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UNIT-I

TRANSITION FROM MEDIEVAL TO MODERN SOCIETIES

Beginning of Changes in Europe

Scientific Inventions and Discoveries

Some of the essential discoveries and inventions of the Modern Age that helped to modernize the lives of the people were:

**Invention of the (Mariner’s) magnetic compass:** This instrument was used by navigators. It helped them to locate their direction right in the middle of the sea. As this compass marked the two poles (north and south), it helped them to choose the correct direction. Traders and travelers in the middle Ages had no means to conduct their sea travels through safe courses. Due to the invention of the magnetic compass, an era of adventurous navigation began.

**The Invention of gun powder:** With the making of gunpowder, the art of warfare in Europe was modernized. This helped kings to strengthen their defense provisions. It made the crown independent and reduced the dependency of the crown on nobles.

**The Art of Printing:** Soon after Europe entered the Modern Age, the art of modern printing was discovered. Due to this, the scope of education broadened, and very soon modern learning reached every corner of Europe. Acquiring knowledge became easier and a ground for the latest ideas was created. This helped to bring about changes in almost all walks of human life.

**Factors that brought about the Renaissance**

When Europeans came into contact with the Arabs, who were more learned and highly educated then the Europeans, they gained knowledge of astronomy, astrology and mathematics. The Arabs also taught Greek philosophy. Europeans learned this scientific and logically based knowledge of the Arabs and expanded their knowledge of these subjects. This basic knowledge was understood, translated and transmitted to the local folks of Europe by the learned scholars of Europe. This caused a wave of modern thought and a spirit of inquiry among the Europeans (who were in the process of transition).

A number of social and political thinkers emerged. They were staunch believers in scientific research and logical facts. They pleaded against the supremacy and authority of the Church, which till then had played an important role in the lives of the people. These thinkers were against the forceful beliefs of the old literature, which was out of the intellectual reach of ordinary man. This Church literature could only be interpreted by priests and learned scholars of Latin language.

**Roger Darber** was one such thinker who stressed that one should accept something as true only if it were proved by scientific facts and logical understanding. He appealed for free thought and desired to liberate mankind from conservative ideas. There were many other thinkers like him who devoted their lives whole-heartedly to the search of facts. It was scientifically proved that the position of the Sun was fixed and definite and that planets (like the earth) moved around it. Due to
this new idea, astronomers were severely punished by religious authorities who termed them ‘irreligious’ and inaccurate. The Church prosecuted them and they were also severely punished.

With the invention of the modern printing technique a revolution in learning and writing was caused in Europe. Paper was introduced and affordable books were printed in Europe. Now even a lay person in Europe could get knowledge about modern knowledge, learning and ideas. Besides these, even the ‘Holy Bible’ was translated by these thinkers in many local languages of Europe. As a result, religious texts became accessible to lay persons without the help of the priests. The supremacy of the Church reduced and people were made to think in the light of modern developments. This created a lasting impression on the minds of the people.

The Decline of Feudalism

The success of the feudal system resulted in a new age of prosperity and progress, during which feudal institutions became outmoded. By 1500 little remained of feudalism in Western Europe.

Growth of Trade and Towns

During the 12th and 13th centuries, the use of money, rather than goods, as a means of exchange led to a revival of commerce. A merchant class developed, renting land in places suitable for trade, often near a castle or abbey. These settlements often became thriving marketplaces for all sorts of goods. For a fee, a commercial settlement could obtain a charter from the local lord, establishing it as a town and giving it the authority to govern itself. Many lords were willing to grant charters to ensure a market for agricultural produce nearby.

Decline of Serfdom

The revival of commerce and the widespread use of money altered the relations between feudal lord and serf. Lords began to rent out their lands to tenant farmers. Some serfs, by engaging in trade, were able to substitute a money payment for their feudal obligations and become tenant farmers. The labor shortage and the rise in wages caused by the Black Death in the 14th century led some nobles to temporarily forbid the substitution of money payments for feudal obligations. By the end of the middle Ages, however, many serfs had become able to purchase their freedom and most feudal lords had become landlords.

Rise of Royal Power

As stability and security in Europe were gradually restored during the middle Ages, the demand for a feudal knight's military service declined. At relatively low cost, monarchs were able to assemble large mercenary armies, which they used to conquer feudal domains and to reestablish royal authority.

All of these factors led to the end of feudalism as a system of government. In France royal authority increased steadily after 1200. In England the Wars of the Roses (1455–1485) weakened the nobility and led to the establishment of strong monarchical rule by the Tudor dynasty. In Germany no strong monarchy developed. Feudalism was succeeded by a system of hundreds of small princely states until Prussia unified the country in the 19th century.
Remnants of Feudalism

Aspects of feudalism remained in practice after the middle Ages. Feudal land tenure was not abolished in England until 1660 and in France until the French Revolution in 1789. The nobility, after losing its feudal powers, continued as an aristocracy. The French Revolution and the rise of liberalism in the 19th century swept away most feudal privileges. The last country to abolish serfdom was Russia, in 1861. Although the feudal system no longer exists; certain feudal customs have survived—even in republics such as the United States. The idea of government as an agreement between ruler and ruled owes much to the lord-vassal relationship. Political units such as counties and parishes, and local offices such as sheriff, constable, and bailiff, reflect feudal origins. Many rules of etiquette originated as part of the feudal knight's code of chivalry.

EMERGENCE OF NATION STATES

○ MEANING

By 1500 Western Europe began to organise itself in a way that is similar to present day Europe. The relationship of lord & vassal which, with the vague claims of the Pope & The Emperor (holy roman emperor) in the background, so long seemed to exhaust political thought, gave way to the idea of princely power over all the inhabitants of a domain. i.e. nation-state. Necessarily, the change to such state of affairs neither took place everywhere in the same way nor at the same pace. By 1800, France & England had been centuries unified in a way that Germany & Italy were still not.

○ CAUSES:

I. France: one of the first nation-states to cover anything like the area of their modern successors, France's existence as a separate kingdom date back as early as 9th century. During the 14th & 15th centuries the unity was gently enhanced by the so-called Hundred Years' war with England.

II. England: a strong monarchy was established by William, the conqueror, in 11th century. The powers of the feudal lords were increased during the 12th & 13th centuries, but were gradually suppressed by the king during the 14th century; new additions to the infant English national mythology during the Hundred Years' war. Feudalism ended in England due to the war of roses in the late 15th century & monarchy was strengthened by Henry VII & successive Tudor Rulers.

III. Spain: a great measure of unity was achieved by the end of the 15th century due to the reconquest (the long struggle against Islam); & Spanish nationalism was strengthened suring the colonization of the new world.

CONSEQUENCES:

❖ Positive consequences:
  * the extreme disorder & anarchy of the feudal times ended.
  * Serfdom was destroyed along with feudalism.
  * economic development was boosted.
  * the militaristic & arbitrary limits of ancient empires & medieval estates were replaced by more rational boundaries.
  * People who shared common cultural traits came together.
Negative consequences:
* growth of a strong feeling of nationalism in each nation-state resulted in national jealousies, rivalries & conflicts over matters like trade & acquisition of colonies.

* rulers or governments of these nation-states attempted to put the Machiavellian theories of government into practice, resulting in double standards of morality, one for the people & the other for the nation-states.

THE RENAISSANCE

Introduction

The classical civilization of ancient Greece and Rome was not forgotten by the Europeans either during the Middle Age or in the Dark Age. The ancient languages were used in church services; for example Latin was used in the west and Greek in the east. Ancient architecture was used as a model for Romanesque construction. Both literature and architecture served as constant witnesses of "the glory that was Greece and the grandeur that was Rome." However, between the 14th and the 17th centuries, the classical Greece-ROMAN CIVILIZATION was rediscovered in a new and fruitful manner. Up to this period, the European Christians had used the classical languages, literature and art as a means to more important ends. Now they began to read Latin and Greek because they found it instructive and delightful to do so. Also, since they had discovered new values in Greek and Latin writings.

1. Meaning of Renaissance

The Renaissance in Europe, the great movement which brought about the awakening of new interest in the old classics. It originated in the 15th century and brought about a transition from faith to reason, from dogma to science. Literally the term 'Renaissance’ means "rebirth" and signified the revival of the study of old classics. It was basically an enthusiastic study of the masterpieces of ancient Latin and Greek literature, with a new interest. Thus a new outlook was developed in the realm of thought and action. In the broad sense, the Renaissance stood for an all-round development as well as a widening of horizons. There was a fresh realization that the world is full of interest and beauty, and many good things which could be experienced and enjoyed without reference to any larger purpose or destiny.

The Renaissance also gave rise to curiosity and the growth of the spirit of inquiry, which resulted in great discontent with the medieval spirit. As Hayes, Moon and Wayland declare the movement "represented in literature, architecture, sculpture and painting, a reaction against medieval culture." Through its bold approach, the Renaissance encouraged an intellectual revolt against the rigid rules and traditions of the medieval period.

The greatest service rendered by the Renaissance, was the release of the human mind and the birth of original thinking. This led to rapid progress in all spheres of activity. It also led to several movements, which took place simultaneously, such as the rise of a new political order, geographical discoveries and the reformation movement which ushered in the modern times. The Renaissance spirit manifested itself during the medieval times. At this time, Europe was experiencing the intellectual tyranny of the church. Owing to the dogmatic attitude of the church, there was mental unrest, as well as the silent and patient development of original thinking. The seeds of independent thinking that were sown in the Middle Ages grew into trees in the modern times.
2. Causes of the Renaissance

Many causes led to the success of the Renaissance movement. Ideas that were not based on reason could not continue indefinitely. The clergy in the church, in actual practice, acted contrary to the principles of true Christianity that they are preached. This undermined faith in the ideas of the universal church and the universal empire.

Original thinkers such as Roger Bacon and Peter Abelard managed to weaken the intellectual authority of the church by blazing new trails. Peter Abelard (1079–1142) felt that it was essential to apply reason to the principles given in the scriptures. In his opinion, the mysteries of Christianity were not to be taken for granted. They had to be tested in the light of reason and investigation.

Another revolutionary thinker was Roger Bacon (1214–1294). He criticized Aristotle and the church severely. He accepted from the past whatever was reasonable and worked patiently for the cause of the new spirit. Owing to his broad outlook and spirit of scientific investigation, he studied subjects like mathematics, physics, natural science and philosophy. He had the foresight to anticipate several modern invasions and wrote about the possibility of having ships without rowers, vehicles without draught animals and flying machines. However, owing to Bacon’s bold approach and original thinking, he earned the enmity of the church, which punished him as well as Peter Abelard.

The fall of Constantinople led to a widespread and systematic study of Greek heritage. After Constantinople, the great center of civilization and culture, fell into hands of the Ottoman Turks, Greek scholars fled to various parts of Europe, where they diffused the great ideas of ancient Greece. Thus an enthusiasm in the study of the classics was injected into the minds of the Europeans.

A rapid spread of ideas was possible by the introduction of the printing press. In the middle of the 15th century, John Gutenberg was successful in operating the first printing press with movable types at Mainz in Germany, where the Indulgences of Nicholas V running into 31 lines was perhaps printed in 1454. In 1473, the first book was printed in Hungary. Printing presses were also set up in 1477 in England by Caxton, as well as in Italy by 1465.

New ideas were brought to Europe owing to the Crusades which brought about contacts with the Arabs and other people in the East.

Voyages were conducted to new countries by adventurers. The geographical explorers and travelers felt that it was essential to absorb the ideas of the East and also to create new ideas. Their voyages of exploration and discovery led to wealth and prosperity, as well as to a broader vision.

A great role was played by progressive kings and Popes in fostering the Renaissance. Thus Pope Nicholas V was not only a great scholar, but also a generous patron of the scholars of classical learning. So also, Renaissance scholarship reached its height under Pope Leo X. Some of the nobles and rich merchants also patronized art and scholarship. For example, artists like Michael Angelo and Leonardo da Vinci were patronized by the brilliant Medici family of Florence.

Indeed the most generous patrons of artists and men of letters in Europe were the heads of great Florentine banking firms namely the Strozzi and the Medici. The great scholar, poet and composer in the Medici family was Lorenzo de Medici who made 15th century Florence resemble Athens
during the days of Pericles, by creating a similar zest and excitement of intellectual life, as also a similar appreciation of all artistic achievements.

3. **Origin of the Renaissance**

The Renaissance had its origin in Italy where it blossomed and later spread to the other countries of Europe. There were several causes leading to the origin of the Renaissance in Italy which became the school of Europe in the Renaissance.

Scholarly refugees such as the Greeks played an important role in stimulating the movement, after they settled in Italy, on fleeing from Constantinople, in 1453. The Italians who read the classics of ancient Greece brought by the Greeks, were filled and with a spirit of creativity.

The Italian cities grew very rich by controlling the distribution of Asian goods on the European continent.

The love of learning was fostered by the rich merchant princes of the Italian cities, who competed with each other in patronizing learning art, and science. Rome soon became a great center of civilization, culture, art, learning and literature, while Florence and Venice became the leading cities of the Renaissance.

Italy was regarded as the seat of the great power and glory of the ancient Romans since it contained the ruins of ancient Rome. Further the Italian language was closest to the classical Latin language. Besides, Italians are great artists by nature, making it natural for the Renaissance to have originated and blossomed in Italy.

In the 15th century, political stability was established owing to the rise of many successful dictators who were responsible for making their families powerful and famous. Thus many important Italian families rose to power, such as the Visconti family in Milan, the De Medici family of Florence, the Borgias of Romagna, the Della Scalas in Verona and Vicenza, and the Carraras in Padua.

Undoubtedly the Renaissance originated in Italy which was also responsible for the diffusion of this great movement. Peter Burke has aptly remarked that "the translators, the printers, the travelers; foreigners, who visited Italy, like Colet, Durer, Du Bellay; Italians who came to live abroad, like Torrigiani or Paolo Emilio; and in a sense Italy as a whole was middleman between Antiquity and Feudal Europe."

4. **Features of the Renaissance**

The characteristics of Renaissance were humanism, nationalism, a new approach to life, and a new spirit in art, architecture, literature and learning, the growth of the vernaculars, and scientific investigation.

The Renaissance stood for humanism, the sympathetic and devoted study of mankind, instead of the theological devotion of the Middle Age. The Renaissance scholars were known as "humorists" and their subjects of study, came to be called the "humanities." Petrarch is regarded as the Father of Humanism. This movement could be regarded for the turning away from the medieval traditions of asceticism and theology towards an interest in man’s life on this earth.
The rise of the rational spirit and of scientific investigation gave rise to a new approach to life. Whereas the medieval approach was one of absolute conformity and obedience, the new approach was based on reason. It laid emphasis on the importance of critical examination and evaluation of ideas and principles.

Several Renaissance scholars such as Francis Bacon and Leonardo da Vinci, were the products of this great movement. These scholars were inspired by the Greeks and the Romans who had led richer and fuller lives than what was known in Western Europe during the previous one thousand years. These scholars helped Europe to take giant steps in the fields of literature, art and architecture, painting, music and science, during the Renaissance period.

5. Growth and Spread of the Renaissance

The Renaissance movement grew and spread creating splendid and lasting effects in the various fields of arts. Ancient masterpieces were rediscovered and new works were produced.

Art

Architecture

The spirit of revival was evident in the field of art too. Renaissance architecture underwent a change under architects like Alberti, Manetti, Brunelleschi Bramante and Michael Angelo. Some of the distinctive features of Renaissance architecture were round Roman arches, rows of Greek columns, Oriental domes and Islamic decoration. Gothicarchitecture with its pointed arches and flying buttresses was discarded. The Doric, Ionic and Corinthian styles of ancient Greece were revived. The lofty, reaping Gothic was replaced by the plain line of the Greek temple or the gentle, elegant curve of the Roman dome. The great cities of Europe were adorned with great churches and cathedrals like St. Paul’s at London, St. Peter’s at Rome, and St. Mark’s at Venice, fine palaces such as the Medici and the Farnese Palaces, as well as beautiful villas like that of Pope Julius III.

