Introduction to the History of Political Thought Papers:

For several decades now, Cambridge has been the 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 Politics. 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. 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 One paper) 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.
Introduction to the Period:

Beginning with the Enlightenment and extending from the American and French revolutions to the wave of revolutions in 1848 and the challenge of capitalism in the thought of Karl Marx, this paper explains the formation of the fundamental concepts of modern politics. The line between the sacred and the civil, 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 nineteenth-century rise of the idea of nation-states and nationalism, the modern concept of empire, the demand for gender equality: 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 understanding political thought, including the foundations of truly modern politics.

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. Note that some lectures from other Faculties may be included in this list because the expertise in the history of political thought in Cambridge is shared among several Faculties. Lecturers are encouraged to place their outlines, bibliographies and other material on the paper’s Moodle site in advance of the lecture. (Moodle is the replacement for the old CamTools.) 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-three named authors (section A) and historical 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. The following page just indicates some possibilities, and is in no sense meant to be directive, simply illustrative, and lists no more than the normal six supervisory slots you should expect, but there is of course considerable overlap between certain authors and themes.
### Some Possible Pathways through this Paper (indicative/illustrative only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. Sociability and Commercial Society in the Enlightenment</th>
<th>II. Republicanism &amp; Political Thought</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Natural Law &amp; History</td>
<td>1. Montesquieu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Montesquieu</td>
<td>2. Hume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Hume</td>
<td>3. Rousseau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Smith</td>
<td>5. French Revolution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III. Critics of Social Contract Theory</th>
<th>IV. Towards Perpetual Peace</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Hume</td>
<td>1. Luxury &amp; Commercial Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Burke</td>
<td>2. Rousseau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Gender &amp; Political Thought (18/19th centuries)</td>
<td>3. Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Wollstonecraft</td>
<td>4. Kant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Bentham</td>
<td>5. Constant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V. Consequences of the French Revolution</th>
<th>VI. German Ideas of Freedom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Rousseau</td>
<td>1. Rousseau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. French Revolution</td>
<td>2. Kant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Burke</td>
<td>3. Culture &amp; Aesthetic Politics in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Constant</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Tocqueville</td>
<td>4. Nationalism &amp; the State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Nationalism &amp; the State</td>
<td>5. Hegel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Marx</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VII. The Background to Marx</th>
<th>VIII. Progress and Civilization in Nineteenth-Century Thought</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Rousseau</td>
<td>1. Gender &amp; Political Thought (18/19th centuries)/ Social Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Smith</td>
<td>2. Hegel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Hegel</td>
<td>4. Tocqueville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Socialism before 1848</td>
<td>5. Mill</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

Lectures will take place in the History Faculty Building unless otherwise indicated. The following information was last updated 28th September 2017. Please consult online lecture lists for the most up-to-date information, though please note the additional information concerning Dr. Guyatt’s lectures in Michaelmas, detailed below.

Michaelmas Term:

DR NICK GUYATT
The Political Worlds of the American Founding, 1781-1790 (B16) (4 lectures: F 10, weeks 6-9)¹

DR R. SCURR
Social science and political thought. (B23) (2 lectures, F 10, weeks 4-5)

PROF. J. ROBERTSON
Natural Law, Sociability, and Luxury: (B14, B15) (4 lectures, M 9, weeks 1-4)

PROF. J. ROBERTSON
Montesquieu and Hume (4 lectures, M 9, weeks 5-8)

DR C. MECKSTROTH
German Political Thought from Kant to Marx (A7: Kant, A10: Hegel, B18: Culture and Aesthetic Politics in Germany, A13: Marx) (8 lectures, M 12)

Lent Term:

MISS S. TOMASELLI
Gender and Political Thought (B19) (2 lectures: F 9, weeks 7-8)

DR. T. HOPKINS
French Political Thought from the Revolution to Tocqueville (B16: The French Revolution; A9: Constant; B20: Socialism before 1848; A11: Tocqueville) (8 Lectures, M 12)

PROF J. ROBERTSON
Rousseau and Smith (4 lectures: Tu. 12, weeks 1-4)

MISS S. TOMASELLI
Burke (2 lectures: Tu. 12, weeks 5-6)

¹ N.B. For exceptional reasons, Dr Guyatt will be delivering his last lecture on Friday 1st December, outside of full term (ie. Week 9). Due to limitations in the software used for timetabling, some online versions of the lecture list suggest that his lectures finish in week 8. The information printed here is correct.
MISS S. TOMASELLI
Wollstonecraft (2 lectures: Tu. 12, weeks 7-8)

DR C. MECKSTROTH
Bentham and Mill (4 lectures: W 12, weeks 1-4)

DR D. BELL
Nationalism and the State (2 lectures: W 12, weeks 5-6)

DR D. BELL
Empire and Civilisation (2 lectures: W 12, weeks 7-8)

Easter Term:

PROF. J. ROBERTSON
Class: Themes in eighteenth-century political thought. (4 one-hour classes: M 12, weeks 1-4)

DR C. MECKSTROTH
Class: Themes in nineteenth-century political thought. (4 one-hour classes: Tu. 12, weeks 1-4)
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 more thematic or historical 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 Bentham
A9 Constant
A10 Hegel
A11 Tocqueville
A12 John Stuart Mill
A13 Marx

Section B

B14 Natural Law and History
B15 Luxury and Commercial Society
B16 The Political Thought of the American Revolution
B17 The Political Thought of the French Revolution
B18 Culture and aesthetic politics in Germany 1770-1810
B19 Gender and Political Thought in the 18th and 19th centuries
B20 Socialism before 1848
B21 Nationalism and the State
B22 Empire and Civilisation in nineteenth-century Political Thought
B23 Social Science and Political Thought
The Examination: 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 examination rubric is: Answer three questions, at least one from each section. (Overlap between answers must be avoided.)

