Suggested additional primary readings:


Secondary Readings:

General and Introductory

D. Leopold, ‘The Structure of Marx and Engels’ Considered Account of Utopian Socialism’, *History of Political Thought* 26 (2005), 443-466. (E)


D. Moggach and G. Stedman Jones, eds, *The 1848 Revolutions and European Political Thought*, (Cambridge, 2018), chs 1-5, 9, 11, 18. (E)


**Robert Owen and Early British Socialism:**


**Henri Saint-Simon and Early French Socialism:**


**Charles Fourier and Fourierism:**


Louis Blanc:

Pierre-Joseph Proudhon:

Flora Tristan, Socialism and Feminism

Suggested Supervision Questions:

1. Did early socialists regard the state as a potential ally or as an enemy?
2. How did socialist writers before 1848 conceive of the relationship between humanity and nature?
3. Did early socialist thinkers seek to destroy Christianity or to reform it?
4. Did early socialism compete with or complement republican politics?
5. What role did international politics play in early socialist thought?
Suggested primary reading:

The French and British Atlantic Worlds


Quobna Ottobah Cugoano [John Stuart], *Thoughts and Sentiments on the Evils of Slavery* (1787), ed. by V. Carretta, (New York, 1999).


The United States from Independence to the Civil War


Secondary Reading:

**General and Introductory**

**The British Atlantic**
R. Hanley, *Beyond Slavery and Abolition: Black British Writing, c. 1770-1830*, (Cambridge, 2019), esp. ch. 7 ‘Ottabah Cugoano and the “Black Poor”, 1786-1791’ (E)

**The French Atlantic and Haiti**
M.L. Daut, *Awakening the Ashes: An Intellectual History of the Haitian Revolution*, (Chapel Hill, NC, 2023) [Forthcoming, October 2023]
America from Independence to Civil War

Suggested Supervision Questions:

1. Were eighteenth- and nineteenth-century opponents of slavery critics or defenders of commercial society?

2. To what extent was the defence of slavery in the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Atlantic world predicated on the defence of racial hierarchy?

3. To what extent did advocates for the abolition of slavery rely upon the same arguments as advocates for the abolition of the Atlantic slave trade?

4. What was the significance of arguments about the origins of slavery for eighteenth- and nineteenth-century debates about its abolition?

5. To what extent did arguments for the abolition of African slavery in the Americas rest upon the idea of racial equality?
B21 Empire and Civilisation in Nineteenth-Century Political Thought

(E) = e-book available from iDiscover

Suggested primary reading:


Secondary Reading

General and Introductory
* C. Bayly, Recovering Liberties: Indian Thought in the Age of Liberalism and Empire (Cambridge, 2012) (E)
D. Bell, ed., Victorian Visions of Global Order: Empire and International Relations in Nineteenth Century Political Thought (Cambridge, 2008), esp. chs 6, 8, 9 and 10 (E)
* D. Bell, Reordering the World: Essays on Liberalism and Empire (Princeton, NJ, 2016) (E)
A. Brewer, Marxist Theories of Imperialism, 2nd ed. (London, 1990), ch. 2 (on Marx) (E)
G. Claeys, Imperial Sceptics: British Critics of Empire, 1850–1920 (Cambridge, 2010) (E)
D. Kelly, ed., Lineages of Empire: The Historical Roots of British Imperial Thought (Oxford, 2009), esp. ch 1 (E)
J. Levy and I. M. Young, eds, Colonialism and its Legacies (Lanham, 2011), esp. chs. 2, 7, 8, 10, 12 (E)
U. S. Mehta, Liberalism and Empire: A Study in Nineteenth-Century British Liberal Thought, (Chicago, 1999)
S. Muthu, Enlightenment against Empire (Princeton 2003) (E)
S. Muthu, ed., Empire and Modern Political Thought (Cambridge, 2012), esp. chs. 8-13 (E)
* J. Pitts, A Turn to Empire: The Rise of Liberal Imperialism in Britain and France (Princeton, 2005) (E)
B. Schultz and G. Varouxakis, eds, Utilitarianism and Empire, (Lanham, MD, 2005) (E)

Settler Colonies, Self-Government and Imperial Federation
J. Ajzenstat, The Political Thought of Lord Durham, (Kingston; Montréal, 1988) (E)
M. Birchell, ‘Mobilizing Stadial Theory: Edward Gibbon Wakefield’s colonial vision’, Global Intellectual History, (available online, 2022). (E)
D. Winch, Classical Political Economy and Colonies, (London, 1965)

British India
S. Dasgupta, Ethics, Distance and Accountability: The political thought and intellectual context of Rammohun Roy, (C.1772-1833), (New Delhi, 2021)
V. Visana, Uncivil Liberalism: Labour, Capital and Commercial Society in Dadabhai Naoroji’s Political Thought, (Cambridge, 2022) (E)
International Law
J. Pitts, Boundaries of the International: Law and Empire (Cambridge, MA, 2018) (E)

Suggested Supervision Questions:

1. To what extent was the concept of empire in nineteenth-century political thought conceived as distinct from that of the state?

2. Were arguments about the British presence in India significantly different from those about imperialism elsewhere in the world?

3. What was the purpose of imperial government according to nineteenth-century theorists of empire?

4. What, according to theorists of empire and civilization in the nineteenth century, was the proper relationship of the colony to the metropole?

5. To what extent was imperial governance a liberal endeavour according to theorists of empire and civilization in the nineteenth century?
Appendix: Examiner’s Reports

POL8 and POL10 are examined and marked separately. Examiners’ reports for Part II papers can be found on the POLIS website: Second Year Students | Department of Politics and International Studies (POLIS) (cam.ac.uk) / Third Year Students | Department of Politics and International Studies (POLIS) (cam.ac.uk).

Past Papers can be found here: Course: History Undergraduate Exams: Past Papers and Reports | Moodle (cam.ac.uk). For POL8, follow the link to Part IB and select T2 (the History Faculty’s designation for the paper). For POL10, follow the link to Part II and select Paper 4 (the corresponding History paper). Questions from the 2023-24 exam papers have been integrated into this guide in the suggested supervision questions appended to the reading lists.

N.B. Reports prior to 2023-4 refer to an older syllabus, which differed in detail from the current syllabus. Reflecting the changes, the History Faculty has removed online access to past papers from before 2023-4. Those interested should still be able to consult them in hard copy through the Cambridge Library System.