The highest expression of Renaissance architecture was reached under the direction of great architects like Raphael and Michelangelo by designing the vast basilica of St. Peter, in Rome and also under Leonardo Da Vinci through his beautifully designed buildings at Milan, Pavia and other cities. In France, kings like Francis I admired the classical style in building, resulting in public structures such as the celebrated palace of the Louvre which now houses one of the world’s largest art collections. In Spain classical architecture received encouragement after 1550, from King Philip II, while in England, the famous architect Inigo Jones designed the classical banquet house in Whitehall in 1619. Sir Christopher Wren later erected the majestic St. Paul’s cathedral in London, thus making the new architecture popular.

Sculpture

Humanism was reflected in Italian sculpture in the 14th century. The Medici of Florence fostered a special interest in classical models and also promoted the scientific study of sculpture. Lorenzo Ghiberti was the first great apostle of the "New sculpture" in the 15th century. His marvelous bronze doors on the baptistery in Florence were regarded as "worthy of being placed at the entrance of paradise". Donatello created the lifelike statue of ‘St. Mark’ in Venice, among his other achievements, while Cellini fashioned the statue of 'Perseus and the slain Medusa'. Della Robbia
was famous for his classical purity and simplicity of style. He founded a school of sculptors in glazed terra-cotta. Michelangelo, great sculptor, painter and architect had many achievements to his credit, among which his statue of 'David' at Florence, is a masterpiece of classical dignity.

During the 16th century, the "new sculpture" spread in Western Europe, as Italian sculptors were invited by Henry VII to England, as well as by Francis I to France. The tomb of Ferdinand and Isabella in Spain was carved on classical lines.

**Painting**

The change in painting was even more striking than in sculpture. Before the 16th century, most of the paintings were frescoes that are pictures made directly on plaster walls, or on wooden panels. However in the 16th century, easel painting, detached pictures on canvas, wood or other materials developed, while the art of oil painting was mastered. Painting could not be inspired by classical pagan models, which had perished. Thus it was more original, and thoroughly Christian. Four of the world's greatest painters namely Leonardo da Vinci, Michelangelo, Raphael and Titian flourished in Italy during the 16th century.

Leonardo da Vinci was a scientific painter who carefully studied the human body and the problems of perspective and mastered the values of light, shade and color. Among his well-known works is the "Mona Lisa" now in the Louvre at Paris, and "The Last Supper" a fresco in Milan. Leonardo was indeed a versatile genius. Doing the job of an engineer, he constructed a canal in north Italy as well as fortifications around Milan. He was also a musician, philosopher, writer and an ingenious craftsman, who could be considered as the ideal of the Renaissance Age. He can be considered to have been the "complete" man, interested in all branches of culture.

Michelangelo was a painter of the first rank whose ceiling frescoes in the Sistine chapel of the Vatican are famous marvels. His most excellent painting is his grand fresco of 'The Last Judgement' in the same chapel. He was also a matchless sculptor, a great architect, an eminent engineer and a charming poet.

Sanzio Raphael became immortal through his "divine" portraits. Thus his Sistine 'Madonna' is regarded as a landmark in portrait painting, owing to its lifelike charm and beauty of composition.

The chief representative of the Venetian school of painting, was Tiziano Vecelli, also known Titian, the official painter for the city of Venice. The pictures of this school were famous for bright mosaic color patterns. Other artists belonging to this school were the "Bellinis, Mantegna, Giorgione and Tintoretto who became famous for their secular bright colored portraits and landscapes.

The "new painting" soon spread from Italy to become the heritage of all Western Europe. Francis I took Italian painters to France where they trained French painters. Philip II encouraged painting in Spain where Velasquez, Rubens, Van Dyck and Murillo distinguished themselves. Holbein and Durer painted magnificently in Germany. However Durer grew more famous as an engraver and wood carver, whose greatest engravings were "The Knight and Death" and "St. Jerome in His Study".
Music

The golden age of Renaissance music began in the 16th century, when the crude musical instruments of the Middle Age took on modern forms and sweeter tones. The harsh rebeck was replaced by the violin, which rose in prominence, while the harpsichord foretold the piano. The Roman school of music produced the master composer Palestrina who is rightly called the "father of modern church music". His style was officially recognized by the Council of Trent (1545-63) other great musicians were Josquin Des Prez, Adrian Willaert and Giovanni Gabrieli of Venice.In England some of the great composers were William Byrd, Thomas Morley and John Wilbye, while in Germany Orlandus de Lassus created several compositions.

Literature

During the medieval age, all the important writing was done in Latin, which was the language of the Church. The "cultured people generally looked down upon the European vernaculars. However in the 13th century, Dante wrote *The Divine Comedy* in Italian rather than Latin. This great Italian poet is regarded as the link between the medieval and the modern world, since his works dealt with love among humans, patriotism and love of nature. Dante’s example was soon followed by others. Thus Patriarch wrote a series of love sonnets to "Laura". He roused the interest of the people in the great works of Virgil, Cicero, Livy and others. Bocaccio wrote "his racy stories in Italian", the *Decameron*. Machiavelli wrote his historical works and his *Prince* as a guide for rulers. Ariosto wrote a popular poem 'Orlando Furioso’, while Tasso composed his epic *Jerusalem Delivered*.

A great contribution was made to German literature by Martin Luther. He offered a translation of the Bible. Spanish literature flourished with the works of several genius minds such as Cervantes who is known by his immortal *Don Quixote* which made fun of medieval feudalism and decadent chivalry. Lope de Vega composed about 1800 dramas, while Calderon wrote an allegorical poem.

Portuguese literature reached its height in the *Lusiads* of Camoens, a patriotic epic dealing with the wonderful voyages and exploits of Vasco da Gama.

In the 16th century, French literature was enriched by "Gargantua" a series of daring, fanciful and humorous tales written by Francis Rabelais. The 17th century witnessed the golden age of French literature, which was enriched by the works of Corneille, Racine, Moliere, Madame de Sevigne and La Fontaine.

Desiderius Erasmus was the greatest Renaissance scholar in Holland whose work *Praise of Folly* blamed the church of being responsible for ignorance.

In England Sir Thomas More’s *Utopia* appeared in English in 1551. English literature flowered through Geoffrey Chaucer’s *Canterbury Tales*, Milton’s *Paradise Lost*, Cranmer’s *Book of Common Prayers*, Edmund Spencer’s graceful *Faerie Queen*, the plays of Ben Johnson and Christopher Marlowe, the essays of Francis Bacon, and the dramas of the immortal Shakespeare.

Science

The spirits of inquiry created by the Renaissance movement led to great progress in science. Scientists such as Peter Abelard, Abertus Magus, Thomas Aquinas and Roger Bacon during the middle age itself based their arguments on reason. In the 13th century, Roger Bacon laid the
foundations of modern science, by insisting on the experimental method, and discovered the uses of
gunpowder and the magnifying lens.

Nicholas Copernicus of Poland revolutionized the thought of mankind by proving that the earth
moves round the sun. Thus his study of movement of heavenly bodies proved that the theory of
Ptolemy, the Greek astronomer of Egypt was incorrect, for Ptolemy had stated that the earth is the
center round which the sun and other bodies move. The Copernican theory was upheld by the
Italian astronomer Galileo, and the German astronomer John Kepler. John Kepler improved upon
the Copernican theory by showing that the planets go round the Sun in an elliptical orbit, rather
than in a circle as affirmed by Copernicus initially.

Galileo popularized the Copernican theory, for which he was punished by the church. However, he
made important advances in physics through experiments and observations. By throwing weights
from the leaning tower of Pisa, he discovered that the speed of a falling body depends upon the
distance it falls, rather than upon its weight. A swinging lamp in the cathedral of Pisa helped him to
discover the laws of the Pendulum. He also perfected the telescope and invented a thermometer. Sir
Isaac Newton discovered the laws of gravitation, governing the movements of the planets round the
sun, as also that of the moon round the earth.

The age of Renaissance also witnessed several inventions and discoveries such as that of the
printing press which was of immense importance. The invention of the printing press with movable
types during the 15th century greatly helped the diffusion of knowledge. The discovery of the uses
of gunpowder brought an end to feudalism by giving the Kings of Europe an instrument for
destroying the baronial castles and for bringing the manorial lords under their control. The
invention of the mariner’s compass helped in the progress of foreign trade. Thus the foundations of
modern science were firmly laid in the age of the Renaissance.

6. Consequences of the Renaissance

The Renaissance led to significant results. It brought about a transition from the medieval to the
modern age. This period witnessed the end of the old and reactionary medieval spirit, and the
beginning of the new spirit of science, reason and experimentation. The hands of the monarchy
were strengthened. People in Europe were tired of feudal anarchy. They looked up to the monarchy
to ensure peace and order, political stability and economic prosperity. The culture of the Christian
people was enriched. However, the Renaissance weakened the church, which could not occupy the
position of unquestioned authority, it had possessed during the medieval period.

The Renaissance gave a great impetus to art, architecture, learning and literature which reached
tremendous heights. It also created a reverence for antiquity and a great respect for the ancient
Greek and Roman classics.

Further, the Renaissance led to the creation of humanism, and gave a stimulus to the growth of
vernacular literature. As a result, the Italian, French, German, Spanish and English languages
blossomed at that time.

The Protestant Reformation movement was also strengthened by the Renaissance. It resulted in far-
reaching scientific inventions and geographical discoveries. The study of history was made more
critical and scientific owing to the development of a more critical spirit demanding accuracy and
the discovery of many historical manuscripts.
HISTORIOGRAPHY

THE RENAISSANCE CONCEPT

The term was first used retrospectively by the Italian artist and critic Giorgio Vasari (1511–1574) in his book ‘The Lives of the Artists’ (published 1550). In the book Vasari was attempting to define what he described as a break with the barbarities of gothic art: the arts had fallen into decay with the collapse of the Roman Empire and only the Tuscan artists, beginning with Cimabue (1240–1301) and Giotto (1267–1337) began to reverse this decline in the arts. According to Vasari, antique art was central to the rebirth of Italian art. However, it was not until the 19th century that the French word Renaissance achieved popularity in describing the cultural movement that began in the late-13th century. The Renaissance was first defined by French historian Jules Michelet (1798–1874), in his 1855 work, ‘Histoire de France’. For Michelet, the Renaissance was more a development in science than in art and culture. He asserted that it spanned the period from Columbus to Copernicus to Galileo; that is, from the end of the 15th century to the middle of the 17th century. Moreover, Michelet distinguished between what he called, "the bizarre and monstrous" quality of the Middle Ages and the democratic values that he, as a vocal Republican, chose to see in its character. A French nationalist, Michelet also sought to claim the Renaissance as a French movement.

The Swiss historian Jacob Burckhardt (1818–1897) in his ‘Die Cultur der Renaissance in Italien’ (1860), by contrast, defined the Renaissance as the period between Giotto and Michelangelo in Italy, that is, the 14th to mid-16th centuries. He saw in the Renaissance the emergence of the modern spirit of individuality, which had been stifled in the Middle Ages. His book was widely read and was influential in the development of the modern interpretation of the Italian Renaissance. However, Buckhardt has been accused of setting forth a linear Whiggish view of history in seeing the Renaissance as the origin of the modern world.

More recently, historians have been much less keen to define the Renaissance as a historical age, or even a coherent cultural movement. Randolph Starn, Historian at the University of California Berkeley, stated: "Rather than a period with definitive beginnings and endings and consistent content in between, the Renaissance can be (and occasionally has been) seen as a movement of practices and ideas to which specific groups and identifiable persons variously responded in different times and places. It would be in this sense a network of diverse, sometimes converging, sometimes conflicting cultures, not a single, time-bound culture".

DEBATES ABOUT PROGRESS

There is debate about the extent to which the Renaissance improved on the culture of the middle Ages. Both Michelet and Burckhardt were keen to describe the progress made in the Renaissance towards the modern age. Burckhardt likened the change to a veil being removed from man's eyes, allowing him to see clearly.

In the Middle Ages both sides of human consciousness – that which was turned within as that which was turned without – lay dreaming or half awake beneath a common veil. The veil was woven of faith, illusion, and childish prepossession, through which the world and history were seen clad in strange hues.—Jacob Burckhardt, The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy
On the other hand, many historians now point out that most of the negative social factors popularly associated with the medieval period – poverty, warfare, religious and political persecution, for example – seem to have worsened in this era which saw the rise of Machiavellian politics, the Wars of Religion, the corrupt Borgia Popes, and the intensified witch-hunts of the 16th century. Many people who lived during the Renaissance did not view it as the "golden age" imagined by certain 19th-century authors, but were concerned by these social maladies. Significantly, though, the artists, writers, and patrons involved in the cultural movements in question believed they were living in a new era that was a clean break from the middle Ages. Some Marxist historians prefer to describe the Renaissance in material terms, holding the view that the changes in art, literature, and philosophy were part of a general economic trend from feudalism towards capitalism, resulting in a bourgeois class with leisure time to devote to the arts.

Johan Huizinga (1872–1945) acknowledged the existence of the Renaissance but questioned whether it was a positive change. In his book *The Waning of the Middle Ages*, he argued that the Renaissance was a period of decline from the High Middle Ages, destroying much that was important. The Latin language, for instance, had evolved greatly from the classical period and was still a living language used in the church and elsewhere. The Renaissance obsession with classical purity halted its further evolution and saw Latin revert to its classical form. Robert S. Lopez has contended that it was a period of deep economic recession. Meanwhile George Sarton and Lynn Thorndike have both argued that scientific progress was perhaps less original than has traditionally been supposed. Finally, Joan Kelly argued that the Renaissance led to greater gender dichotomy, lessening the agency women had had during the middle Ages.

Some historians have begun to consider the word Renaissance to be unnecessarily loaded, implying an unambiguously positive rebirth from the supposedly more primitive "Dark Ages" (middle Ages). Many historians now prefer to use the term "Early Modern" for this period, a more neutral designation that highlights the period as a transitional one between the middle Ages and the modern era. Others such as Roger Osborne have come to consider the Italian Renaissance as a repository of the myths and ideals of western history in general, and instead of rebirth of ancient ideas as a period of great innovation.

**Important Points to Remember:**

**Meaning of Renaissance**

- A renewed interest in the Roman and Greek Classics.
- It launched a new outlook on thought and action.
- It was manifested in rapid progress in all spheres of activity and the unprecedented spirit of inquiry.

**Causes of the Renaissance**

- Reason became an important ground for all issues.
- The most prominent thinkers like Roger Bacon and Peter Abelard had to face condemnation of the church as they spoke for the application of reason on religious concepts.
- Thanks to the fall of Constantinople, Greek scholars fled to various parts of Europe and spread great ideas of ancient Greece, which aroused the interest in the classics.
• The invention of the printing press by John Gutenberg was an important factor leading to the rapid spread of ideas throughout Europe.
• Explorers of new lands also contributed in the discovery of fresh ideas.
• Many kings and Popes patronized the movement.

Origin of the Renaissance

• As Italy contained the ruins of ancient Rome it was great power and glory of ancient Romans since it.
• The Greek scholars escaped from Constantinople to Rome where they inculcated an interest in art among the Romans.
• The Italian tongue was closest to the classical Latin language and moreover, Italians are artistic in nature.

With the backing of a number of traders Italy became a center of civilizations, art, culture, literature and learning with Venice and Florence as the main cities.

Features of the Renaissance

• Humanism was an unprecedented amount of interest in man’s life on this earth. Petrarch was the father of Humanism.
• Scientific investigation was an important feature that brought in a new perspective on issues.
• The Renaissance period is remembered for prominent scholars like Leonardo Da Vinci and Francis Bacon who were inspired to lead richer lives as was never done before. Such distinguished men contributed to the arts, music, literature, sculpture, painting and architecture in a major way.

Growth and Spread of the Renaissance

• **Literature:** An important development was the use of vernacular languages (e.g. Italian instead of the classical Latin) by scholars like Dante.

• **Architecture:** The ancient Gothic style of architecture was done away with and in its place; the ancient Greek style was accepted. Architects like Michelangelo, Raphael and Leonardo Da Vinci were important influences.

• **Sculpture:** A scientific study of culture was made possible and a "new sculpture" came into being. This new development was fostered by sculptors like Donatello, Cellini and Michelangelo who carved precious works like St. Mark.