SAMPLE EXAMINATION PAPER

SECTION A

1. Why did Hume deny that ‘self-love’ provided the basis for political society?
2. On what basis did Montesquieu rest his criticisms of ‘despotic government’?
3. Why and with what consequences for his theories did Rousseau argue that man in a state of nature cannot perfect himself?
4. How compatible are the views about human motivation contained in Smith’s *Theory of Moral Sentiments* and his *Wealth of Nations*?
5. How important are Burke’s views about religion for his political theories?
6. Why did Wollstonecraft distinguish the rights of man from the rights of woman?
7. Why did Kant argue that governments should not aim to promote the happiness of the governed?
8. Why did Bentham give so much prominence to the analysis of human motivation in his political writings?
9. How did Constant reconcile his ‘great veneration for the past’ with his enthusiasm for the progress of enlightenment?
10. Why did Hegel believe that modern states differ from ancient states?
11. In what respects did Tocqueville believe that the American experience was instructive for Europe?
12. To what extent did the value of liberty of thought for Mill depend on its associations with liberty of action?
13. Why had Marx so little patience with the theories of so many nineteenth century socialists?

SECTION B

14. Why was Vico so insistent that the principles of his ‘New Science’ were different from those of the great Protestant exponents of Natural Law?
15. How far did theorists of commercial society believe that governments could and should promote the public interest?
16. How important to early American political thought was the British constitutional experience?
17. Can the origins of the Terror persuasively be located in French revolutionary patterns of thought?
18. How novel were German Romantics’ ideas about the nature of ‘freedom’?
19. Did the political language of nineteenth-century theorists of the condition of women differ from that used by their eighteenth-century predecessors?
20. Did early socialism possess a political theory?
21. Was nationalism entailed by the principle of nationality?
22. Is utilitarianism necessarily imperialist?
23. Explain the ambition of nineteenth-century positivists to replace politics by science.
READING LISTS

The aim of Section B is to allow students 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. Candidates need not master every one of the Section B primary texts, but need to show evidence of engagement with texts relating to each topic.

The Bibliography is designed to aid Lecturers, Supervisors, and students. Students are not expected to read every item on it, but should be guided in their reading by their supervisors. They may then return to the Bibliography for further reading in an aspect of an author or topic which particularly interests them, and for revision reading.

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

The reading list provided by the History Faculty is lengthy. In recognition of the fact that the structure of teaching and the timing of supervisions differs for HSPS students, it has been thought helpful to divide the secondary reading for each topic into two parts: suggested secondary reading and further reading. Under the first heading, students will find those texts thought to be most helpful as an introduction to the topic, and a range of significant interpretations of the chosen thinker or theme. Under the second, they will find further reading suggestions that will facilitate more in depth study of topics. The division is by no means intended to be prescriptive, and individual supervisors may well recommend that students begin with texts from the ‘further reading’ sections.
A1. HUME

(E) = e-book available via LibrarySearch.

Set texts:


Suggested secondary reading:

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

Philosophy, politics and history:
D. Forbes, Hume’s Philosophical Politics (Cambridge, 1975)
*J. Robertson, The Case for the Enlightenment: Scotland and Naples 1680-1760 (Cambridge, 2005), chapter 6, pp. 256-324. (E)
*J.P. Wright, Hume’s Treatise of Human Nature: An Introduction (Cambridge, 2009) (E)

Moral philosophy:

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

Further secondary reading:

Philosophy, politics and history:
S. Blackburn, How to Read Hume (London, 2008)


**Moral philosophy:**


L. Turco, ‘Hutcheson and Hume in a Recent Polemic’ in Mazza and Ronchetti (eds), *New Essays on David Hume*, 171-198.

**Politics and political economy:**


C. Wennerlind and M. Schabas (eds), *David Hume’s Political Economy* (London and New York, 2008): esp. the chapters by Wennerlind and Schabas on money; Berry on superfluous value (luxury); Charles and Cheney on French translations of Hume; Hont (above) on the rich country – poor country question.

**Suggested supervision questions (from old Tripos papers):**

‘It is therefore, on opinion only that government is founded’ [HUME, ‘Of the First Principles of Government’]. What, for Hume, followed from this proposition?

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

Why did Hume think that the concept of property was fundamental to an understanding of politics?

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

To what extent did the arguments of Hume’s political essays depend on the principles set out in Book III of the *Treatise of Human Nature*?
A2. MONTESQUIEU

(E) = e-book available via LibrarySearch.

Set Text:


Suggested secondary reading:

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

Further secondary reading:

D. Kelly, The Propriety of Liberty: Persons, Passions, and Judgement in Modern Political Thought (Princeton, 2010), chapter 2
R. Kingston (ed), Montesquieu and His Legacy (Albany NY, 2008)
P.A. Rahe, Montesquieu and the Logic of Liberty (New Haven CT, 2009)

Particular topics:


Suggested supervision questions (from old Tripos papers):

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

Explain Montesquieu’s confidence that despotism was unlikely to be established in Europe.

What scope did Montesquieu’s *Spirit of the Laws* allow for rulers to effect change by legislation?

Why was Montesquieu so hostile to ancient forms of government, republics in particular?

