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Summary

The aim of the POLIS-CESPRA exchange is to explore Raymond Aron’s democratic theory and its legacy in the second half of the twentieth century. Whilst Aron has widely been recognised in the English speaking world as a leading theorist of international relations, his work on democratic theory *Démocratie et totalitarisme* (1965) is key to understanding not just the twentieth century itself, but the subsequent development of democratic theory both in France and the Western world. Indeed, it is in the Centre founded around Aron by Francois Furet that the leading theorists of democratic theory in France first came together – Marcel Gauchet, Claude Lefort, Pierre Manent, Bernard Manin, Philippe Raynaud, Pierre Rosanvallon, and Dominique Schnapper to name but a few, and their work is starting to have an impact throughout the Western world. Yet to fully understand this renewal, a return to the man who was the source of this renewal seems necessary. By bringing together both younger scholars who are rediscovering these elements of Aron's thought and an older generation who have more personal recollections and perspectives, it is the object of this exchange to do precisely that.
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Abstracts

Aron, Weber and the Crisis of Historicism
Sophie Marcotte Chénard (University of Toronto/EHSS)
This essay tackles the problem of the “crisis of historicism” (1870-1930) in German thought and its relation to Raymond Aron’s conception of political rationality. During his time in Germany in the 1930s, Aron witnessed the growing political and social instability, the rise of Nazism and the collapse of the Weimar Republic. It was in this context that the “crisis of historicism” reached its peak. The radical historicism of the 20th century, which may be defined as a doctrine according to which there is nothing more than relative and competing worldviews (Weltanschauungen), culminates in a philosophy of historical and moral relativism. This view leads, on a political level, to decisionism or nihilism. In that sense, the crisis of historicism is synonym with a crisis of reason.

How does Aron understand and respond to this crisis? What are the effects of the historicist view on the elaboration of his political philosophy? Drawing on Aron’s early writings on German philosophy of history as well as later texts on Weber and rationality, this essay seeks to shed light on the specific character of the Aronian conception of political rationality. Through an analysis of Aron’s interpretation of the possibilities – and limits – of the Weberian notions of rationality and value judgments, the aim of this paper is to assess Aron’s effort to go beyond the shortcomings of Weber’s response to the threats of historicism. I will attempt to show that Aron sees the tension between the universality of moral and political norms and the singularity of historical experience as the necessary condition of an adequate understanding of the mechanisms of political reason and as the basis of a “praxeology” or a theory of political action.

Raymond Aron and Machiavellian liberalism
Hugo Drochon (University of Cambridge)
The recent interest in Raymond Aron’s political thought in the English speaking world has revolved around Aron’s political liberalism. But how are we to classify such liberalism, when we know of Aron’s rejection of the (neo-)liberalism of Hayek during his time? This paper aims to explore Aron’s ‘Machiavellian’ liberalism, notably though his engagement with Vilfredo Pareto’s work and thought, as mediated through James Burnham’s now forgotten The Machiavellians, which Aron helped to have translated and edited in French. If Aron’s engagement with Pareto’s sociological writings are well-known, the impact Pareto, and the ‘neo-Marchiavellians’ more generally – Mosca and Michels – had on Aron’s democratic thought has been somewhat overlooked, and this paper will explore how Aron utilised t
the ‘fact’ of oligarchy as a way of defining both democratic and totalitarian regimes in the twentieth century.

**Thinking about democracy philosophically: Tocqueville’s alternatives**  
*Giulio de Ligio (EHESS)*

To justify the essential opposition between democracy and totalitarianism, Raymond Aron developed the presuppositions of what he called the «alternative of Tocqueville». Although democracy and totalitarianism share some features as modern societies, they are fundamentally distinct as political regimes. A political way of thinking allows the sociologist to compare societies and to preserve the sense of philosophical questions and practical alternatives.

The Aronian political approach has been extended by philosophers such as Claude Lefort, Marcel Gauchet and Pierre Manent. Having themselves recourse to Tocqueville in order to deepen the understanding of modern experiences and principles, they aim at fully articulating the human meaning of democracy as well as its internal problems. It is still important to understand why and in which sense the French renewal of a political understanding of democracy implies a philosophical questioning. Such a perspective is not mainly preoccupied with democratic procedures or contexts. It draws attention to what democracy entails for man’s relations with other men and with the world as a whole. The very questions raised by the French political philosophers are revealing of what is at stake in the democratic experience and point at other «Tocqueville’s alternatives». Is democracy a political regime or an irreversible social revolution, a distinct form of humanity, a religious dogma regulating every human action? Which experience of the human soul and bonds does modern democracy engender?

Those questions are still to be confronted philosophically and politically. It does not suffice to think democracy as the opposite to totalitarianism. Taking the French debate seriously, we may then have to question a last alternative Tocqueville famously elaborated, the opposition between democracy and all the other «distinct humanities». A political philosophy of democracy may still reveal itself to be necessary.