• Painting recorded the most prominent influence of the Renaissance artists, who employed novel techniques such as easel painting. Famous artists like Da Vinci, Raphael, Michelangelo and Titian produced immortal paintings such as Mona Lisa, the Sistine Chapel many others.
Music: Newer instruments like the violin and the piano replaced the older and less pleasant rebeck and harpsichord. It was the age of great composers and the Roman school brought forward Palestrina, the father of modern church music.

Science: The experimental method was stressed upon in all kinds of inquiry. The Copernican theory (stating that the earth revolves around the sun rather than the other way round). Copernicus, Kepler, and Galileo were prominent influences. Sir Isaac Newton was credited with discovering the laws of gravitation.

Consequences of the Renaissance

- The Renaissance is remembered most for the beginning of the new spirit of science, reason and experimentation.
- The unquestioned authority that the Church enjoyed was under danger probably for the first time ever.
- With the renewed interest in the classics which proved a great boost to all the arts and literature.
- Vernacular languages were given respect and used extensively.
- The spirit of critical inquiry enabled the subsequent discoveries which widened human horizons in an unparalleled manner.

THE REFORMATION

Introduction

During the 16th century, at the time of the Western European expansion overseas in America, Asia and Africa, there was a notable break in the Christian Church in Europe. There was a revolt against the authority of the Pope, on the part of a large number of Christians who gave up some of the doctrines of the Catholic Church. These Christians mainly in northern Europe organized themselves under different creeds and assumed new names. This break in the church that gave rise to the new groups called 'Protestants' is often called the 'Reformation'.

Difference of opinion had existed among Christians from early times. There had been earlier heresies and schisms, such as Aryanism, which flourished for a while and gradually faded away. Separate national churches were formed in Armenia, Mesopotamia, Egypt and Abyssinia, as a result of other varieties of faiths.

In the 11th century, a serious schism arose between east and west, between the Christians using Latin. Thus the believers were divided into two groups, the 'Orthodox' Church of the east, and the 'Catholic' Church of the west. However, the break in the Church occurring in the 16th century, was the result of dissatisfaction that had appeared in the Middle Age and often showed up in the 14th and 15th centuries.

1. Meaning

The Reformation could be described as a religious movement that was directed against the Church of Rome. It involved a revolt against the authority and principles of the Christian Church in Rome with the Pope as its head. The Reformation was also a rebellion against the corruption and abuses
in the Church, monasticism, Church rituals and sacraments as well as interference of the Pope in temporal affairs. Those going against the Pope were called 'Protestants' while those continuing their allegiance to him, were referred to as 'Roman Catholics'.

2. Importance of the Reformation.

One can hardly over-estimate the importance of the Reformation as a movement in the history of Europe. The religious revolt was responsible for changing the course of history, since the influence of the Church extended to all fields of human activity. During the middle Ages, the powerful authority of the Church led to the regimentation of thought. The Church influenced or controlled political institutions. It hampered economic activities and stunted literary and artistic developments. However the Church expected unquestioned loyalty and absolute faith in its teachings, which had to be accepted as gospel truth.

The Reformation helped to put an end to this age of blind faith and dogmas and ushered in the modern times. For this reason, the Reformation occupies an important place in the study of the forming of the modern world.


There were several instances of injustice practiced by the church. Yet it was difficult to openly criticize or defy its teachings. The manifestations of discontent against the church began long before Martin Luther challenged the church. Thus there were several causes, both remote and immediate, for the outbreak of the Reformation. The following were the remote causes of the Reformation:

**Spirit of Inquiry**

The transition from the medieval to the modern period involved changes in every field in Europe. The church was bound to feel the impact of these changes. The original thinking of certain scholars led to the rise of a spirit of inquiry. People began to question the church and its teachings owing to the Renaissance movement, the revival of the secular and human spirit of ancient Greece and Rome, the geographical discoveries, the Crusades, the contact with the east as well as the scientific inventions and discoveries.

However the clergy discouraged any criticism which was severely dealt with. Thus, in the 13th century, the Albigenses of southern France criticized the Christian priesthood and were wiped out by indiscriminate massacres. The followers of Peter Waldo, known as the Waldensians, criticized the luxurious life led by the clergy. But they managed to survive despite severe persecution.

**The Decline in the Prestige of the Pope**

The Pope’s power began to decline gradually, with the rise of powerful Kings. For example, the French King Philip IV (1285-1314) succeeded in establishing the right to tax church property, inspite of severe opposition by the Pope. He also compelled the Pope to reside at Avignon in France, instead of at Rome, after the Pope’s interference in his political affairs. This 'Babylonian Captivity’ lasted for 70 years and greatly damaged the Pope’s prestige and power.
The election of two Popes, one by the Italian Cardinals and another by the French Cardinals, created a further setback. In 1409, a third Pope was elected by a joint sitting of the two groups of Cardinals, creating further confusion. The Great Schism arose since Christians in Western Europe were divided in their recognition of the three Popes. The matter was settled in 1417 when a new Pope was elected and accepted by all, at the Church Council of Constance. However, the power of the Pope further declined owing to this Schism and more criticism.

**Moral Opposition**

During the 14th and 15th centuries, strong criticism was leveled against certain practices of clergymen whose lives were regarded as scandalous and immoral. Several scholars raised their voices in opposition to certain Catholic teachings and practices. Among them was John Wye (1320-1384), an English priest and professor in the University of Oxford who declared that the Pope was not Christ’s representative on earth, but an anti-Christ. He did not believe that monasticism was not a true part of Christianity, or that the sacraments were effective when an evil and wicked clergy administered them. He also felt that individual Christians should only be guided by what they read in the Bible. He recommended that the Church should be subordinate to the State. Wye is regarded as the "Morning star of the Reformation", since he challenged the church, a hundred and fifty years before Martin Luther. Inspite of being condemned by the Pope, Wye had many followers including country gentlemen, politicians and poor people. His followers known as the Lollards grew in numbers in England. The English Kings, Henry IV and Henry V, tried to stop the spread of the Lollard movement through fines, imprisonment and burning.

After Wye’s death, his writings were spread in Bohemia by John Huss, a priest and professor in the University of Prague. The Holy Roman Emperor Sigismund invited John Huss to attend a general church council at Constance where he was burned at the stake in 1415. This led to a popular outbreak in Czechoslovakia. The Hussite Wars lasted for many years and led to several concessions by the Pope, before the restoration of the Catholic Church in that region.

**4. Spread of Protestantism.**

**Germany**

**MARTIN LUTHER AND THE REFORMATION**

Martin Luther was born in 1483. His parents were poor peasants. Like most parents of the time, they were strict disciplinarians and also raised Martin according to the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church. At the age of 5, Martin was already studying Latin in school. He began attending the school of a religious brotherhood in Magedeburg, Germany when he was 13. He was a brilliant student and received his Master of Arts degree from the University of Erfurt in 1505 and began the study of law. It was shortly after this that Martin had a religious experience. During a violent storm he was knocked to the ground by a lightning bolt. "Help me, St. Anne, and I'll become a monk" he cried. It was after this that he joined the Augustinian Cloister in Erfurt.

In 1507 Luther was ordained and left for the University of Wittenberg to teach moral philosophy. Three years later he journeyed to Rome on business for the Augustinians. While there he was shocked at the spiritual laxity in the Holy City. After returning from Rome, Luther earned his Doctorate of Theology. From 1513 to 1518 he lectured at the University of Wittenberg on Biblical
Theology. At this time he began establishing himself and became widely known. In 1515 at the age of 32 Doctor Luther was appointed District Vicar for the Augustinian Order.

Throughout his career, Luther was torn by inner turmoil. He questioned that if man was ruled by sin, how could he hope to gain redemption in the eyes of God? He continually sought peace through "good works" -- including fasting and punishing his flesh. His failure to cleanse himself drove him to the edge of despair. Luther's crisis continued until study of the Holy Scriptures brought a new conviction that salvation is not "earned" by works -- it is a Divine Gift of God. It is through faith that man receives God's divine gift of the life, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ. Then his sins are forgiven by the sheer mercy of God. This Doctrine of Justification by Faith soon came to form the basis of Luther's religious thoughts. It was because of this that Luther began to question the Church's practice of Indulgence. According to the church, some people were better than needed in order to be saved. Their "extra merit" could be transferred via an indulgence to those whose salvation was in doubt. This was done by making a pilgrimage and paying a small sum. By Luther's time the idea was being abused and indulgences were on public sale. As a parish priest of Wittenberg, Luther protested this situation to the Archbishop of Mainz.

All of these things led to Luther writing his 95 Thesis and nailing them to the door of the Castle Church of Wittenberg on October 31, 1517. There were three basic ideas: protest against the abuse of papal authority; challenge to the Pope; and denial of the "extra merit" theory behind indulgences. Most of the Thesis was not opposed to traditional Roman Catholic doctrine. The Church ordered Luther to appear in Rome to answer charges of heresy. Prince Elector Fredrick the Wise of Saxony, intervened and the Imperial Diet (hearing) was held in Augsburg, Germany, in October 1518. Luther refused to recant. Reform issues spread and the Pope issued a Bull (Papal Order) threatening Luther with excommunication. At the age of 38 Luther publicly burned the Bull and was excommunicated in January 1521. In April 1521 Luther, the reformer, appeared before the Imperial Diet at Worms. There Charles V, Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire, proclaimed Luther a heretic and put him under the Ban of the Empire and all of his works were banned.

After being declared a heretic and banned by the Diet of Worms, Luther was given asylum by Prince Frederick and spent a year at Wartburg Castle under Prince Frederick's care. While here he translated the Bible into German. He did this to make the Bible available to all people. During his absence from Wittenberg, the reform movement was progressing but becoming very disorderly and church property was being destroyed. The town council asked Luther to return and speak to the people. At great risk to his life he did this and pleaded with the reformers not to use violence, fearing the reform might lead to revolution. However, many German peasants, long being oppressed, felt the time had come to revolt. Luther called for swift suppression of the rebellious peasants. He lost the support among many radical reformers. Luther remained in Wittenberg where he wrote, taught and preached for the next 20 years. It was also here that in June 1525 at the age of 42 he married Katharina von Bora, a former nun, whom he had sheltered at one time in Wittenberg. Theirs was a happy marriage. They had six children of their own and gave a home to eleven orphans.

During his later years Luther managed to remain very prolific. Despite the Ban of Church and Empire, he continued on with his work. During his lifetime he published almost 400 works which included Biblical commentaries, catechisms, sermons and tracts. He also worked on revisions of his translation of the Bible. Luther was said to have an excellent singing voice and loved to sing his own hymns. He helped people take part in church by writing hymns, both words and music. In
1546 Luther was asked to arbitrate a dispute in Eisleben. He traveled to the town of his birth and at the age of 63 died of a stroke. His body was interred in the Castle Church in Wittenberg, where he had posted his 95 Thesis almost 30 years before. Of all the things Luther wrote about, his Reforms had the most impact. Some of the more important ones are the following. In Luther's *Address to the Christian Nobility of the German Nation* he urged the state to undertake reforms which the Church had neglected. The papacy should be a spiritual institution allowing finances to be handled by national churches.

In *The Babylonian Captivity* tract Luther reduced the number of Sacraments to two – baptism and the Lord's Supper. He wrote these Sacraments, had visible signs of outward grace and was instituted by Christ Himself. It was Luther's intention to bring the whole congregation into the worship service. In 1526 he produced a vernacular liturgy, the German Mass. He also insisted that the laity be offered the wine as well as the bread in Holy Communion. It was his belief that the Word of God, received in faith and revealed as the Holy Gospel, was the true path to salvation. The Scriptures are the supreme authority in matters of faith and life. Luther taught that the individual conscience is answerable only to the Word of God. Christ alone is the intermediary between man and his Creator. Through baptism we are all members of the priesthood of believers.

Luther encouraged his close friend and colleague, Philip Melanchthon, to write the Augsburg Confession. Those doctrines expressed in 1530 are still basic to the Lutheran Church. Melanchthon claimed that Lutherans remained faithful to the true teachings of the Christian Church. Martin Luther lived what he believed and became a turning point in history. He left behind a rich legacy of doctrines, literature and ethics. Above all he taught people to be faithful to their God.

**Scandinavia**

Luther gained popularity in Scandinavia, for Lutheranism was made the established form of Christianity by the king of Denmark and Norway, as well as by the king of Sweden. Thus most of the people in these countries and in northern Germany became *LUTHERANS* after the 16th century.

**Switzerland**

Ulrich Zwingli (1484-1531) led a revolt against the Catholic Church in Switzerland. Since he did not agree with Luther on a few points regarding church organization as well as on sacraments, his church was styled the Reformed Church, as differing from Luther’s Protestant Church. Some of the states in Switzerland became Protestant, while others remained Catholic. A civil war broke out between the Catholic and the Reformed Cantons in which Zwingli was killed in the Battle of Kappel in 1531. After peace was signed, part of Switzerland became Protestant, while the rest continued to be Catholic.

**France**

John Calvin (1509-1564) was a young Frenchman who exerted a greater influence in shaping Protestant doctrines and organization, than Henry VIII or Martin Luther. After his break with the Catholic Church he took refuge in Switzerland, because he was regarded as a heretic in France. From 1536 until the time he died in 1564, Calvin’s teachings spread far and wide from Geneva. There were several reasons for the wide acceptance of his doctrines. Firstly, Calvinism appealed to those who were tired of autocracy, since it was more democratic than other forms of Christianity.
Further, his doctrines clearly and concisely set down in a book called "The Institutes" which is a masterpiece of theology. The French Protestants called the Huguenots were Calvinists and so were many of the Swiss, the Hollanders and the Magyars. John Knox introduced Calvinism in Scotland, where it was called Presbyterianism because the management of the Church was in the hands of Presbyters or elders. The Pilgrims of New England as well as the Puritans were also Calvinists.

**England**

Why had sown the seeds of discontent in England where the religious revolt was led by the King Henry VIII. The King was initially against Luther. However he later broke with the Pope who did not agree with King Henry VIII’s decision to divorce his wife Catherine of Aragon so that he could marry Anne Boleyn. Thus in 1534 the King induced Parliament to pass the Act of Supremacy which substituted the king for the Pope as head of the Church in England. Under the reign of his son Edward VI (1547-1553), and that of his daughter Elizabeth (1558-1603), several changes were brought about. The Bible was to be regarded as the sole guide of faith. The Catholic doctrine of 'good works' was declared as superstitious.

Changes were made in the sacraments and also in the prayer books which were translated from Latin to English. Though England re-allied with the Pope, under Henry’s daughter Queen Mary, the Church of England, or the Anglican Church was firmly established during the long reign of Elizabeth.

Thus many Protestant sects such as Lutheranism, Anglicanism and Calvinism arose in the 16th century. Followers of Menno Simons, called Mennonites sprang up in Switzerland and Holland, while the Quakers and the Baptists (who favored Baptism) became well known in England.

5. **REFORMS IN CATHOLIC CHURCH (THE COUNTER REFORMATION)**

In the 16th century the Roman church undertook to reform itself. This reform movement, extending into the following century, raised the moral and educational standards of the clergy; inspired the church with a renewed zeal and morale, which enabled it to win back areas endangered by Protestantism; and contributed significantly to producing the Catholic Church as we know it today. The chief agencies in carrying out this work were the papacy, which was much different from the papacy of the Renaissance; a group of religious orders, some reformed and some new, most notably the Society of Jesus, or Jesuits; and the Council of Trent. The Inquisition and the Roman Index of Prohibited Books also had a part in the work.

The spirit of the Catholic Reformation was a spirit of zeal and ardor for the faith, recognition of abuses in the church and a dedication to the work of reform, and an attitude of intolerance toward heresy. The forces in the church that desired conciliation with the Protestants and that might have been willing to make concessions to secure unity were defeated by those who set their faces against all compromise, rejected any thought of concession, suppressed heresy where they could, or simply shut it out. Actually, it would appear the split had become permanent before the Catholic Reformation reached its full activity. What the Catholic reformers did was simply to recognize the accomplished fact and by their intolerance and intransigence help to establish it as a fixture of Christian life. In an age of religious intolerance, no other outcome was likely. It can be said quite accurately that the intolerance of Catholics toward Protestants was equaled only by the intolerance of Protestants toward Catholics and surpassed only by the intolerance of the various Protestant groups toward one another.
The Catholic Reformation is also referred to frequently as the Counter Reformation. If it was truly a Counter Reformation, then it must have been called forth or at least greatly influenced by the Protestant Reformation. But it is also evident that there were widespread impulses for reform within the church before anyone had ever heard of Luther.