How did Montesquieu’s definition of liberty bear on his judgment of ancient and modern forms of government?

Why did Montesquieu suggest that the English needed to be particularly jealous of their liberty?
A3. ROUSSEAU

(E) = e-book available from LibrarySearch

Set Texts:


Suggested secondary reading:

General and introductory
N.O. Keohane, Philosophy and the State in France: The Renaissance and the Enlightenment (Princeton NJ, 1980), chapter 15

More particularly,
C. Brooke, Philosphic Pride. Stoicism and Political Thought from Lipsius to Rousseau (Princeton, 2012), Ch. 8: Jean-Jacques Rousseau (E).
*F. 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) collected articles, including:
pp. 1-28: ‘Perfectible Apes in Decadent Cultures: Rousseau’s Anthropology Revisited’, also in Daedalus, 107 (1978), 107-34;

Further secondary reading:

A. Abizadeh, ‘Banishing the Particular: Rousseau on Rhetoric, Patrie, and the Passions’, Political Theory 29 ( ), 556-582.


C. Kelly and E. Grace eds., *Rousseau on Women, Love and Family* (Hanover NH, 2009)


Rousseau’s contexts


Suggested supervision questions (from old Tripos papers):

How would Rousseau’s social contract rectify the inequality which he believed had corrupted modern society?

‘In a word, I see no tolerable mean between the most austere Democracy and the most perfect Hobbesianism’ ['Letter to Mirabeau', 1767]. What light does this comment by Rousseau throw on his Social Contract?

How would Rousseau achieve the transparency among individuals required by the concept of the general will?

Does time have a constructive as well as a negative role to play in Rousseau’s political thought?
How important was religion in Rousseau’s *Social Contract*?
Did Rousseau suppose that *amour propre* could be turned to man’s moral and political advantage?

A4. SMITH

(E) = e-book available from LibrarySearch

Set Texts:


Suggested secondary reading:

Major interpretations:


*D. Winch, Adam Smith’s Politics*, (Cambridge, 1978) (E)

The *Theory of Moral Sentiments*


C. Griswold, *Adam Smith and the Virtues of Enlightenment* (Cambridge, 1999) (E)


The *Wealth of Nations*


Further secondary reading:

D. Kelly, *The Propriety of Liberty: Persons, Passions, and Judgement in Modern Political Thought* (Princeton, 2010), chapter 3


The Theory of Moral Sentiments
F. Forman-Barzilai, Adam Smith and the Circles of Sympathy: Cosmopolitanism and Moral Theory (Cambridge, 2010) (E)
R.P. Hanley, Adam Smith and the Character of Virtue (Cambridge, 2009) (E)

The Wealth of Nations
E. Rothschild, Economic Sentiments: Adam Smith, Condorcet and the Enlightenment (Cambridge, Mass, 2001), chapters 4, 8

The ‘Adam Smith Problem’

Suggested supervision questions (from old Tripos papers):

Did Adam Smith provide commercial society with a moral justification?

What did Adam Smith take to have been the consequences of the ‘unnatural and retrograde order’ of Europe’s historical development?

To what extent did Adam Smith believe that governments should intervene to prevent particular economic interests from disadvantaging others?

Which principles of justice underlay Adam Smith’s account of commercial society?

Which was more basic to Smith’s theory of moral sentiments, sympathy or propriety?

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?

Did Adam Smith believe that the pernicious consequences of international commercial competition could be satisfactorily contained?
A5. BURKE

(E) = e-book available from LibrarySearch

Set Texts:

Pre-Revolutionary Writings, ed. I. Harris, (Cambridge, 1993) (E)

Suggested secondary reading:

R. Bourke, Empire and Revolution: The Political Life of Edmund Burke (Princeton, 2015)

Further secondary reading:

P. Bullard, Edmund Burke and the Art of Rhetoric (Cambridge, 2014) (E)
I. Crowe (ed), An Imaginative Whig: Reassessing the Life and Thought of Edmund Burke (Columbia, Missouri, 2005)

*Suggested supervision questions (from old Tripos papers):*

Did Burke think of civilization as fragile?

What in Burke’s view made the revolution in France so very different from all previous political upheavals?

‘A state without the means of some change is without the means of its conservation’ [BURKE, *Reflections on the Revolutions in France*]. When and how did Burke think such change would or should come about?

Given his view of the need to be governed by men of ability, why did Burke not argue for meritocracy?

What role did religious institutions play in Burke’s political thought?

Did Burke entirely reject the idea that men had rights?

According to Burke, what role do passions and sentiments play in politics?
A6. WOLLSTONECRAFT

(E) = e-book available from LibrarySearch

Set Text:


Recommended additional primary texts:


Suggested secondary reading:


*S. Bergès and A. Coffee (eds), The Social and Political Philosophy of Mary Wollstonecraft (Oxford, 2016)

M.H. Guest, Small Change: Women, Learning, Patriotism, 1750-1810 (Chicago, 2000), Introduction & Part IV.

C.L. Johnson (ed), The Cambridge Companion to Mary Wollstonecraft (2006), esp. chapters 2, 3, 4 and 7 (E).