**Change and Continuity: Raymond Aron as a Challenger of Democratic Peace Theory**  
*Benjamin Brice (EHESS)*

One of the most prominent features of Raymond Aron’s thought on international relations is his reflection about historical processes. The main question is: what can change in international politics and what cannot? On the one hand, history is on the move and new
contexts lead to new institutions, new practices and new ideas. Thus, according to Aron, it would be misleading to stick to the leading principles of the 19th century’s international law in a time when “secular religions” would have prevailed, or to be unable to distinguish between ancient and modern tyrannies. But, on the other hand, he also observed continuities through the centuries. For example, even if Thucydides’ history belongs to a completely different world, his descriptions of political regimes and human passions are still relevant to get insights into contemporary politics. To use Aron’s own words (in of his articles, “L’aube de l’histoire universelle”), the challenge is to articulate the procès (“process”) and the drame (“drama”), namely what is changing and what is not through history.

This paper assumes that this dialectic can be very helpful to study contemporary international relations, and I would like to apply it to the IR theory known as “Democratic Peace Theory” (or more adequately “Democratic Peace Theories”). Obviously, Raymond Aron died before these theories became prominent in IR controversies. However, the way he thought the procès and drame dialectic can help us to criticize some of Democratic Peace Theory’s assumptions which are little challenged.

**Aron, Mitrany and democratic theory beyond the state**  
*Or Rosenboim (University of Cambridge)*

In the 1940s, Raymond Aron was concerned not only with the recovery of France, but also with the new world order emerging from the war. In particular, Aron paid attention to the future of Europe as a democratic and liberal political entity. In his articles and essays, he reflected on the international conditions that would allow Europe to gain shape as a political unity that could guarantee its peoples political liberty in a democratic structures. Aron was not alone in thinking about the democracy beyond the state in the 1940s. Another key thinker, who was also based in London during the war, was the political scientist David Mitrany. Similarly concerned with overcoming the tensions between order and liberty in domestic and international affairs, Mitrany elaborated the theory of functionalism as the foundation for a new European order. In this paper, I compare the proposals of Aron and Mitrany, to highlight their competing interpretations of democracy in particular, and of politics in general.

**Raymond Aron and Francois Furet: Two critical interpretations of communism**  
*Philippe Raynaud (Paris II/EHESS)*

Raymond Aron and François Furet were two brilliant minds who, if their itineraries were very different, in fact held very similar ideas. At the beginning of World War II, Aron
Raymond Aron and the Renewal of French Democratic Thought

(1905-1983) was already the author of important works and he was a witness to the rise of the national socialist party in Germany. Even if he had been a socialist when he was a student, he was never a revolutionary. His interpretation of communism is grounded in a philosophical reflection which began in the 1930s and which expressed his double position of “spectateur engagé” and of sociologist. François Furet (1927-1997) was younger: he was a communist just after the war and his comprehension of communism emerged from his research into the French Revolution and its Jacobin Legacy. This paper will offer a comparison between these two approaches: it will (1) provide an analysis of the philosophical foundations of Aron’s Critique of Marxism and of “secular religions” and (2) a reconstruction of Furet’s approach of modern revolutions, from Jacobin Terror to communism.

The democratic spirit of laws

Dominique Schnapper (EHESS)

The victory of democracies over their external enemies has marginalized the debate on the opposition between democracies and totalitarian countries. We are now aware that under the impact of their own dynamics, they could be threatened by their tensions and possibilities of perversions and “corruptions” (in Montesquieu’s sense). The risk exists that democracies might be corrupted by the exaggeration of their own “principles”. They could go from autonomy to independence, from freedom to abuse of freedom, i.e. license, from search for equality to search for identity and general indistinction.
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If you have any concerns or wish to report an incident, however minor, security will be happy to take your details and act upon the information given.
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This building operates a sounder alarm system and a main atrium fire curtain. When the alarm sounds you must evacuate the building via the wing fire exits. Please make yourself aware of their location and the muster point, which is situated under the Raised Faculty building by the muster sign.

Do not use the lift during an evacuation. If you are in the lift when the alarm sounds the lift will automatically return to the ground floor where you must exit via the evacuation points.

The fire evacuation points are situated towards the ends of the wings on all floors, with further evacuation routes through the ground floor lobby and Arc café. Internal fire evacuation doors will default to open but the final evacuation door from the building will need to be opened by pressing the green release button. During an evacuation, do not use the main stairwell as this route will be closed off by the fire curtain. If you are on the stairs when the alarm sounds make your way to the next floor landing and use the fire escape route on that floor.

First Aid
If you require a First Aider please contact Reception.
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The Café is operated by The Brookwood Paternership and is open five days a week between 8:30am and 5pm.
There is a coffee vending machine in the Law Faculty, which is open on Saturdays from 9am.

Toilets
The Gentlemen’s toilets are situated on the ground and second floors, Ladies’ on the ground, first and third. There are accessible toilets on all floors. Showers are situated in the Ladies and Gentlemen’s toilets on the ground floor. There are changing facilities available on the ground floor.

Smoking
There are two designated external smoking areas at the Alison Richard Building; one situated at the front of the building, next to the bench furthest from the building where a cigarette bin is provided. The second is at the rear of the building at the end of the crescent seating area furthest from the building, where there is also a cigarette bin. Please only smoke in these designated areas.
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