Many distinguished men saw the needs of the church and tried early to do something about them. Among these men were Gian Matteo Giberti and Gian Pietro Caraffa. About 1517 these men and others founded at Rome the Oratory of Divine Love to restore to its proper dignity the observance of Divine Service. This group was not a religious order, and its members took no vows. They worked in Rome until the sack of the city in 1527 forced them to leave.

One of the manifestations of the stirrings in the church was the foundation of new religious orders and the reform or refounding of older ones. The Camaldolese were reformed and brought back to a very ascetic way of life under the leadership of the famous Venetian family of the Giustiniani. In 1524 the Theatines were founded by Caraffa and Gaetano da Thiene. The members were priests, and their aim was the reform of the regular clergy. They were not allowed to beg, and only the rich and noble became members.

Another such order was that of the Clerics Regular of Saint Paul, known popularly as Barnabites, founded by Antony Zacaría of Cremona with the aim of relieving the sufferings of the people and raising their moral standards. Still another was the Clerics Regular of Somascha, or the Somaschi, who devoted themselves to work in hospitals, orphanages, refuges for prostitutes, and so forth. One of the most famous of the orders associated with this movement is that known popularly as the Capuchins, which arose within and remained part of the Franciscan order. Founded by Matteo da Bascio they received their nickname from their distinctive hoods. The Capuchins met considerable resistance within the Franciscan order, but with the help of Cardinal Caraffa received papal recognition in 1528. Living severely ascetic lives, eating the simplest of foods and wearing the coarsest of garments, they went about doing great works of charity and striving by word and example to turn the thoughts of laymen to God.

Orders of women also were active in this movement. The most famous was that of the Ursulines, founded in 1535 at Brescia by St. Angela Merici, and approved by the pope in 1544. This order, devoting itself to the education of girls, had a great success in both the old world and the new.

The first pope of the Catholic Reformation was probably Paul III (1534-49). His pontificate witnessed the founding of the Jesuit order, the opening of the Council of Trent, and the refounding of the Roman Inquisition.

Paul recognized the need for reform. In 1536 he appointed a commission of nine cardinals to suggest means of reforming the church. This commission was composed of many of the distinguished men who had long been identified with the desire for reform: Contarini, Sadoletto, Giberti, Caraffa, and Pole. This body presented a report in 1537, which contained a detailed discussion of abuses at all levels of the church. It singled out the practice of pluralism and the lives of the clergy. Monasteries were criticized, as was religious instruction in the universities. The report censured bishops, cardinals, and even the pope. It was attacked by some on whom criticism fell and was suppressed.
The commission was originally established to help prepare for the meeting of a general council at Mantua in 1537. This meeting did not take place, and before a council finally did convene, there had been established perhaps the most significant agency of the Catholic reform, the Society of Jesus, or Jesuit order. The Jesuits were the creation of St. Ignatius Loyola, one of the most remarkable figures of his age. He was Spanish, the youngest of thirteen children of a poor family of the Basque nobility. The date of his birth is not certain, but 1491 is the accepted year. Like other young nobles, he was trained to be a soldier, and it was his gallantry and courage that helped to bring a turning point in his life. In 1521, when the French were fighting to regain Navarre from the Spanish, Loyola was the officer in charge of the defense of Pamplona. When the defenders found themselves far outnumbered and in a hopeless situation, they thought of surrender; but their young captain would not give in. He insisted on continuing the fight against hopeless odds, and as a result exposed himself to a cannon ball that smashed his right leg. When the French had taken the fortress, they treated Loyola honorably, attempted to have his leg set, and sent him home to the family castle of Loyola. Due to clumsy surgery, he found himself with one leg shorter than the other and his military career at an end. During his convalescence, he experienced his conversion. He had hoped to while away the time during his recovery by reading romances of chivalry, but the family library had none of these books. Instead he was forced to read religious literature, and Ignatius felt a new passion take possession of him: the desire to devote his life to the service of God. He carried his military and chivalrous ideals with him into his new career; henceforth, he would be a good soldier of Christ.

In February 1522, he left the ancestral castle. He knew that he was to serve God, but the precise form of his service had not yet become clear to him, though he planned to make a pilgrimage to Jerusalem. In 1523 he was able to make the journey. On his return to Spain, having concluded that he needed more education in order to fulfill his mission, he went to school. First he studied Latin grammar at Barcelona, undaunted by the fact that as a man in his thirties he was attending school with boys. After that he attended other Spanish universities. During these years, he attracted like-minded followers; they all preached and wore distinctive garb.

These activities caused Loyola to incur the suspicions of the Inquisition, which found him perfectly orthodox but imposed restrictions on his religious activities. These restrictions impelled him to leave Spain and to enroll in the University of Paris in 1528. Here he again had a brush with the Inquisition. His Spanish followers failed to join him in Paris, and he started over again to find fellow workers. The six men he gathered around him were to be the original members of the order he later founded, and their outstanding abilities testify to Ignatius's gift for choosing men. These six young men he was able to imbue with his own fervent desire of devotion and service to God. Before leaving Paris, Ignatius had received his baccalaureate and graduate degrees and had begun the study of theology.

From Paris the little group went to Italy, where Loyola finally decided to found a new religious order. By a bull of September 27, 1540, Paul officially established the Societas Jesu, the Society of Jesus or Company of Jesus, known popularly as the Jesuits. In 1541 Loyola, against his wishes, was elected first general of the order.

The bull establishing the order limited its membership to sixty, but in 1543 Paul III, by another bull, lifted this restriction. Henceforth, there were no limitations to the size of the membership except the very high requirements for admission and the rigorous training. Other privileges followed, which enabled the order to do its work more effectively. For example, the clergy were
allowed to dress like ordinary secular priests. Paul III and most of his successors recognized the potential value of these men to the papacy, and found it advantageous to give them the type of organization needed for their greatest effectiveness.

The Constitutions of the order were drawn up and later revised by Loyola himself, and form an impressive monument to his genius for organization. They reflect the military training and outlook of their author primarily in the stress placed on obedience, the basic quality of a Jesuit. He must be completely at the disposal of his superiors, with no more will of his own than a stick that an old man holds; he must be like a corpse.

It was in accordance with the military spirit of the order that its head, the general, had very great power and the order was a highly centralized hierarchy. The general was to be chosen for life by the general congregation, and he was to be responsible only to the pope. The general congregation consisted of representatives from each of the provinces into which the order was divided. It was to meet only at the call of the general, except in the case of his death or his inability to conduct the business of his office.

There were various ranks among the members, the lowest being that of scholastic, or student. Those who finished their education became priests and were eligible for the higher ranks. One of these was that of spiritual coadjutor. This rank was the source of teachers in the order's schools, as well as preachers, confessors, and heads of institutions belonging to the order. They were numerically the largest group. However, the highest rank in the order was that of the "professed," or the "professed of the four vows." In addition to the vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience, they took an additional vow of special obedience to the pope.

The original purpose of the Jesuits was to reach and convert the masses of people who had strayed from the church. Thus preaching was their fundamental task. The order was not founded originally as a means of carrying on the struggle with Protestants, though this later became one of its activities. The Jesuits also laid stress on the instruction of children in Christian doctrine. They urged more frequent confession and communion than had previously been customary, and in this they were highly successful. As a result, they made the priest, more than ever before, a soul-guide or director of conscience. The Jesuits became very famous as confessors and even performed this function for kings and princes.

The fame of the order, however, rests to a great extent on other activities that came to assume greater importance than the founder had originally assigned to them: teaching, fighting heresy, and converting the heathen. The Jesuits came to be far and away the most successful educators in the church, and perhaps in all Europe. They were interested primarily in higher education, and came to dominate many universities and seminaries.

The purpose of Jesuit education was the purpose of the order as a whole: to serve God through loyalty to the church. For this reason, the aim of the Jesuit schools was not that of the modern secular university, which is to extend the frontiers of human knowledge even at the cost of long-held preconceptions. The teachers were well prepared, the methods were up-to-date, and the training was excellent, but the curriculum and teaching methods were regulated with a view to creating devoted Catholics. Students had to study a prescribed set of courses, and teachers had to stick to the assigned textbooks and interpretations. Within these limitations, the Jesuits were superb educators.
They came to be perhaps the most effective agents in the combat with heresy. Loyola himself felt that the Reformation was the result of ignorance and corruption on the part of the Catholic clergy. He had no very detailed knowledge of the works of the reformers; he forbade his followers to read the writings of heretics, and followed this counsel himself. His own attitude toward heretics was without bitterness; he hoped rather that they might be won back by persuasion. This was the position adopted by his followers, who generally refused to enter the service of the Inquisition, although they tended to be in favor of depriving heretics of civil rights and of banishing them if they could not reconvert them.

Basic to Loyola's work was his Spiritual Exercises. Taking the exercises was the first step that bound his earliest followers to him, and all members of the order have had to take them at regular intervals throughout their lives. Nonmembers and even laymen have been able to take them.

The importance and influence of this deceptively simple little book lies in the qualities that made Ignatius a great leader: absolute devotion to the church, a keen understanding of human nature, insistence on discipline, and common sense. The exercises are to be taken over a period of four weeks, not alone but under the supervision of an experienced guide. They consist of meditations, prayers, and contemplations on Hell and on the life of Jesus. Their effectiveness lies in the skill with which the various faculties are enlisted: the sense, the imagination, and the emotions. At the end of the exercises, the individual who took them was to be purified, devoted to Christ, and willing to give everything in service to the church.

The Jesuit missionaries to England were trained in the school at Douai founded by William Allen. The most successful missionary in Germany was a Dutchman, St. Peter Canisius (1521-97). For thirty years he worked in Germany as a professor at Ingolstadt and as Jesuit Provincial for Upper Germany. He founded many colleges and compiled a catechism that was widely used. He made many conversions and gave a great impetus to the work of winning back to the church parts of Germany that had been in danger of falling away. Through his work and that of others, Catholic princes were able to keep their people loyal to the faith. This was true, for example, in the Hapsburg lands and in Bavaria.

One of the most remarkable successes of the church in winning back lost or doubtful territory came in Poland, where the absence of a powerful central government had facilitated the spread of Protestant doctrines. The Convention of Warsaw passed by the Polish Diet in 1573 had recognized the different faiths and declared perpetual peace between them. The peasantry, however, who comprised the great mass of the Polish population, remained faithful to the Roman communion. Some of the bishops, especially Stanislaus Hosius, worked effectively to restore the traditional faith, and some of the kings were active to the same end. The Jesuits were the chief agents in this work, founding many schools in Poland; Canisius did remarkable work. Poland became and remained a stronghold of Catholicism in Eastern Europe.

The restoration of the Catholic Church in Hungary and Bohemia, in which the Jesuits played a large role, belongs properly to a later period than that covered by this book. It was thus largely through the efforts of the Society of Jesus, supported by rulers who had sometimes been their pupils, that a great deal of eastern Europe was won back to the Roman allegiance.

One of the most spectacular and controversial of all the Jesuit achievements was the work of converting the non-Christian peoples in the new worlds being opened by the explorers and
The first and most famous of all the Jesuit missionaries was Francis Xavier (1506–52), one of the original members of the order, who was sent to the Far East at the request of King John III of Portugal. In 1542 he landed at Goa and began his work. Before his death ten years later, he traveled over sixty-two thousand miles. First he worked in India, where he was especially successful with the poorer classes but made little headway among the higher castes. From there he went farther east, working in the Malay Peninsula and in the Moluccas, or Spice Islands.

In 1549 he went to Japan, which was in a state of great disorder because of the weakness of the mikado, or emperor, dominated by the shogun. The great nobles were more or less independent, and armed conflict between them was constant. After many setbacks and great hardships, Xavier managed to make some conversions and to begin planting Christianity in Japan. But now his thoughts had moved on to China, and he was eager to go there and continue the work. He was on his way when he died in 1552, at the age of forty-six, without having received permission to enter the country.

His methods have sometimes been severely questioned. In the first place, he strove for mass conversions, on occasion baptizing hundreds of people at a time or giving the sacrament to whole villages. Some have estimated that he baptized altogether several hundred thousand persons, even a million. While these figures may be exaggerated, they convey an accurate impression. So many conversions in such a short time must surely have been superficial, according to his critics.

In order to get such results, he made a great effort to adapt his methods to the people with whom he was dealing. This was in accordance with Loyola's approach to potential followers, and it came to be typical of the Jesuit missionaries. However, it was also open to criticism on the grounds that it involved concessions to heathen practices that contradicted Christian teachings. In Japan, in order to win people over, Xavier abstained from meat, fish, and alcoholic drink just like the Buddhist priests.

He also saw the need of learning the language and understanding the customs of the people whom he was trying to convert and of adapting himself to their ways. In the short time he had, he was unable to do more than point the way, but others adopted these methods with astonishing results. Whenever he could, he established schools and appointed native-born priests.

One of the most remarkable of Xavier's successors was Matteo Ricci (1552–1610). In 1583, he entered China where he lived for the remaining twenty-seven years of his life. The obstacles in his way were formidable, to put it mildly. China had a civilization older than that of the Christian nations of Europe, with deeply rooted religious and philosophical ideas and ways of thought quite different from those of the West. The Chinese were fearful and suspicious of foreigners. The language was exceedingly difficult, and there were no westerners who knew it well enough to teach it to Ricci. It is a sign of his extraordinary talent and devotion that he was able to surmount all these difficulties to such a degree, in fact, that some of his writings in Chinese were accepted as classics of Chinese literature. He also helped in the process of making reliable knowledge of China available to the West; for example, he suspected correctly that China and Cathay were the same country.

He was able to found communities of Christians in several Chinese cities including even the capital, Peking, where he spent the last decade of his life. Other Jesuits were sent to China, and by
the time Ricci died a famous man in China with thousands of friends and acquaintances there were about twenty-five hundred Christians in the country.

In India a beginning had been made by Xavier. Before his coming, the Portuguese had tried to impose Christianity on the natives with no attempt to understand their customs and sensibilities. Christianity had come to be identified in the minds of the Indian population with foreign conquest. Xavier had tried to change all this, but it persisted even after his death.

The Jesuit Roberto de Nobili (1577–1656) observed and condemned this deplorable state of affairs. He was a Roman aristocrat, a grandnephew of Pope Julius III. Sent out to India in 1606, he followed the methods of Ricci, learning native languages, adopting native ways of life, and condoning the continuance of time-honored practices when he felt they were not irreconcilable with Christianity. Though there was some opposition within the church to his methods because of what appeared to be concessions to idolatry, he was able to gain the approval of Pope Gregory XV in 1623 and continue his work.

In the New World where the natives were often savages, the Jesuits faced a different situation. The Colonial powers Portugal, Spain, and later France had much more effective control in the New World than was possible in such states as China and Japan. It was also true that, whereas the Jesuits were pioneers of Christianity in the Far East, this was not the case in the Americas. Other priests had preceded them, primarily Franciscans and Dominicans. Christianity was imposed on the natives by force of arms, something which was impossible in Asia. In the eyes of the soldiers, sailors, and officials who dominated the colonies, the missionaries were sometimes regarded primarily as a means of keeping the natives orderly or even assisting in the spread of trade.

Before the Jesuits reached the New World, there may have been ten million Christians in Latin America. However, no real attempt had been made to adapt the church to the specific background and outlook of the people. Here as in Asia, only the Jesuits seemed able or willing to use such an approach. They used the methods of accommodation, which were so successful elsewhere: learning the native languages and becoming thoroughly acquainted with the local culture. Because of the primitive character of the tribes among whom they worked, they needed great courage and devotion. These qualities were heroically exemplified in many of them; they willingly faced the risks involved, and some laid down their lives for the cause.