Further secondary reading:


W. Gunther-Canada, Rebel Writer: Mary Wollstonecraft and Enlightenment Politics (DeKalb, Illinois, 2001)

Suggested supervision questions (from old Tripos papers):
What was Wollstonecraft’s ultimate ambition for women?
Did Wollstonecraft believe that women were enslaved by their passions?
Did Wollstonecraft want women to be more like men?
How did Wollstonecraft justify her usage of the language of rights in her Vindications?
Did Mary Wollstonecraft believe in the progress of civilization?
Was Wollstonecraft more concerned with emancipation than with rights?
What did Wollstonecraft see in the French Revolution?
A7. KANT

(E) = e-book available from LibrarySearch

Set Texts:

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

Suggested secondary reading:

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

On Moral Theory:
S. Sedgwick, Kant’s Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals: An Introduction (Cambridge, 2008) (E)
*A. Wood, Kant’s Ethical Thought (Cambridge, 1999) (E)

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

On Anthropology & Human Nature:

On Revolution:

On Cosmopolitanism:
O. Höffe, Kant’s Cosmopolitan Theory of Law and Peace (Cambridge, 2006)
P. Kleingeld, Kant and Cosmopolitanism: The Philosophical Ideal of World Citizenship (Cambridge, 2011) (E)
C. Meckstroth, ‘Hospitality, or Kant’s Critique of Cosmopolitanism and Human Rights,’ Political Theory (Forthcoming, 2017).

Further secondary reading:

M. Kuehn, Kant: A Biography (Cambridge, 2001) (E)
J. C. Laursen, ‘The Subversive Kant: The Vocabulary of “Public” and “Publicity”’, Political Theory, 14 (1986), 584-603
R. Maliks, Kant’s Politics in Context (Oxford, 2014) (E)
R.J. Sullivan, An Introduction to Kant’s Ethics, (Cambridge, 1994) (E)

Suggested supervision questions (from old Tripos papers):

Why did Kant think that a state is required to secure justice in domestic politics, but that international justice does not require a world state?

How did Kant reconcile the claim that rebellion is never justified with his insistence that the only good reason for a state is to secure citizens’ freedom?

‘Kant betrayed his moral principles by denying a right to revolution.’ Discuss.

Why did Kant think we must strive gradually to approximate the idea of perpetual peace, even though we cannot be certain ever to attain it?

Did Kant’s view of individual freedom as the central political value lead him to advocate a minimal state?

Why did Kant’s moral and political theory place freedom above other values?
A8. BENTHAM

(E) = e-book available from LibrarySearch

Set Texts:


Suggested secondary reading:

* R. Harrison, Bentham, (London, 1983)
* J. Waldron, Nonsense upon Stilts: Bentham, Burke and Marx on the Rights of Man, (London, 1987)

Further secondary reading:


Suggested supervision questions (from old Tripos papers):

What implications did Bentham’s view of ‘fictions’ have for politics?

Is it appropriate to describe Bentham’s ideas as philosophically and politically ‘radical’?

Why did Bentham think the principle of utility offers a more secure foundation for politics than natural rights?

Do Bentham’s utilitarian principles support or compete with democracy?

Why was Bentham more concerned with the consequences of decisions than the rightful authority to make them?

How did Bentham’s criticisms of Blackstone inform his view of politics?

‘The community is a fictitious body… The interest of the community then is, what? – the sum of the interests of the several members who compose it’ [BENTHAM, An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation]. What role did this claim play in Bentham’s political theory?
A9. CONSTANT

(E) = e-book available from LibrarySearch

Set Text:

Political Writings, ed. B. Fontana, (Cambridge, 1988)

Suggested secondary reading:

A. de Dijn, *French Political Thought from Montesquieu to Tocqueville: Liberty in a Levelled Society?* (Cambridge, 2008), chap. 4 (E)

*B Fontana, Benjamin Constant and the Post-Revolutionary Mind* (New Haven, CT, 1991)

B. Garsten, ‘Religion and the Case against Ancient Liberty: Benjamin Constant’s Other Lectures’ *Political Theory* 38 (2010), 4-33.


*J. Jennings, ‘Constitutional Liberalism in France: from Benjamin Constant to Alexis de Tocqueville’, in G. Stedman Jones & G. Claeys (eds), The Cambridge History of Nineteenth-Century Political Thought* (Cambridge, 2011) (E)


*H. Rosenblatt, Liberal Values: Benjamin Constant and the Politics of Religion* (Cambridge, 2008) (E)


Suggested further reading:

Suggested additional primary texts:

B. Constant, *Principles of Politics Applicable to all Governments* [1806], ed. by E. Hofmann, trans. by D. O’Keefe, (Indianapolis IN, 2004) [available at oll.libertyfund.org].


Secondary reading:


G. Dodge, *Benjamin Constant’s Philosophy of Liberalism: A Study in Politics and Religion*, (Chapel Hill, NC, 1980)


*Suggested supervision questions (from old Tripos papers):*

According to Constant, how had the rise of commerce in the modern world made the protection of individual liberty both possible and necessary?

Did Constant’s view of liberty depend on a critique of democracy?

Did Constant’s criticisms of the Jacobins and of Bonaparte emphasize their similarities or differences, and what were the consequences for his political theory?

Why did Constant explain the politics of his day in terms of a contrast between ‘modern’ and ‘ancient’ societies?

What role did the idea of a ‘neutral power’ play in Constant’s political theory?

Why did Constant argue that representative assemblies should be formed by property holders?