The earliest Jesuit successes in the New World came in the Spanish possessions, since they did not at first receive adequate support in the Portuguese and French territories. The Spanish, who had been guilty of gross mistreatment of the natives, had changed their ways, partly under the influence of Las Casas, and adopted a policy of humane treatment and peaceful conversion. This policy included an effort to civilize the natives before attempting to convert them. Special districts were set up for them, from which outsiders were excluded, in order to protect their goods and their wives. These districts, called "reductions," were established at about the end of the century during the reign of Philip III in what are now Brazil, Bolivia, Paraguay, Uruguay, Ecuador, and Argentina. The Jesuits, under the Spanish crown, were responsible not only for religious instruction but also for government and for military and economic affairs.

The order achieved great successes in civilizing and Christianizing the Indians by using techniques similar to those employed in the East. They studied the native languages, observed the local customs, and carefully distinguished the different types of tribes with whom they had to deal. By
adapting their methods to the character and needs of the people among whom they labored, they surpassed the achievements of the missionaries who had preceded them.

It was the fate of the order, partly no doubt because of its successes, to be a source of great controversy and to find bitter enemies within the church as well as outside. In any event, the Society of Jesus has left a permanent mark on the Roman church and thus on the modern world. As the chosen troops of the papacy, they were the spearhead in the fight against Protestantism. They gave the church a new morale and will to victory against the forces that threatened it. They played an important part in the proceedings of the great council that met at Trent in the middle years of the sixteenth century.

THE COUNCIL OF TRENT

The Council of Trent met over a period of eighteen years (1545-47, 1551-52, 1562-63). It met the challenge of the Protestant Reformation by clarifying doctrine and by instituting reforms that improved the quality of the clergy. It also helped the church to hold on to what it had retained, regain much of what it had been in danger of losing, and remain a powerful force in the life of Christendom. The council failed to reunite the church; reconciliation with the Protestants proved impossible. This is additional proof that abuses in the church may not be considered the major cause of the Protestant Reformation, because even after the abuses had been corrected, the split remained.

Before the council met, there were two parties within the Catholic church itself, with different views of the proper attitude to be taken toward Protestantism. One group, which drew much of its inspiration from Erasmus, may be called the liberals. These men, some of whom held high rank in the church, still hoped for eventual reconciliation. They were aware of the pressing need for reform, and they hoped for a thorough purification of the church as a way to bring back the heretics. Among these liberals, in Italy for instance, there was a good deal of interest in Protestant writings. The doctrine of justification by faith received serious attention. On the other side was the strict party led by Cardinal Gian Pietro Caraffa. This fiery Neapolitan was the leader of those who were completely opposed to any concessions to the heretics. He felt that the church should stand firmly on its traditional doctrines and suppress heresy by force. He was at the same time convinced of the need for reform, and just as uncompromising an opponent of the abuses in the church as he was of heresy. Thus the future of the church depended on the outcome of the struggle within its ranks as well as the external conflict.

The demand for a general council had been voiced early in the course of the Protestant Revolt. Luther had called for one even before his excommunication, and the Protestants had long been repeating this plea. There were others, however, who were decidedly less enthusiastic about the idea. The popes and the members of their entourage in the Curia were inclined to be suspicious of the very idea of a general council, remembering the conciliar movement of the previous century, which had challenged papal supremacy in the church in the name of the representative principle. The prospects of a sweeping reform did not attract those persons who profited by abuses, and this included the highest-ranking men in the hierarchy. Clement VII, pope during the crucial years 1523-34 when the Reformation was spreading and taking root, was particularly opposed to the calling of a council.
There were numerous political factors that could not be left out: the desirability of a general council and the attitudes of King Francis I of France and Emperor Charles V. Charles's position were determined by his relationship to the German Lutherans and to France. At times the emperor strongly advocated a council; at other times he was opposed to it. Francis feared that a council might threaten the privileges of the Gallican church, which he so largely controlled, and that it would favor the interests of his old enemy Charles. The fact that the popes were regularly involved in diplomatic alliances with one of the combatants against the other was another stumbling block to the convocation of a council that would be truly ecumenical. Thus a condition of peace, or at least truce, between Francis and Charles was regarded as necessary before a council could be called. It was also necessary that pressure for reform in the church should become overwhelming and that it should become clear to all that no other remedy but a general council would do the job; in other words, self-reform by the Curia was not to be expected. The Sack of Rome of 1527 helped to stimulate discussion of reform and of a general council; the great catastrophe was widely blamed on church corruption, many seeing in it the signs of a divine judgment. Nothing came of all this during the pontificate of Clement VII. His successor, however, came to the papal throne already pledged to the calling of a council, and has the great merit of having actually gotten it started.

Cardinal Alessandro Farnese, who became pope in 1534, took the name Paul III. Although he had publicly advocated a council, it is not clear just how much he favored the idea; it was reported that he actually opposed it. He was, however, under great pressure from the emperor to call a council, and in 1536 he yielded by convoking the meeting at Mantua in May 1537. However, the meeting did not begin until 1545 at Trent after numerous postponements and changes of place. From the start, the divisions of opinion that had long been evident in the church were manifest in the council. The question of procedure was vital. The emperor, still hoping for reconciliation in Germany between the faiths, favored discussion of reform first, hoping this would help bring back the Protestants. He also favored, at least in Germany, concessions to their views, such as communion "in both kinds" and the marriage of priests. Charles probably completely failed to understand the basis of the Reformation; even if he had had his way completely, it would not have ended the schism. The party of Cardinal Caraffa saw things quite differently. While recognizing the need for reform, it had no inclination to make any doctrinal concessions.

The position of the pope was favored by the proximity of Trent to Italy, which made possible a numerical majority of Italians who backed his position. The Spanish representatives, on the other hand, upheld the views of their king, the emperor Charles. They believed in the conciliar theory and hoped to have reform placed first on the agenda. These Spanish prelates were hostile to the curia, and the mutual antagonism of the Spanish and Italians hampered the work of the council. On the question of doctrinal formulation, however, the Spanish and Italian factions saw eye to eye in opposing any concessions.

The order of discussion represented another compromise; it was decided that reform and doctrine should be discussed concurrently. On matters of reform the disagreements were not great, but doctrinal issues often brought great debates. It was a fact of momentous importance that, on all these matters, it was invariably the strict party that won out. Thus there were no concessions made to Protestant doctrines, with the result that the split became more hopeless than ever. The emperor was angered by the intransigence of the council and refused to accept its decrees.

In the meetings of 1545-47, important doctrinal decrees were passed. The Latin Vulgate was accepted as the official text of the Bible, a decision that did not please some Catholic scholars who
were aware of the inadequacies of the Vulgate and would have preferred a text more abreast of recent scholarship. All the books of the Vulgate were declared canonical. This meant that the Roman church accepted certain books of the Old Testament which for the Protestants were apocryphal, because they were not available in Hebrew versions. The Protestant doctrine that the Bible is the sole rule of faith was countered by the decision of Trent that accepted the tradition of the church as coordinate in authority with the Scriptures as a source of divine revelation. It was also affirmed that the Catholic church alone had the right to expound the Bible officially. The decree on justification asserted the necessity for both faith and good works in the process of salvation. The Protestant doctrine of justification by faith alone, the bondage of the will, man's utter depravity and helplessness, and the doctrine of predestination were rejected. On March 3, 1547, the council issued a decree on the sacraments, all seven of which were declared to be true sacraments instituted by Christ.

In 1551 the council reassembled at Trent, summoned by Pope Julius III (1550-55). Decrees were passed on three of the sacraments: The Eucharist, penance, and extreme unction. The Eucharist was declared to be the most excellent sacrament. Though some members favored granting the cup to the laity, it was officially declared that the entire sacrament is present in the bread. The decree also carried a reaffirmation of the doctrine of transubstantiation. The treatment of penance and extreme unction also reaffirmed the traditional positions.

At the insistence of the emperor, who had still not completely abandoned hope for solving the German problem by reconciliation, a delegation of Protestants appeared at the council in January 1552. They were no more eager to attend than the Fathers were to receive them. The subsequent discussions with the Protestants had no other effect than to make clearer than ever the hopelessness of the split.

The resumption of war in 1552 between Charles and the French caused the suspension of the council, which did not meet again for ten years. Its last sessions (1562-63) were marked by bitter conflict between the Italian members, who represented the pope, and the Spanish, who were antipapal and wanted to reduce papal power. Tension was so great that for a period of ten months starting in September 1562 no business could be carried on. There were riots in the streets and actual bloodshed. Pope Pius IV, however, was able to bring the council to a successful conclusion in December 1563. At its last session it voted to submit its decrees to the pope, an act which recognized his victory and his supremacy in the church. He confirmed all the conciliar decrees and established a congregation of cardinals to see that they were carried out. Thus the conciliar movement of the sixteenth century, like that of the fifteenth, marks a victory for the papacy within the church and another important step in the construction of papal absolutism.

In spite of conflict and diplomatic problems, the sessions of 1562-63 were fruitful. As the sessions began, no reform decrees of real importance had yet been passed; there was resistance at Rome to reforms that would cause a decline in papal revenues. Before the end of the council, however, reform decrees of great importance were issued. After so many fruitless attempts at reform, now at last, when the Christian world had been rent asunder, a really thoroughgoing reformation in the church was instituted. Special attention was given to the bishops; the decrees of the council insisted on the duty of bishops to reside in their dioceses. They must never be absent for more than three months, and not at all during Advent and Lent. Pluralism was forbidden. Bishops were required to preach every Sunday and holy day, and to visit every church within their diocese at least once a
year. Each bishop was to exercise careful supervision over his clergy, ordaining only worthy priests and severely disciplining those guilty of misconduct.

Priests also were held to the obligation of residence and were required to preach. To improve the level of priestly education, the council proposed the establishment of a theological seminary in every diocese. Priests were to exercise care for their flocks, explaining the Bible, the sacraments, and the liturgy.

Regulations were also drawn up for the religious orders, dealing with the age of admission and the conditions under which novices could be admitted, the election of superiors, and similar matters. To end the abuse of the granting of abbeys in commendam as favors to laymen and other unworthy persons, it was provided that abbeys could be granted only to members of religious orders. The enforcement of the rules relating to the orders was entrusted to the bishops.

The reception of the decrees of the council by the Catholic states of Europe varied greatly. In the Italian states, Portugal, Poland, and Savoy, the decrees were soon adopted, and Emperor Maximilian II adopted them in Germany in 1566. Philip II of Spain adopted them "without prejudice to the rights of the Crown." The French never officially accepted them, but in practice France was willing to abide by the doctrinal decrees, though she never recognized those concerning discipline.

Thus the decrees were not adopted universally, enthusiastically, or unanimously. Even where they were accepted, old abuses were not immediately wiped out. Reforming bishops often faced immense difficulties in carrying out the decrees of the council. Resistance to reform might come from the local clergy, who had vested interests in perpetuating abuses, and even from the papacy, whose interference might hinder reform rather than further it. Nevertheless, the work of the council eventually succeeded in infusing a new spirit in the church, which strengthened it immensely and made it capable of defense and even further conquest.

To the popes also fell a larger share of the responsibility for furthering the work of the council. A pope in the mold of Paul IV (who indeed had been impressed by him and given him advancement) was Pius V (1566-72). He was a man of blameless life, who brought his asceticism to the papacy, living in a monastic cell and sometimes going barefoot through the streets of Rome, visiting the churches like a pilgrim. Needless to say, luxury, pomp, and laxity of behavior among the cardinals and other prelates in Rome came to an end.

Pius V lost no time in carrying out the disciplinary decrees of the Council of Trent as far as he could, particularly in Rome. Cardinals, bishops, and priests were recalled to their duties, and the reorganization of the Curia was undertaken in an effort to stamp out such abuses as simony and nepotism. The streets of Rome were cleared of prostitutes. The pope saw to the publication of the Roman Missal and Catechism ordered by the council. He also published a Roman Breviary, as well as the Summa theologicae of Thomas Aquinas, whom he made a Doctor of the Church in 1567. He ordered the universities to teach Thomism exclusively.

Pius was also active in admonishing secular rulers to combat heresy and to promote the cause of reform. By threatening the emperor Maximilian II with excommunication, he checked concessions to Protestants in Germany. When the Catholic queen of Sweden took communion "in both kinds," she was excommunicated. Elizabeth I of England, as has been seen, was excommunicated in 1570.
In Italy, the activity of the Inquisition was intensified by this pope. He sent troops to France to fight the Huguenots. He was largely instrumental in raising the forces that won the battle of Lepanto in 1571 against the Turks, a glorious but not very fruitful victory. Pius V, one of the outstanding popes of the Catholic Reformation, helped to give it those qualities of unbending rigidity and zeal for reform that we have already noted. He has since been canonized.

The popes, who followed Pius V, though they did not equal him in moral stature, continued the work of reform and reorganization, carrying out the decrees of the council and strengthening the church. Gregory XIII (1572-85) is associated with the calendar reform which was brought about under his supervision. Under the Julian calendar, which had prevailed since the days of Julius Caesar, there had grown up a discrepancy between the calendar year and the solar year. This discrepancy was now rectified, partly by dropping ten days from the year 1582, when the new calendar went into effect. Thus October 4, 1582, was followed by October 15. Protestant countries like England followed suit only in the eighteenth century, and Russian in the twentieth. Gregory greatly favored the work of the Jesuits, helping their German College of Rome to become a training school for missionaries to Germany. He also favored the Jesuits' Roman College, making it into the Gregorian University and bringing in eminent teachers. He insisted on residence for bishops and even deprived some of the cardinals of offices whose duties they were not carrying out.

His successor, a Franciscan who took the name Sixtus V (1585-90), is one of the most vigorous popes of the Catholic Reformation; but stern and bellicose in the line of Paul IV and Pius V. His methods were drastic and harsh and not always effective. He succeeded in putting down the disturbances of the nobles, whose unruly behavior had long been a curse of the Papal States, and restoring order in the Campagna. Adultery, prostitution, theft, and even small moral faults were prosecuted so vigorously that objections were heard in Rome and the pope was bitterly attacked in lampoons.

Sixtus was, however, a great administrator. Under him, the dome of St. Peters, designed by Michelangelo, was finally completed. Because of his efforts, a new edition of the Vulgate based on the Septuagint was brought out. The work was completed hastily and required corrections under the next pope, but with these changes it became the basis for all subsequent editions.

His greatest accomplishment lay in the reorganization of papal administration. In 1586 he fixed the number of cardinals at seventy. In 1588 he revised the entire structure of the Curia by establishing the system of permanent congregations, each one charged with a branch of the work of the church. The idea was not wholly new, but Sixtus developed and systematized it and made it the basis of the entire mechanism of the church. Among these bodies were the Congregation of the Holy Office or Inquisition; the Congregation of the Council, charged with carrying out the decrees of Trent; and the Congregation of the Index, which was to supervise the list of prohibited books.

By the start of the 17th century, the Catholic Reformation was reaching its full development. The papacy, in the hands of able and determined men, was in full charge of the movement; the church, with its moral authority and spiritual prestige restored, proved to have weathered the crises of the Renaissance and Reformation. The seventeenth century was to witness further triumphs, and the future was to show that the chief problems the church would face would not come from Protestantism, but from the forces that have so largely characterized the modern world: religious indifference and skepticism, science, the growth of materialism, and the pursuit by men of ends that were primarily secular and material.
THE ROMAN INQUISITION

The Catholic Reformation aimed not only at spreading the faith through reform of the church and through preaching and teaching; in another of its aspects, it also sought to suppress heresy. The chief institution directed to this purpose was the Holy Office of the Roman Inquisition. It was not altogether new; in the middle Ages, there had been papal and episcopal inquisitions established for the task of searching out heretics and bringing them to trial. By the fifteenth century, however, the activity of these bodies had lessened. In Italy, the power of the papal Inquisition had declined, together with its organization. In 1478, however, Ferdinand and Isabella had revived the Inquisition in the Spanish kingdoms, and it operated very effectively. Cardinal Caraffa (later Paul IV), who had observed it in operation, was impressed by it and wanted a papal Inquisition of the same sort a permanent, centralized tribunal with universal jurisdiction and power over all persons, even the most highly placed, who might be suspected of heresy.

It was Caraffa who was chiefly instrumental in persuading Paul III in 1542 to reestablish the Roman Inquisition. It had six Inquisitors-General, with great powers. They were independent of the bishops in their jurisdiction, could degrade priests from their offices, could exercise censure, call in the aid of the secular arm, and delegate powers. While they could punish, only the pope could pardon. Caraffa himself was president of the tribunal, a fact that prevented any serious deviation into leniency. The Dominicans, long associated with the suppression of heresy, were put in charge of the courts of the Inquisition.

As a matter of fact, however, although the records of the Holy Office have never been made available, it appears to have proceeded with more restraint than might be inferred. Torture seems to have been used rarely, special consideration was given to the sick, and the judges were merciful. Caraffa was inflexible, however, in his insistence that no mercy be shown to the great. This is clear from the four rules of procedure that he established: 1) punish on suspicion; 2) have no regard for the great; 3) punish most severely those who take shelter behind the powerful; 4) show no mildness, least of all toward Calvinists.

At first the establishment of the Inquisition in the Italian cities was slower than Caraffa had hoped. The Italians did not show any natural disposition toward the burning of heretics, and some of the cities resisted the foundation of the new tribunal. When Caraffa became Pope Paul IV in 1555, he had his opportunity to give the Inquisition the scope and effectiveness that he desired. Even as pope, his interest in the work of the Holy Office was enormous. It was said by the Venetian ambassador at Rome that nothing on earth could prevent him from attending its meetings. Michele Ghislieri (later Pius V), a man after the pope's own heart, was put at the head of it, and Paul greatly increased its authority and powers. He was able to make it effective in the Italian cities that had harbored unorthodox views, especially Venice.

The states of Europe were asked to facilitate the work of the Inquisition. In France, the request was denied. In Spain, however, the activities of the Inquisition, long vigorous, were stimulated even further. Persecution reached a new peak; even St. Teresa came under suspicion, and the archbishop of Toledo was arrested. When Paul IV, long an enemy of the Hapsburgs, finally made peace with Philip II, the result was to strengthen the Spanish domination in Milan and Naples and, in turn, to provide the Inquisition with Spanish support and enable it to oppose the resistance of the Italian states. Thus the increasing Spanish domination helped in the repression of heresy and free thought in Italy.
Even after the death of Paul IV in 1559, the repression of heresy in Italy continued. The French duchess of Ferrara, Rene, daughter of Louis XII, was forced by the Inquisition to leave Ferrara, where she had long been hospitable to advanced opinions in religion. In 1562, in Calabria, two thousand Waldensian heretics were massacred. With the coming of the implacable Ghislieri to the papal throne as Pius V in 1566, the Inquisition he had headed became particularly active. Burnings became common in Rome, and cardinals and ambassadors were compelled to attend. Throughout Italy the same policy of repression was carried out.

THE INDEX

Another means of suppressing heretical doctrines was found in the Roman Index of Prohibited Books, a list of works considered dangerous to the faith, which Catholics were, therefore, forbidden to read. Even before this list was officially drawn up, there had been cases of censorship of the reading matter of the faithful, particularly since the invention of printing in the fifteenth century. Popes, councils, and secular rulers both Catholic and Protestant all engaged in censorship. In 1501 Pope Alexander VI made archbishops official censors for their provinces. Paul III also undertook to prevent the dissemination of pernicious books, and imposed severe punishments on those who sold them.

The Roman Inquisition was active in censoring books, and Cardinal Caraffa, after becoming Pope Paul IV, published the Roman Index of Prohibited Books in 1559 and established a special congregation to look after censorship. Three classes of authors and books were placed on the Index: 1) authors who had erred ex professo. All their works were forbidden, even those that contained nothing against the faith; 2) authors of whom only some works were condemned. In this category was placed the 1537 report of Paul III's reform commission, of which the present pope had been a member; 3) books with some harmful doctrines, mostly by anonymous heretics. In this third group were also books that lacked the name of the author, or the date and place of publication, or had been printed without ecclesiastical permission. All translations of the New Testament in the vernacular were forbidden, and sixty-one printers were named, all of whose works were prohibited. Erasmus was placed in the first category, and all of his writings were condemned.

Paul's successor, Pius IV, revised the Index and relaxed the harshness that had appeared excessive to some Catholics. For example, the blanket condemnation of Erasmus was lifted, and only some of his works were prohibited. The Council of Trent, which had shown an interest in censorship since its earliest sessions, drew up its own list of forbidden books. This list, the Tridentine Index, was published in 1564. Erasmus was put in the second class. On the other hand, a wide variety of books was now condemned, including not only heretical ones but also obscene books on witchcraft, and so forth. Pius V appointed a Congregation of the Index, to keep the Index up to date and to publish revised editions periodically.

RELIGIOUS REVIVAL

More than repression was needed to revitalize the church, however; and there was a genuine revival of Catholic piety led by a number of men and women of outstanding devotion and sanctity. Charles Borromeo, after the death of his uncle Pope Pius IV, returned to Milan where he was archbishop. Pius IV had made him cardinal and papal secretary of state. He was in Milan from 1565 until his death in 1584 carrying out the Tridentine reforms and raising the standards of the clergy. The administration of the province was reformed to bring about closer supervision of the priests.
Seminaries were founded. Provincial councils were regularly held. Discipline was restored both among secular priests and in the religious orders. He gave his property to the poor, and founded schools and hospitals for their benefit. During time of plague he visited the sick and brought them the consolations of the church.

In Spain, two outstanding saints of the period were Teresa of Avila and John of the Cross. St. Teresa, a member of Spanish nobility, had become a Carmelite as a young girl. The Carmelite order, which attracted women from highly placed families, was living under a somewhat relaxed rule, and its members were on the whole rather worldly. Teresa, after undergoing severe religious crises and unusual mystical experiences, felt led in 1562 to found in Avila a convent that should return to the original strict rule of the order. In addition to being a devout mystic, she proved to have great practical talent as an organizer and enormous energy, which enabled her to found numerous other reformed convents of her order.

St. John of the Cross, a member of the male branch of the Carmelites was an ascetic who also longed for a return to strict obedience to the primitive rules of the order. He collaborated with Teresa by bringing the Carmelite reform to men, as she was doing for women. Like her, he was a mystic. Both of them met with opposition, and John was subjected to suffering and indignity. Eventually, after they had both died, the reformed Carmelites received permanent recognition from the popes. The influence of their reform spread far and wide and persists today among the members of their order.

A contemporary of these saints, who worked in Rome, was St. Philip Neri (1515–95). He too was a mystic, a man noted for his humor and his informal approach, who worked in the streets of Rome, preaching even when he was still a layman to all sorts of people, and attempting to bring about a moral regeneration. He eventually did become a priest. He is most famous for the order he founded, known as the Oratory (to be distinguished from the Oratory of Divine Love). It was different from other orders in the church because it combined priests and laymen in a very loose organization with a very simple rule. Its chief bond, according to the founder, was love and affection. It accomplished much and was widely imitated.

Thus throughout Catholic Europe, inspired by such leaders as these, there was a renewal and revival of Christian feeling. In France, such individuals as St. Francis de Sales (1567–1622) did great work. The seventeenth century was to see a continuation of the Catholic reform. To what extent was this revival a result of the Protestant Reformation? It is impossible to determine. But it may be said that the conflicts and crises of Christendom in the sixteenth century were not in vain. There was a revival of faith in Europe. The churches were to find that their mutual antagonisms were perhaps less dangerous to their well-being than forces outside them altogether. More subtle enemies lay in wait, and to this day have not been successfully met.

6. Consequences of the Reformation.

The Reformation had significant and far-reaching effects:

Three groups of Christians: Christianity was already divided between the Orthodox East and the Catholic West, much before the 16th century. During the Reformation, in the 16th century, the Catholic West further split up into two groups; one that remained Catholic and the other that took the new name of Protestant. The areas to which Catholic Christianity remained confined included
Italy, Spain, Portugal, France, the Southern Netherlands, the forest cantons of Switzerland, southern Germany, Ireland, Poland, Lithuania, Czechoslovakia, most of Hungary, northern Yugoslavia, South America, Central America, Mexico, most of the West Indies, Quebec and the Philippine Islands. However, Protestant Christianity mainly spread in northern and central Germany, Scandinavia, Finland, Esthonia, Latvia, the Northern Netherlands, most of Switzerland, Scotland, England, the United States, most of Canada, South Africa and Australia.

There were certain basic similarities between the Catholic, Protestant and Orthodox countries. They were inspired by Jesus as their founder; they magnified the Bible and upheld Christian morals and virtues. However, there were several theological differences. Protestants and those of the Orthodox Church did not agree with the Catholics over the Pope’s claims and rejected his authority and government. Protestants made important changes with regard to the sacraments, rejecting the concepts of purgatory, invocation of saints and veneration of relics. The Protestants asserted that final authority rested in the Bible, while the Catholics and the Orthodox claimed that it lay in the living institution of the Church.

An immediate and unfortunate effect of the Reformation was intolerance, which expressed itself in persecution and religious wars. Instead of generating the true spirit of Christ, that is, the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, the Reformation made thousands suffer on account of their religion. The subjects of the Spanish, Portuguese and Italian monarchs were forced to remain Catholic, or to suffer death or imprisonment at the hands of the Inquisition. King Philip II of Spain, and ‘Bloody’ Mary in England persecuted the Protestants. Similarly, the Protestant princes of Germany punished their Catholic subjects.

Civil war broke out in Switzerland under Zwingli. In Germany, Lutheranism resulted in civil strife until the Treaty of Augsburg restored peace in 1555. In France too, civil war broke out between the Huguenots who were Calvinists, and those who preferred Catholicism followed by the French monarchs. Many of the Huguenots had to leave France after suffering badly. The Edict of Nantes issued by King Henry IV in 1598 restored peace in France. These civil wars were a hindrance to security, material prosperity and cultural advancement.

As a result of the Reformation, revolts and wars broke out, causing loss of life, property, prestige and power.

a. War between Spain and the Netherlands: A large number of Dutch people who had become Calvinists rose in opposition to Philip II, the ruler of the Netherlands. A terrible war took place and Holland was finally recognized as an independent state only in 1648, fifty years after Philip’s death.

b. The Anglo-Spanish War: During the rule of Elizabeth, Protestantism was re-established in England. Philip II then sent a vast fleet of warships, the Armada in order to carry out his will forcibly. However the valor of the English seamen as well as the violent storms, succeeded in repulsing and destroying the Armada.

c. In 1618, a war broke out in Germany between the Catholics and the Protestants, which lasted for thirty years. Hence it is known as the Thirty Years War. This soon spread like a great fire, into an international war being not only religious, but also political and economic. The various treaties of 1648 that brought the war to an end are called the Peace of Westphalia.
placed Calvinists on an equal footing with Lutherans and Catholics. Further all Church property would continue to be in the possession of those who owned it in 1624.

d. Owing to the Reformation, the hands of the rulers were strengthened against the Church. Thus it was a boon to rulers. In the name of the Reformation, Henry VIII deprived the Pope of any powers over the English church. The German princes were happy to be free from the control of the Pope. The kings of Europe could now build their countries according to the pattern of their choice. The spirit of nationalism was given a fresh impetus by the Reformation.

e. New ideas arose in the economic field where there were healthy changes. People were free from medieval ideas and the tyranny of the Orthodox Church. Thus, they could pursue certain economic activities such as money lending, which was criticized in the past. Owing to the Reformation old ideas were discarded and the moneylender was given a status in society.

f. By annihilating the economic power of the medieval Church, the Reformation paved the way for the rise of capitalism.

g. Though the Reformation was religious in nature, it had far-reaching effects in all fields. Thus it helped in the shaping of the modern world, along with other movements.

THE DOCTRINAL UNITY OF THE REFORMERS

A. Doctrine

1. Bible Only (Sola Scriptura): The Reformers declared the Bible to be the only rule of faith and practice. They believed that God had made a revelation in written form to men in the Bible. They taught that the Bible was inspired by God and authoritative, and that it took precedence over the declarations of popes, church tradition and church councils. They asserted that men, under the illumination of the Holy Spirit, are to study the Bible to learn about God, Christ, salvation, and church government and practices. They encouraged Christians to read and study their Bibles in a scholarly way so as to form a biblical theology based on the authority of the Scriptures alone. The Bible, hitherto written in Latin and read only by the clergy, was translated anew into the vernacular tongues of Europe and made a book of the people.

2. Christ Only (Solo Christo): Salvation is located not in the church, an organization, but in the person Jesus Christ. Jesus Christ actually secured and procured the salvation of all who are saved by grace through faith in Christ.

3. Grace Only (Sola Gratia): The Reformers believed that salvation was caused totally by God’s grace. Man is not saved by works but by God’s grace in Christ. No man deserves salvation, and if he is saved it is because of God’s unconditional grace.

4. Faith Only (Sola Fide): Faith alone is consistent with God’s grace in calling to salvation. Thus the Reformers taught that salvation was appropriated by faith alone. Good works could not save but only Christ can save those who believe in Him. Every and any person who trusts the Saviour will be saved, but even a person’s faith is a gift from God.

5. God’s Glory Only (Soli Deo Gloria): The underlying, foundational doctrine of the Reformers was that God’s glory was the ultimate purpose of all things. They held tenaciously to the doctrines of God’s sovereignty in election, predestination and the
efficacious call of God in salvation, and saw how these contributed ultimately to God’s glory rather than to man’s or to the church’s. The Reformers taught supernaturalism and the necessity of a new birth from God.

B. Attitude towards Rome

1. The Reformers did not believe that Roman Catholicism and Protestantism were just two different forms of Christianity. They believed and taught that Roman Catholicism was heretical and apostate. Roman Catholicism was a religion of works, but Protestantism was the true Christian religion based on God’s grace appropriated by faith. The Reformers were not tolerant of Rome, for they sincerely believed that Rome was holding souls in bondage with no hope of salvation. NOTE: There can be no fellowship between grace-based salvation and law-based salvation, between faith-based salvation and works-based salvation, just as there can be no fellowship between light and darkness. Roman Catholicism is a legal religion, but Protestantism is evangelical Christianity. Catholicism is ruled by the principle of human authority, but Protestantism by the principle of freedom in Christ. Catholicism leads to bondage, but Protestantism to the true gospel and spiritual freedom.

2. The Reformers would not go so far to say that there were no Christians in the Roman Church, but they distinguished between saved people in the Roman Church and the Roman Church as an unbiblical and corrupt system. “Therefore, while we are unwilling simply to concede the name of Church to the Papists, we do not deny that there are churches among them. The question we raise only relates to the true and legitimate constitution of the Church, implying communion in sacred rites, which are the signs of profession and especially in doctrine. . . . We do not at all deny that churches remain under his (Anti-Christ’s) tyranny; churches, however, which by sacrilegious impiety he has profaned, by cruel domination has oppressed, by evil and deadly doctrines like poisoned potions has corrupted and almost slain; churches where Christ lies half-buried, the Gospel is suppressed, piety is put to flight, and the worship of God almost abolished; where, in short, all things are in such disorder as to present the appearance of Babylon rather than the holy city of God”.

Important Pointsto Remember

Meaning

Reformation was a revolt against the authority of the church, represented by the Pope. The activists that opposed Roman Catholicism were called ‘Protestants.’

Importance of the Reformation

The church enjoyed an overall supremacy, controlling political institutions, economic activities, literary and artistic developments.

Blind faith in the church was questioned and this heralded the modern times.

Causes of the Reformation

The Spirit of inquiry was brought down from the Renaissance movement was strengthened with geographical discoveries that brought in a secular outlook.
The French King Philip IV established the right to tax church property and forced the Pope to live in France instead of Rome. Hence the authority of the Pope was greatly reduced.

The clergy faced stiff opposition from the people as some of them were involved in immoral activities. John Wye declared that the Pope did not represent Christ but in fact was anti-Christ.

The Pope’s interference in non-religious matters was highly resented and this made the Pope unpopular not only among monarchs but also among the people.

As the Clergy became more materialistic, church property and rare relics were sold off.