‘Variety is life; uniformity is death’ [Constant, *The Spirit of Conquest and Usurpation*]. What implications did this claim have for Constant’s political theory?
A10. HEGEL

(E) = e-book available from LibrarySearch

Set Texts:

*Elements of the Philosophy of Right*, ed. A. Wood (Cambridge, 1991) [especially Preface, Introduction, and Ethical Life]

Suggested secondary reading:

General and introductory
*F.C. Beiser, Hegel (London, 2005) (E)*

Hegel’s Social and Political Theory
*S. Avineri, Hegel’s Theory of the Modern State, (Cambridge, 1972) (E)*
*D. Knowles, Routledge Philosophy Guidebook to Hegel and the Philosophy of Right (London, 2002) (E)*
*F. Neuhouser, Foundations of Hegel’s Social Theory: Actualizing Freedom (Cambridge MA, 2000) (E).*
*C. Taylor, Hegel and Modern Society, (Cambridge, 1979) (E)*

Specifically on the philosophy of history:
*T. Pinkard, Does History Make Sense? Hegel on the Historical Shapes of Justice (Cambridge, MA, 2017).*

On Religion:

Further secondary reading:

E.M. Dale, Hegel, the End of History, and the Future (Cambridge, 2014) (E)*
Suggested supervision questions (from old Tripos papers):

If Hegel’s state was supposed to be based on the freedom of the citizens, why was he so critical of democracy?

Explain the relation between Hegel’s view that society is in one sense always free and his argument that it has become more truly free in the course of history.

Why did Hegel think the modern state succeeded at realizing freedom where ancient models had failed?

‘Hegel sacrifices the individual to the state.’ Discuss.

Why did Hegel begin his discussion of ethical life with the family?

What did Hegel’s political thought owe to his view of the ancient Greek polis?

‘It is the march of God in the world, that there be a state’ [Hegel, Philosophy of Right]. What did Hegel mean by this?
A11. TOCQUEVILLE

(E) = e-book available from LibrarySearch

Set Texts:

Democracy in America, eds H.C. Mansfield and D. Winthrop (Chicago, 2000)
The Ancien Régime and the Revolution, ed. J. Elster (Cambridge 2011) (E)

Suggested secondary reading:

J. Elster, Alexis de Tocqueville: The First Social Scientist (Cambridge, 2009) (E)
P. Manent, Tocqueville and the Nature of Democracy (Lanham MD, 1996)
*C.B. Welch, De Tocqueville (Oxford, 2001) (E)

Further reading:

Additional primary texts:
Tocqueville on America after 1840: Letters and Other Writings, eds. A. Craiutu and J. Jennings (Cambridge, 2009) (E)

Secondary literature:
L. Damrosch, Tocqueville’s Discovery of America (New York, 2010)
A. de Dijn, French Political Thought from Montesquieu to Tocqueville: Liberty in a Levelled Society? (Cambridge, 2008), chap. 6 (E)

*Suggested supervision questions (from old Tripos papers):*

Did Tocqueville think that the political dangers facing France and the United States required similar or different responses?

Why did Tocqueville think ‘mores’ (*moeurs*) were so important for protecting liberty?

How important to Tocqueville’s account of liberty and the threats it faced in a democratic society was his understanding of the historical role of the aristocracy?

Why did Tocqueville distinguish between a ‘federal’ and an ‘incomplete national government’, and consider the latter ‘one of the great discoveries of political science in our age’?

Why did Tocqueville suggest that great revolutions would happen less often in a democratic society?

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*]?
A12. J.S. MILL

(E) = e-book available from LibrarySearch

Set Texts:


Suggested secondary reading:


G. Claeyys, Mill and Paternalism (Cambridge, 2013) (E)
N. Urbinati, Mill on Democracy: From the Athenian Polis to Representative Government (Chicago, 2002).

On Economics:

On the Subjection of Women:

On International Relations:
J. Pitts, A Turn to Empire: The Rise of Imperial Liberalism in Britain and France (Princeton NJ, 2005), Ch. 5, pp. 123-162.
G. Varouxakis, Liberty Abroad. J.S. Mill on International Relations (Cambridge, 2013) (E)
Further secondary reading:

F. Hayek, *John Stuart Mill and Harriet Taylor: Their Correspondence and Subsequent Marriage* (London, 1951)
D. Kelly, *The Propriety of Liberty: Persons, Passions, and Judgement in Modern Political Thought*, (Princeton NJ, 2010), Ch. 4 (E)
D.E. Miller, Mill’s “Socialism”, *Politics, Philosophy & Economics* 2 (2003), 213-238.

Suggested supervision questions (from old Tripos papers):

How important to Mill’s political theory was faith in the progress of civilization over time?
‘I regard utility as the ultimate appeal on all ethical questions; but it must be utility in the largest sense, grounded on the permanent interests of man as a progressive being’ [On Liberty]. What followed from this definition of utility for Mill’s theory of liberty?

Were Mill’s arguments against the subjection of women consistent with the qualifications he would place on rights to self-governance and equal suffrage in Considerations on Representative Government?

Why was Mill’s distinction between ‘true’ and ‘false’ democracy important for his larger theory of the connection between liberty and representative government?

How did Mill understand the political challenges posed by economic progress?

To what extent did Mill’s political thought support the authority of elites?

How did Mill’s theory of representative government reflect his claim that everyone deserves ‘to have his opinion counted at its worth, though not more than its worth’ [MILL, Considerations on Representative Government]?
A13. MARX

(E) = e-book available from LibrarySearch

Set Texts:

Marx: Early Political Writings, J. O’Malley and R. A. Davis eds (Cambridge, 1994)
Marx: Later Political Writings, ed. T. Carver (Cambridge, 1996)

Suggested secondary reading:

General and introductory
*J. Elster, An Introduction to Karl Marx (Cambridge, 1986).
*G. Stedman Jones, Karl Marx: Greatness and Illusion, (London, 2016)

More particularly,
*D. Leopold, The Young Karl Marx: German Philosophy, Modern Politics, and Human Flourishing (Cambridge, 2007) (E).