Martin Luther questioned the sale of indulgences in 1517 by the agents of Pope X. He was excommunicated but could not be punished as he enjoyed the support of the people, the priests and the monks.

**Spread of Protestantism**

- In Germany the north turned Protestant while the south remained Catholic.
- Lutheranism was adopted in Scandinavia.
- Switzerland became partially Protestant influenced by the Reformed Church of Zwingli.
- The French Protestants were Calvinists and were called Huguenots.
- Through the Act of Supremacy, King Henry VIII of England made the King of England the head of the Church instead of the Pope.
- The Anglican Church was established during the reign of Queen Elizabeth.

**The Counter Reformation**

- Ignatius Loyola founded the Society of Jesus and its followers were known as Jesuits. Their contribution earned back substantial respect for the Catholic Church.
- The Pope tried to retain Catholicism in Spain, Portugal, France, Italy and Austria by entering into various treaties.

**Consequences of the Reformation**

- The Catholic Church, first split into the Orthodox Church, suffered another split: Protestantism.
- Religious persecution was an undesirable effect of the Reformation.
- Civil wars broke out in Switzerland, France and Germany.
- Kings gained supremacy at the expense of Popes.
- New trades like money lending were no longer frowned upon by the clergy.
- As the economic authority of the church decreased, it paved the way for capitalism.
GEOGRAPHICAL DISCOVERIES IN THE 15TH AND 16TH CENTURIES

Introduction

The Renaissance aroused a spirit of adventure as well as a great deal of curiosity among the Europeans. After Constantinople was captured by the Ottoman Turks in 1453, the Europeans had to depend upon the Italian merchants for securing oriental goods. Venice was a great commercial empire lying between Europe and the East, in the 14th and 15th centuries. The ports of the eastern Mediterranean received spices from the Indies, silk from China, gems and fine cotton goods from India, pearls from the Persian Gulf, ivory and emeralds from the east coast of Africa, and also fine steel weapons from the forges of Damascus and other Muslim cities. Venice then bartered in exchange, products from Europe such as hides, furs, woolen clothes and copper. To carry out this exchange, Venice sent out great trading fleets, which passed through the straits of Gibraltar stopped at ports on the west European coast and ended in the lowlands. Though the Europeans, like the Portuguese, envied the Venetian monopoly of trade, they were forced to depend upon Venice for commodities such as spices.

1. Importance of Geographical Discoveries

The geographical discoveries of the 14th and 15th centuries were of immense significance as they helped to usher in the modern times. Further they also changed the course of history. Owing to these discoveries, great power was put in the hands of the European states, illustrating how Europe was able to march ahead, while countries of the East lagged far behind.

Before the geographical explorations took place, contact between the East and the West was established only through land. Adventurous travelers experienced great difficulty in covering vast distances, and spent most of their lives in trying to reach their destinations. Thus discoveries of new sea routes led to great changes in the world.

Though contacts had been established in the past, many countries had remained a closed book to most of the people. However, during the later middle Ages, several bold and enterprising men of Europe, sailed the unknown seas, and brought to sight the existence of new countries and continents.

2. Causes of Geographical Discoveries

There were many factors that urged the Europeans to discover new trade routes and new lands. The basic reason why Europeans made geographical discoveries was that "Europe was hungry", as has been remarked. Young men were hungry for adventure, whereas kings were hungry for conquest. However, thousands of Europeans in the crowded parts of Europe were hungry for land as well as for gain. Thus these motives drove people out of Europe in search of new lands.

After the fall of Constantinople, the capital of the Eastern Roman Empire, into the hands of the fanatical Ottoman Turks, the trade routes lying within the Turkish empire, were closed to European traders. Thus European countries were provoked into discovering new trade routes and thus even new countries. There was a steady increase in Europe in the demand for Oriental Commodities, such as Asian Spices. The Europeans were traders who had to supply their economic needs, since their need was greater than the rest of the world.
Owing to the Crusades, a closer contact was established between the Christians and the Muslims, during the middle ages. Thus the European traders in general, and the Italians in particular, had better avenues of trade and commerce available to them. Huge profits were reaped from the oriental trade, by the new towns, which sprang up in the medieval age. For example, Venice the "queen of the Mediterranean", developed a rich commercial empire and was highly envied for her strategic position and for her brisk commerce and wealth. The desire to have profits thus formed a strong motive for geographical discoveries.

The monopoly of the distribution of the Asian articles of commerce on the European continent was in the hands of the Genoese and Venetian merchants. This had led the Italian merchants to purposely increase the prices and thus maximize their profits. Owing to this, there was a desire in the non-Italian traders to directly contact the Asiatic countries. Byfinding an all sea-route to the East, these traders could obtain their goods without paying any additional tolls.

Marco Polo’s sojourn in the empire of Kublai Khan and the precious stones that he displayed to his friends created in them a desire to amass wealth. Europeans were ready to face great dangers in order to discover new trade routes and secure the fabulous riches of the East. The love of adventure encouraged many Europeans to sail the unknown seas and to face costly risks, since the large ocean liners of the modern period, could not be built during the 15th century. Yet several Europeans come forward to do great deeds even at the cost of sacrificing their lives.

Christianity, the dominant religion of Europe, was also one of the most intensely missionary religions known to the world. Towards the end of the Middle Age, Christian missionaries had traveled all over Europe and were now turning in the direction of Asia. Thus it became a passion among many missionaries to propagate Christianity in new lands. Powerful missionary movements were organized in Europe, to carry the message of Christianity to every nook and corner of the world. The kings and nobles, who encouraged the search for new lands, also desired to spread Christianity in these lands. Thus merchants and missionaries left Europe together, eagerly following the explorers in their discovery of new routes. The Renaissance had fostered a spirit of inquiry that had revolutionized geographical ideas. Though the church had supported the theory that the earth is flat, scholars established the fact that the earth is round. This new idea was highly useful for the geographical explorations.

It was not enough only to possess the willingness to go on dangerous voyages, to undertake risks, or to possess skill and experience. The European sailors already possessed skill in the art of navigation owing to maritime activities on the Mediterranean coast, and also along the indented coast of Africa. However certain aids to navigation were essential. The scientists and inventors of the Renaissance period provided aids such as the Mariner’s compass. Scholars improve upon the art of map making and the knowledge of geography and astronomy. Powerful and rich men provided better economic facilities. An improvement in the technique of shipbuilding also helped the discoveries to a great extent.

3. Early Travelers to the Far East

Europeans established direct contact with central and eastern Asia in the 13th and 14th centuries. The Pope and King Louis IX of France sought to convert the Mongols to Christianity; so as to secure their help as allies in the Crusades against the Muslims. In 1245, a Franciscan monk, John of Plano Carpini, was sent on a journey through Poland and Russia, to the capital of the great Khan in
Mongolia. He was followed by William of Rubruquis, another Franciscan monk, who traveled from Constantinople northward and eastward around the Black and Caspian seas. The books written by these Franciscans about their travels awakened the interest of Europeans in distant and strange parts of Asia.

The Polo brothers, who were merchants of Venice, were the first Europeans to travel to China and visit the court of Kublai Khan, about 1260. On their second trip to China, they took along young Marco Polo, son of one and nephew of the other, who became the most celebrated traveler of the Middle Age. They traveled for four years through Armenia and Persia, and across the Gobi desert, and traveled for 17 years in China. When the Polos left China by boat in 1292, they touched the Spice Islands and Southern India and sailed up the Persian Gulf. They traveled on land to the Mediterranean, arriving in Venice in 1295. Many Europeans including Christopher Columbus read Marco Polo’s valuable account of his travels.

The trails of the Polos were followed by European merchants and missionaries who traveled to China either over land through Russia and Mongolia or by sea from Persia around India and Indo-China. During the rule of the Buddhist Mings, for nearly three centuries, Christianity was blotted out in China. However the lure of far Cathay, as China was called at that time inspired Europeans to find new water routes to the Indies and to Cathay.

4. Important Geographical Discoveries

The pioneers in the field of adventurous voyages were the Portuguese and the Spaniards.

The Cape-Route to the East

Prince Henry, commonly called Henry the navigator, was a great patron of navigation in Portugal. He had the dream of finding a way to the East by sailing around Africa. Though he did not sail ships himself, Prince Henry established a school in Portugal for navigators, which attracted skillful Italian sailors and learned geographers. He sent out naval expeditions of fighting men, merchants and missionaries. They colonized the Madeira and the Azores Islands, and also explored the uncharted coast of the Dark Continent. Even after Prince Henry’s death Lopo Gonsalves crossed the Equator in 1472, and ten years later, Diego Cao found the mouth of the Congo. In 1488, a brave captain named Bartholomew Diaz sailed up to Africa’s southern most tip which he named the "Cape of Storms". However on his return to Portugal the King preferred to call it the "Cape of Good Hope" since it gave the Portuguese the good hope of reaching India.

The King’s hope was fulfilled in 1497, when Vasco da Gama another Portuguese navigator sailed around the cape up the east coast of Africa, across the Indian Ocean and landed at Calicut in India. He returned in 1499, with a cargo of eastern goods worth 60 times the cost of his expedition. Thereafter, the Portuguese regularly sailed to the East via the Cape of Good Hope, returning laden with rich cargoes of spices, silks and jewels.

5. The Consequences of the Discoveries

Owing to the geographical exploration and discoveries, Europeans were led to Asia, Africa and America. Thus different results were produced in different places. While America was speedily Europeanized, Asia, and Africa were affected less promptly and less deeply.
After the discovery of the new routes, Europe secured plentiful supplies of not only old and essential articles, but also of many new ones. There was a wide and extensive market in Europe of articles such as Indian textiles and Persian carpets. Several new articles such as potatoes, chocolate, cocoa, quinine, tobacco, cane-sugar, furs, whale oil, indigo, tea, coffee, porcelain, cotton silks and spices were introduced in Europe. With the increase in the number and quantities of commodities entering Europe, there was a decline in prices. Europeans began to consume many of the originally scarce foreign goods as staple commodities.

After the discovery of the new routes, Europe secured plentiful supplies of not only old and essential articles, but also of many new ones. There was a wide and extensive market in Europe of articles such as Indian textiles and Persian carpets. Several new articles such as potatoes, chocolate, cocoa, quinine, tobacco, cane-sugar, furs, whale oil, indigo, tea, coffee, porcelain, cotton silks and spices were introduced in Europe. With the increase in the number and quantities of commodities entering Europe, there was a decline in prices. Europeans began to consume many of the originally scarce foreign goods as staple commodities.

6. Dates & Events

1245 - John of Plano Carpini was sent to the court of the Great Khan in Mongolia.
1260 - The Polo brothers reach the court of Kublai Khan in China.
1488 - Bartholomeu Dias reaches the Cape of Good Hope at the tip of Africa.
1492 - Queen Isabella of Spain sponsors Christopher Columbus to find a route to India.
1498 - Vasco da Gama goes around the cape and across the Indian Ocean to reach India (Calicut).

John Cabot makes a voyage to North America

1499 - Amerigo Vespucci lands in America.
1500 - Cabral reaches South America (Brazil)
1510 - Goa becomes the capital of the Portuguese Eastern Empire.
1513 - Balboa crosses the Isthmus of Panama.
1515-1547 - The French king Francis I extends his colonies to Canada and the Mississipi Valley.
1517 - The Portuguese reach China.
1519 - Hernando Cortez discovers Mexico.
1534-1541 - Jaques Cartier carries out explorations in North America.

Important Points to Remember:

Importance of Geographical Discoveries

- Geographical discoveries through sea routes revolutionized the way people traveled. Thus new countries could be discovered.
Causes of Geographical Discoveries

- “Europe was hungry” for land as well as profit. Adventure and conquests were other motives for setting forth to discover new lands.
- The fall of Constantinople into the hands of the Ottoman Turks was reason enough for the Europeans to seek alternative routes.
- Cities like Venice, that thrived on oriental trade were envied and emulated.
- New discoveries (the earth is round not flat) and the adventurous spirit of explorers aided daring journeys.
- The spread of Christianity to nations far and wide served as an important factor.
- There were a number of inventions like the mariner’s compass that helped in geographical discoveries.

Early Travelers to the Far East

- The Polo brothers from Venice were the first Europeans to travel to China and visit the court of Kublai Khan, about 1260.
- The Polos laid out important routes that were followed by European merchants and missionaries who traveled to China.

Important Geographical Discoveries

- Portuguese and the Spaniards were the most adventurous explorers.
- Henry the navigator encouraged navigation by establishing a school for geographers.
- Bartholomew Diaz sailed to the “Cape of Storms” and “The Cape of Good Hope”
- Vasco da Gama was successful in reaching Calicut in India.
- Goa was conquered by the Portuguese, who made it the capital of their Eastern Empire.
- Christopher Columbus patronized by Queen Isabella of Spain set off on a voyage and reached the West Indies, thinking he had landed on India.
- Balboa crossed the Isthmus of Panama in 1513.
- Amerigo Vespucci landed on the “New World”. It was named after him.
  - One of the ships belonging to Ferdinand Magellan conducted a voyage around the world.
  - A Northwest sea route to the east was discovered.

Consequences of the Geographical Discoveries

- The “New World” was beginning to get ‘Europeanized’.
- Exclusive commodities that were scarce were easily available in abundance.
- It heralded an era of colonialism, imperialism and exploitation: countries like Portugal, Spain, England, Holland and France started establishing colonies over the newly discovered
lands. Colonies not only provided raw materials but also served as markets for the imperialist powers.

- Atlantic became the main highway of trade. Cities like Lisbon, London, Antwerp and Amsterdam buzzed with commercial activity.
- The general standard of living of the people increased; migration increased the prospects of one’s life. A powerful middle class emerged.
- Strong monarchies arose in countries like France England and Spain.
- New lands enabled persecuted people to migrate, thus in a way it fostered Protestantism.
- The church suffered a setback thanks to the introduction of a secular outlook.
- The gap between the east and the west was bridged as never before.

**COMMERCIAL REVOLUTION IN EUROPE**

A number of factors contributed to commercial revolution in Europe. Firstly, the discovery of the sea routes to both Asia and America provided a great fillip to the expansion of European commerce. The spice trade particularly thrived and the Europeans imported large quantities of cloves, cinnamon or pepper. They also imported clothes, calicoes, chintzes and gingham. They also imported a large variety of new products from the new world such as potatoes, maize, tomatoes, sugar, warm furs, cocoa, tobacco, gold, and ivory was also brought to Europe's economy.

Secondly, the rise of the banking institutions also greatly contributed to commercial revolution. No doubt private banks existed in various countries of Europe during the 14th and 15th centuries but their resources proved inadequate to meet the growing needs of the 17th century. Therefore, these private banks were superseded by the public demands chartered by the government. The first such bank was chartered in 1609 and is known as Bank of Amsterdam. In 1694 Bank of England was chartered.

Thirdly, the government also contributed to commercial revolution by encouraging the formation of trading companies. The government felt that trading companies would be able to bear the probable losses involved in long distance trade and would be 'in a better position to secure concessions for trade from foreign rulers.

Above all, they felt that they would be able to realize taxes from the companies and there would be very little chance of being defrauded.

The commercial practices also underwent a great change during this period and they fundamentally differed from the practices existing in the medieval age. The new commercial practice was characterized by three distinct features, viz. expansion, specialization and integration. Expansion means that the market for the commodities greatly expanded. It was not confined to local, provincial or even national level but even covered international trade. Trade grew between different countries of Europe and later on even with different corners of the globe. In other words, the commercial markets greatly expanded.

In contrast with the practice prevailing in the medieval age when industrial and commercial functions were combined, these two functions were separated, and a special class of merchants,
exclusively devoted to business, made its appearance. The percentage of the total population engaged in commercial activities also steadily increased. Certain new classes of commercial functionaries like brokers, commission agents, commercial travellers also made appearance. These classes devoted themselves to some particular branch of commercial activity.

The practice of integration was another feature of commercial revolution. The practice was a reaction against excessive specialization and once again led to reunion of the economic functions. This practice manifested itself in the form of establishment of large shops, invasion in the field of production by the mercantile firms, and greater share of the manufacturers in the marketing of their goods.