Further secondary reading:

F. Wheen, *Karl Marx* (New York, 1999)

*Suggested supervision questions (from old Tripos papers):*

Why and in what way did Marx think human emancipation required abolishing the state?
What role did ‘alienation’ play in Marx’s discussions of religion, the state, and the capitalist economy?
Why was Marx so insistent in the *Critique of the Gotha Programme* that the Lassallean socialists were mistaken in identifying socialism with a ‘fair distribution’ of goods?
‘The philosophers have only interpreted the world, in various ways; the point is to change it’ [MARX, ‘On Feuerbach’]. So why did he write more about history and economics than about plans for change?
Why did Marx distinguish political emancipation from human emancipation?
Did Marx’s analysis of commodity fetishism in *Capital* break with his earlier theory of alienation?
B14. NATURAL LAW AND HISTORY

(E) = e-book available from LibrarySearch

Suggested primary reading:


Suggested secondary reading:

*M. Goldie and R. Wokler (eds), The Cambridge History of Eighteenth-Century Political Thought (Cambridge, 2006), Part III: Natural Jurisprudence and the Science of Legislation, including:
  9. K. Haakonssen, ‘German Natural Law’,

More particularly, on Natural Law in Germany:
*T.J. Hochstrasser, Natural Law Theories in the Early Enlightenment (Cambridge, 2000) (E)

On Natural Law in Scotland:

On Vico’s response to Natural Law:

Further secondary reading:


*Suggested supervision questions (from old Tripos papers):*

Why was Natural Law still so important for political thought in the early eighteenth century?

Why did Vico think that his ‘rational civil theology of divine providence’ held the key to understanding the historical development of human societies?

Did the increasingly historical approach to Natural Law in the eighteenth century make it less ‘natural’?

Were eighteenth-century theories of sociability responses to a weakening of faith in natural reason?

To what extent did post-Hobbesian natural law take a historical turn?

Why did Vico think that the Protestant natural lawyers had failed to explain human sociability?
E15. LUXURY AND COMMERCIAL SOCIETY

(E) = e-book available from LibrarySearch

Suggested primary reading:

Jean-François Melon, A Political Essay upon Commerce, transl. David Bindon (Dublin, 1738, repr. 1739) chs 1-9, 15-18 (available on Eighteenth-Century Collections Online; access through http://libguides.cam.ac.uk/eresources)

Suggested secondary reading:

The luxury debate and political economy:

On Mandeville:
E.J. Hundert, The Enlightenment's Fable (Cambridge, 1994) (E)

The French debate:
N.O. Keohane, Philosophy and the State in France: The Renaissance to the Enlightenment (Princeton NJ, 1980), Parts III and IV.

On Ferguson:

Further secondary reading:

H.C. Clark, Commerce and Absolutism in Old Regime France, (Lanham, MD, 2007), chapters 2-8.
R. Hamowy, Adam Smith, Adam Ferguson and the Division of Labour, Economica, n.s. 35 (1968), 244-259.

Suggested supervision questions (from old Tripos papers):

Why was Fénelon’s critique of luxury so enduringly provocative to those who would defend commercial society in the eighteenth century?

Was the eighteenth-century luxury debate about the town versus the country?
Where did Adam Ferguson’s *Essay on the History of Civil Society* leave the luxury debate?

Why did Mandeville’s defence of luxury convince so few in the eighteenth century?

Why did both defenders and critics of commercial society use the language of vice and corruption?

Why was Fénelon’s utopia of agrarian self-sufficiency so persistent a reference point for participants in the eighteenth-century luxury debate?
B16. POLITICAL THOUGHT OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

(E) = e-book available from LibrarySearch

Suggested primary reading:

Supplementary primary reading:

Suggested secondary reading:

**Further secondary reading:**

T. Ball and J.G.A. Pocock (eds), *Conceptual Change and the Constitution* (Lawrence, Kansas, 1988)
R. Beeman et al. (eds), *Beyond Confederation: Origins of the Constitution and American National Identity* (Chapel Hill, NC, 1987)
H. Belz, R. Hoffman and P. Albert (eds), *To Form a More Perfect Union: The Critical Ideas of the Constitution* (Charlottesville, Virginia, 1992)
R.K. Matthews, *If Men Were Angels: James Madison and the Heartless Empire of Reason* (Lawrence, Kansas, 1995)


*Suggested supervision questions (from old Tripos papers):*

What was at issue in the choice between a ‘confederal’, a ‘federal’ or a ‘national’ constitution for the United States of America?

‘Neither wholly national nor wholly federal’ [*The Federalist*, number 39]. What did James Madison mean by this characterization of the Constitution of 1787?

Was the Constitution of 1787 the fulfilment or a repudiation of the Declaration of Independence?
Why did John Adams think that the word Republic ‘may signify any-thing, every-thing, or nothing’ [ADAMS to J. H. Tiffany, April 30, 1819]? 

‘Divide et impera [divide and rule], the reprobated axiom of tyranny, is under certain qualifications, the only policy, by which a republic can be administered on just principles’ [MADISON, 1787]. Discuss with reference to the U.S. federal constitution.

Did the Anti-Federalists and the Federalists share a common vision of America?

Were the Anti-Federalists the only true republicans among theorists of the American Revolution?
B17. POLITICAL THOUGHT OF THE FRENCH REVOLUTION

(E) = e-book available from LibrarySearch

Suggested primary reading:

Sieyès, Political Writings, ed M. Sonenscher (Indianapolis, 2003)
Condorcet, Political Writings, ed. S. Lukes and N. Urbinati (Cambridge, 2012)
Paine, The Rights of Man, ed. G. Claeyts (Indianapolis, 1992)

Also:
G. de Staël, Considerations on the Principal Events of the French Revolution, ed. A. Craiutu (Indianapolis IN, 2008)

Suggested secondary reading:

M. Forsyth, Reason and Revolution: The Political Thought of the Abbé Sieyes, (Leicester, 1987)

Further secondary reading:

K.M. Baker, Condorcet: From Natural Philosophy to Social Mathematics (Chicago, 1975)
H.C. Clark, *Compass of Society: Commerce and Absolutism in Old Regime France*, (Lanham MD, 2007), chapters 8-10.

*Suggested supervision questions (from old Tripos papers):*

Did the political theorists of the French Revolution re-define the concept of a republic?

Was sovereignty the central issue in the political debates of the French Revolution?

‘Political unity was the central problem facing political thinkers in the French Revolution.’ Discuss with reference to two or more authors.

Did any French Revolutionary thinker explain how to reconcile respect for universal ‘rights of man and citizen’ with the constituent power of the people?

Which was more important to thinkers of the French Revolution, reason or virtue?

How important was the concept of equality to the political theorists of the French Revolution?

‘There must not be any confusion between a constituting power and a constituted power’ [SIÉYÈS, *Views of the Executive Means*]. Why did subsequent political thinkers of the French Revolution struggle to avoid this confusion?
Suggested primary reading:


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


Suggested secondary reading:


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


Further secondary reading:


Herder:
F.M. Barnard, Herder on Nationality, Humanity, and History (Montreal, 2003)
S. Muthu, Enlightenment against Empire (Princeton, 2003), chap. 6
V.A. Spencer, Herder’s Political Thought: A Study of Language, Culture, and Community (Toronto, 2012)
J. Zammito, Kant, Herder, and the Birth of Anthropology (Chicago, 2002)

Humboldt:

Fichte:
A.J. La Vopa, Fichte, The Self and the Calling of Philosophy, 1762-1799 (Cambridge, 2001)
R.R. Williams, Recognition: Fichte and Hegel on the Other (Albany, 1992), chap. 3.
Novalis:

Schiller:
F. C. Beiser, Schiller as Philosopher: A Re-Examination (Oxford, 2005) (E)
J. Reed, Schiller (Oxford, 1991)

Suggested supervision questions (from old Tripos papers):

What political implications follow from the view of German thinkers in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries that freedom is the development of individuality?

How did German thinkers at the turn of the nineteenth century understand the relation between culture and politics?

Why did a number of German thinkers in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries come to argue that a rational state was an insufficient guarantee of freedom?
Did the late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century German thinkers who emphasized the political role of culture reject reason?

What role did the notion of history play in late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century German theories of culture and politics? Answer with reference to two or more of the authors you have read.

Were German theorists of culture in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries seeking a substitute for religion?

‘Thus what Rousseau and the ancient poets put behind us, under the names “state of nature” and “golden age”, lies ahead of us instead… What we have to achieve is represented as something we have lost’ [FICHTE, Some Lectures Concerning the Scholar’s Vocation]. Why was this difference so important to Fichte?
B19. GENDER AND POLITICAL THOUGHT IN THE EIGHTEENTH AND NINETEENTH CENTURIES

(E) = e-book available from LibrarySearch

Suggested primary reading:

Mary Astell, Political Writings, ed. P. Springborg (Cambridge 1996) (E)
A. Pyle ed., The Subjection of Women: Contemporary Responses to John Stuart Mill (Bristol, 1995)
F. Engels, The Origins of the Family, Private Property and the State, ed. M. Barrett (Harmondsworth, 1972)

Suggested secondary reading:

Arianne Chernock, Men and the Making of Modern British Feminism (Stanford, California, 2010)
H. Guest, Small Change: Women, Learning, Patriotism, 1750-1810 (Chicago, 2000)
N.J. Hirschmann, Gender, Class & Freedom in Modern Political Theory (Princeton, 2008)
**S. Knott and B. Taylor (eds), Women, Gender and Enlightenment (Basingstoke, 2005), Part 2, Sections 6, 8, 9 and 10 (E).
C.G. Moses and L.W. Rabine (eds), Feminism, Socialism and French Romanticism (Bloomington, IN, 1993).
K. Offen, European Feminisms, 1700-1950: A Political History (Stanford, California: 2000) (E)

Further secondary reading:

Mary Astell and the early eighteenth century

The Enlightenment

**The Revolutionary period**


**Mill and Victorian Britain**


**Engels and the later nineteenth century**


**Suggested supervision questions (from old Tripos papers):**

Was the happiness of women or of society foremost in the considerations of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century theorists of the condition of women?

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

Did eighteenth- and nineteenth-century theorists of the condition of women believe in progress?

Did eighteenth- and nineteenth-century theorists of gender and political thought believe that changing the relations between the sexes would change society, or that changing society would change the relationship between the sexes?

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?
**B20. SOCIALISM BEFORE 1848**

(E) = e-book available from LibrarySearch

**Suggested primary reading:**


**Suggested secondary reading:**


**Further secondary reading:**


Owen & Britain:

Saint-Simon & Early French Socialism:
E. Durkheim, Socialism and Saint-Simon, A. W. Gouldner (ed), (London, 1959)
F.E. Manuel, The New World of Henri Saint-Simon (Cambridge, 1956)

Fourier:
J. Beecher, Victor Considérant and the Rise and Fall of French Romantic Socialism (Berkeley CA, 2001)

Proudhon:

Blanc:

Marx & Engels’ Views:
L. Kolakowski, Main Currents of Marxism, Vol. 1 The Founders (Oxford, 1978), chap. 10: ‘Socialist Ideas in the First Half of the Nineteenth Century as Compared with Marxian Socialism’

52
Herzen & Russia:

Suggested supervision questions (from old Tripos papers):
Were the early nineteenth-century socialists’ critiques of commercial society forward- or backward-looking?
What significance did socialist authors before 1848 attach to the French Revolution?
Was socialist thought before 1848 religious?
‘Early nineteenth-century socialism was a rejection of politics.’ Discuss.
How important to early nineteenth-century socialism was the idea of shaping passions through education?
‘Industrial competition was the central problem that early socialist theorists sought to confront.’ Discuss with reference to two or more authors.
Did early socialist thinkers seek to destroy Christianity or to reform it?
B21. NATIONALISM AND THE STATE

(E) = e-book available from LibrarySearch

Suggested primary reading:


Suggested secondary reading:


E. Kedourie, *Nationalism* (New York, 1960), chapters 5-7


*S.* Recchia & N. Urbinati, ‘Giuseppe Mazzini's International Political Thought’ in Recchia and Urbinati (eds), *A Cosmopolitanism of Nations*, pp. 1-30 (E)

Further secondary reading:


Suggested supervision questions (from old Tripos papers):
When and how did the idea of nationality enter into European theories of the state?
What criteria were used by nineteenth-century thinkers to identify national communities worthy of political freedom?

Why was nationalism a vehicle for liberalism in the nineteenth century?

Why were many nineteenth-century conservatives sceptical of nationalism?

To what problems were nineteenth-century theories of nationality and nationalism thought to be solutions?

Are nineteenth-century theorists of nationality best understood as supporters or opponents of the French Revolution?
B22. EMPIRE AND CIVILISATION IN NINETEENTH-CENTURY POLITICAL THOUGHT

(E) = e-book available from LibrarySearch

Suggested primary reading:


Thomas Carlyle, ‘Occasional Discourse on the Negro Question’, Fraser’s Magazine, 40 (1849)
http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1853/07/22.htm

The following primary texts, published around 1900, are also important:

J.A. Hobson, Imperialism: A Study (1902)
Dadabhai Naoroji, Poverty and Un-British Rule in India (London, 1901), Introduction

Suggested secondary reading:

C. Bayly, Recovering Liberties: Indian Thought in the Age of Liberalism and Empire (Cambridge, 2012) (E)
*D. Bell, Reordering the World: Essays on Liberalism and Empire (Princeton, NJ, 2016)
*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)
*G. Claey’s, Imperial Sceptics: British Critics of Empire, 1850–1920 (Cambridge, 2010) (E)
*S. Muthu, Enlightenment against Empire (Princeton 2003)
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)
N. Slate, Colored Cosmopolitanism: The Shared Struggle for Freedom in the United States and India (Harvard, 2012) (E)

International Law
Further secondary reading:


D. Kelly (ed.), *Lineages of Empire: The Historical Roots of British Imperial Thought* (Oxford, 2009), esp. chs 1 and 5.


J. Levy and I. M. Young (eds), *Colonialism and its Legacies* (Lanham, 2011), esp. chs. 2, 7, 8, 10, 12


Suggested supervision questions (from old Tripos papers):

Were Liberal theories of empire proof against the Marxist critique of imperialism?

Was Liberalism necessarily imperialist?

To what extent did nineteenth-century accounts of empire depend upon arguments about civilization?

Did nineteenth-century thinkers believe empire was promoted or undermined by modern commercial relations? Answer with reference to two or more of the thinkers you have read.

Were nineteenth-century theorists of empire more concerned with the colonies or with the metropole?

Were arguments about the British presence in India significantly different from those about European imperialism elsewhere in the world?
B23. SOCIAL SCIENCE AND POLITICAL THOUGHT

(E) = e-book available from LibrarySearch

Suggested primary reading:


Suggested secondary reading:


Further secondary reading:

D.G. Charleton, *Positivist Thought in France during the Second Empire, 1852-70* (Oxford, 1959)
Saint-Simon:
R. Wokler, ‘Saint-Simon and the Passage from Political to Social Science’, in A. Pagden (ed), *The Languages of Political Theory in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, 1987), 323-38 (E)

Specifically on Comte:

Durkheim:
R.A. Jones, *The Development of Durkheim’s Social Realism* (Cambridge, 1999) (E)
S. Lukes, *Emile Durkheim: His Life and Work, a Historical and Critical Study* (Stanford CA, 1973)

Suggested supervision questions (from old Tripos papers):

Did nineteenth-century Social Science represent a turn away from political philosophy?

Did positivist ideas in Social Science depend upon an assumption of progress in history?

Why was reflection on the French Revolution so important to the development of social science in the nineteenth century?

Did nineteenth-century contributors to the rise of social science agree on the meaning of ‘science’?

‘Nineteenth-century social science was motivated by a social and practical goal, not merely by the pursuit of knowledge.’ Discuss.

How did nineteenth-century social scientists understand the relation of society to nature?

Why was the idea of the division of labour so important to nineteenth-century social scientists?