A number of selling agencies were established through which the industrial firms began to dispose of their goods. Likewise the retail traders also tried to establish control over the manufacturing process by setting up factories for production of items they were selling. As a result of this process of integration the economic functions which had been served during the earlier period, were once again combined. In a way we can say that it reverted to earlier type.
UNIT-II

ERAS OF ABSOLUTISM AND MERCANTILISM

CAUSES FOR THE RISE OF ABSOLUTE MONARCHY IN EUROPE

A number of factors contributed to the rise of absolute monarchies in Europe in the 17th and 18th centuries. In the first place, the disorder, anarchy and confusion which prevailed in Europe during the medieval period greatly contributed to the growth of the absolute monarchies. People were fed up with uncertain conditions which caused them untold misery and were willing to be ruled by an absolute ruler who could assure them peace and order. This fact was fully exploited by rulers of Spain, France, England, Russia, Austria etc. to establish their absolute rule.

Secondly, as a result of the Crusades the rulers and nobles of Europe came in contact with the East, where absolute monarchy was a common form of government. This had its impact on the rulers of Europe and they tried to assert their authority. The nobles and barons who could have possibly checked them were so much enfeebled due to Crusades that they never dared to challenge the authority of the kings.

Thirdly, the enormous expansion in trade, commerce, industry and the consequent rise of towns and cities also greatly contributed to the growth of absolute monarchies in Europe. The traders, merchants and industrialists wanted peace and order so that they could carry on their occupation without any hindrance and were too willing to extend necessary support to the absolute rulers who promised them peace and order. The middle classes also provided the kings with necessary finances and useful officials.

Fourthly, the decline of the empire and the Papacy led to the growth of a number of nations where rulers successfully asserted their authority and established absolute rule. Had the empire not declined and the Papacy maintained its dominant position, absolute monarchies would not have grown in Europe.

Fifthly, Renaissance and Reformation also greatly contributed to the growth of absolute monarchies. As a result of Renaissance people took to the study of classical literature and discovered that ancient Romans thrived under the autocratic rule of one person and were willing to support autocratic rulers for the sake of the glory of the nation. Similarly, Reformation dealt a severe blow to the prestige of the Roman Church and in a number of countries the king became the head of the church. The kings began to treat church as a department of the state. They appointed the officials of the church and paid them salaries from the government treasury. Naturally, the kings began to be looked upon as heads of the state as well as the church.

Sixthly, the discovery of gun-power also greatly facilitated the emergence of absolute monarchies. After the discovery of gun-power the kings tried to free themselves from the control of the feudal lords and started maintaining standing armies of hired soldiers. With the help of canons and muskets these soldiers could destroy the castles and military forces of the nobles and barons. Consequently, the nobles and barons who could possibly raise voice against the autocratic powers of the king submitted to their authority.
Seventhly, the spirit of patriotism and nationalism which pervaded the seventeenth and the eighteenth centuries played no less significant role in the promotion of absolute monarchies. Fired by the spirit of patriotism and nationalism people were willing to extend full support to the rulers who could provide position of pride to the country.

Eighthly, during this period a number of political thinkers like Machiavelli, Bodin, Hobbes etc. greatly eulogised absolute monarchy and thus created a favourable climate for the growth of absolute monarch. Machiavelli in his ‘The Prince’ projected the need of an absolute king because he alone could provide security to people. He treated the king above law and Parliament. Likewise Jean Bodin in his book ‘The State propounded the theory of legal sovereignty’ asserted that the king was the source of all law and was accountable to God alone. Likewise Hobbes made a plea for absolute monarchy on the ground that it alone could provide peace, prosperity and stability to the country. Thus these thinkers created a favourable climate in favour of absolute monarchy.

Finally, the emergence of absolute monarchies was rendered possible due to the presence of a number of powerful monarchs like Louis XIV of France, Frederick of Prussia, Peter of Russia, Charles II of Spain, and Joseph II of Austria. These rulers waged numerous wars and brought glory of their perspective states. In addition they also attached great importance to the social, economic and cultural upliftment of the people which naturally won them their support, and helped them to establish their absolute rule.

Absolutism in France

The Foundations of French Absolutism: When Henry IV became King of France in 1589, he inherited a royal mess. Peasants were on the verge of starvation due to poor harvests; wolves, and bands of demoralized soldiers were a constant danger, and the population shrinking. Everyone in the country yearned for stability. Henry was largely responsible for this recovery. He was the first French Ruler since Louis IX (the real "St. Louis") to genuinely care about his people. When the French Revolution broke out in 1789, his statue was the only one the mob did not tear down.

Henry converted to Catholicism, but issued the Edict of Nantes as a means of winning Protestant support. He kept France at peace (except for one short insignificant war) and sharply lowered taxes. He compensated for the loss revenue from taxes by introducing an annual fee to be paid by royal officials to make sure that their positions would be inheritable, the Paulette.

Henry managed to restore financial and political stability in the country, but he was murdered by a fanatic in 1610, which created a crisis. He was succeeded by his son, Louis XIII, who still under age. Louis’ mother, Catherine de Medici, ruled as regent, although the real power lay with a number of feudal nobles. Things changed in 1624 when Catherine arranged to have Armand Jean du Plessis, Cardinal Richelieu appointed to the council of ministers. Richelieu soon became first minister, and used his strong influence over Louis XIII to strengthen the French monarchy. Richelieu single-handedly set in place the foundations for French absolutism. In 1624, Richelieu managed to reshuffle the royal council and thereby eliminated his political rivals. He leveled castles (a symbol of feudal independence) and had those who opposed him executed summarily. He successfully increased the power of the French state and thereby the power of the King.

Religion was still a point of contention in France, even though the Edict of Nantes had attempted to settle religious disputes. Under the Edict, the Calvinist Huguenots were granted 150 towns where
they might practice their faith. In 1627, Louis XIII decided that the Huguenots should be suppressed. He claimed that although they Huguenots demanded freedom of conscience, they did not allow Catholics to worship in their cities, which to him was political disobedience. In 1628, Louis' forces attacked the Huguenot city of New Rochelle, and destroyed the cities walls. Protestants were allowed the right to worship publicly, but Louis reinstated the Catholic liturgy, and Cardinal Richelieu himself celebrated the first Mass. This was an important step towards the unification of France as a Catholic state.

In foreign policy, Richelieu opposed the Holy Roman Empire which surrounded France, even though it was Catholic and he was a prince of the Church. He allied with Gustavus Adolphus of Sweden in the Swedish phase of the Thirty Years War. At the end of the war, the province of Alsace was French. Many of his actions seemed to contradict his position as a prince of the church; however he justified his policies by stating that "Where the interests of the state are concerned, God absolves actions which, if privately committed, would be a sin." In 1625, Richelieu gave official recognition to a group of philologists who later formed the French Academy. In 1694, long after Richelieu’s death, the academy published a dictionary which standardized the French language, much as Luther’s efforts in Germany had standardized *haupt deutsch* as the language of Germany.

Richelieu hand picked his own successor, Jules, Cardinal Mazarin an Italian known for his love of money and finery. When Louis XIII died in 1643, Queen Anne of Austria governed for the new child King Louis XIV who was four years old. She depended heavily upon Mazarin, who became the dominant power of the government. Anne and Mazarin prolonged the Thirty Years War by keeping French troops in the field, the cost of which led to a crisis. To pay the costs of the conflict, Mazarin borrowed heavily from financiers against expected revenue from new taxes and the sale of new offices. However, powerful nobles known as "nobles of the sword" (who owed their title to inheritance as opposed to the "nobility of the robe" who bought their titles) resisted, and tried to regain the influence they had lost earlier. When French forces defeated the Spanish in 1643, the French people believed peace was at hand, and that additional taxes were unnecessary. Ordinary people also joined the fray, demanding that taxes be lowered because of poor economic conditions. The result was a revolt known as the "Fronde" which lasted from 1648 to 1653.

Fronde means "slingshot" or "catapult." Street urchins who threw mud at the coaches of passing rich people were called *frondeur*. The term was used to describe anyone who opposed the policies of the government. Many groups, including noblemen, resented the increased power of the monarchy under Louis XIII, and Mazarin did not have Richelieu’s ability to control them.

During the Fronde, civil order broke down completely. Violence continued off and on for almost twelve years. Three significant consequences for the future resulted from the Fronde:

§ It became apparent that the government would have to compromise with the bureaucrats and social elites that controlled local institutions, who were already largely exempt from taxation. This eliminated another source of badly needed revenue.

§ The French economy was badly disrupted. It would not recover for many years.

§ Louis XIV was traumatically affected by the rebellion. He and his mother were frequently threatened, and on one occasion, when he was twelve years old, a mob broke into his bed chamber
to make sure he was indeed there. The experience terrified him. Louis never forgot the humiliation, and soon determined that an absolute monarchy was the only alternative to anarchy.

The Reign of Louis XIV: In September, 1651, Louis, age thirteen, declared his majority and the right to rule. His reign (1632-1715) was to become the longest in the history of Europe. He knew very little Latin and precious little arithmetic, but was fluent in Spanish and Italian and wrote elegantly. He installed his royal court at Versailles, twelve miles from Paris, and required all the nobility of France to spend some portion of the year there, or face disastrous consequences. Versailles had been begun by Louis XIII as a hunting lodge and as a retreat from a queen whom he disliked. Under his son, it was turned into an architectural masterpiece. The gigantic Great Hall of Mirrors, where the Treaty of Versailles (ending World War One) was negotiated was illuminated by candles and contained a ceiling with allegorical paintings of Louis’ victories.

Versailles was soon considered a reflection of French genius. The Russian Czar. Peter the Great (my hero) imitated it when he built his palace known as the Peterhof. Frederick the Great also constructed his palace at Potsdam after its design. He even gave it a French name: Sans Souci ("without care.") You should see it: I have. French soon became the language of polite society and the vehicle of diplomatic exchange. Nobles at the Imperial Russian Court spoke only French to each other—they were actually more fluent in French than in Russian. George I of England, German by birth, was fluent in French, but spoke no English, and refused to learn it. French also became the language of scholarship and learning, replacing Latin. At times, over 10,000 persons were in attendance at Versailles. Those nobles who were especially favored had the rare honor of assisting Louis when he dressed in the morning. It was a special privilege to help him put on his shirt, or to deliver to him the chaise percé ("chair with a hole in it.")

Louis was a shrewd judge of character, and surrounded himself with men of talent, but avoided dependence on any single person, as had his father. At times he could be unscrupulous, spying on nobles and opening their letters to discover their plans. During a visit to an unpopular finance minister, Louis was served with solid gold flatware and saw pools filled with seawater and large saltwater fish. He had planned to get rid of the minister anyway, and for this display of grandeur ordered him arrested, and kept the mansion for himself. Louis kept the propaganda machine going, which portrayed him as a glorious monarch. In 1662, he chose the sun as his emblem, and declared himself nec pluribus impar ("without equal.") To him, the son represented everything virtuous about an absolute monarch: firmness, benevolence, and equity. He was often depicted as Apollo, the Greek/Roman god of the sun, and was often called the "Sun King."

Financial and Economic Management Under Louis XIV: Financial management was Louis’ greatest weakness. While he was a master at extracting revenue from his subjects, his greatest talent was spending it with dizzying speed. His financial excesses and poor financial management put the monarchy into a financial tailspin, and set in motion the events which would lead to the French Revolution. Louis aptly predicted: Après moi, le deluge. ("After me, the flood.")

An old agreement between the Crown and the nobility provided that the King could tax the common people freely provided he did not tax the nobles. This was actually something of a quid pro quo; since the nobles did not pay taxes, they could not claim any legitimate say in how tax revenues were spent. The middle classes had numerous tax exemptions, so that they paid very little. As a result, Louis failed to tap substantial sources of revenue, and the weight of taxes fell most heavily on those who could least afford it, the peasants.
Louis appointed Jean Baptiste Colbert as controller general of finances. Colbert was a financial genius who soon managed the entire royal administration. His central principal was that the wealth and economy of France should serve the state; and he therefore rigorously instituted a mercantilist system on France.

Mercantilism is that economic theory in which a nation’s international power is based on its wealth, particularly its gold supply. Since resources are limited, government intervention is needed to secure the largest part of a limited resource. In order to accumulate gold, a nation must always sell more goods abroad than it buys abroad. It was this economic practice in Great Britain which led to the Navigation Acts, Tea Act, etc. of the American colonial period.

Colbert attempted to make France self-sufficient by supporting old industries and creating new ones. He constructed roads and canals, imposed high foreign tariffs and eliminated many domestic tariffs to make purchase of domestic goods more attractive. His most important accomplishment was the creation of a powerful merchant marine to carry French goods. The French merchant navy increased from 18 unseaworthy vessels in 1661 to 276 frigates, galleys, and ships of the line in 1681. He hoped to make Canada part of the French empire and sent four thousand peasants there to populate Quebec. The city of Quebec was established in 1608, one year after the founding of Jamestown. Colbert also established the French East India Company in 1664, but it could not effectively compete with the Dutch and English East India Companies, which were more efficiently run. The government had to bail out the company, and later revoked its charter.

Colbert’s policies made France the leading industrial nation of Europe at the time. The textile industry, particularly production of woolen goods, grew at a prodigious rate. However, the French economy was largely agricultural, and it was the peasants who worked the soil (Thomas Jefferson’s chosen people) who were taxed mercilessly.

Louis also raised money by selling titles of nobility, ecclesiastical offices, as well as government and military positions. This not only raised money easily, it also enhanced loyalty, as those to whom he sold the office were legally bound to him. One minister commented rather dryly: "As soon as the crown creates an office, God creates a fool willing to buy it." In one Edict of 1696, Louis sold 500 offices and titles. Few noble families could trace their titles back more than a few generations. This led to tense differences between the nobles of the sword (who could trace back their ancestry many generations) and the nobles of the robe (who were the new comers). One noble of the sword denounced those who bought and paid for their offices and worked for the King as the "reign of the bourgeoisie."

**Louis XIV and Religion:** Although Louis was relatively pious, he had little interest in theology; however as he grew older, he brought into his inner circle a group of ministers who were extremely devout Catholics. He also brought into his bedroom a mistress who was also fervently religious. (Apparently her fervency did not extend past the first five commandments.) Louis reversed the policies of his predecessors, and began a campaign of persecution against French Huguenots. He closed most Protestant churches and attempted to force the Huguenots to convert to Catholicism. In 1685, he issued an Edict which revoked the Edict of Nantes, which had guaranteed religious liberty to the Calvinist Huguenots:

We now see with the proper gratitude that we owe to God...for the best and largest part of our subjects of the so-called reformed religion have embraced Catholicism, and now that, to the extent
that the execution of the Edict of Nantes remains useless, we have judged that we can do nothing better to wipe out the memory of the troubles, of the confusion, of the evils that the progress of this false religion has caused our kingdom…than to revoke entirely the said Edict. Although Louis pleased his Catholic subjects with the revocation (the Edict of Nantes had never been popular) almost 200,000 Huguenots emigrated to England, Prussia, Holland, and South Africa, despite an order from the king that forbade them from leaving the country.

Louis also persecuted a weird group known as the Jansenists, named for Cornelius Jansen, the Bishop of Ypres who died in 1638. The Jansenists came close to accepting Calvin’s doctrine of predestination, so much so that their enemies called them "Calvinists who go to Mass." Unlike the Calvinists, who believed that one was called to a particular vocation, the Jansenists believed one should withdraw completely from the world. They disapproved of anything frivolous, and were particularly offended by the gaudy displays of Versailles. They particularly disapproved of the idea of repeated penance, or of deathbed conversions. Their most determined enemies were the Jesuits, who persuaded the Pope to condemn them in 1653. Louis ran into some opposition from the Parlement of Paris, and died before he had completely eliminated the sect.

The Concept of "Balance of Power:" The idea of a "balance of power" held that great powers should be in equilibrium with each other; no one power should be allowed to become too powerful. The decline of one power could threaten the balance of power if as a result, the power of another state was considerably enhanced. It arose largely at the end of the era of religious warfare, and became the dominant cause of warfare: to prevent any one country from becoming too powerful or dominating too much of the continent.

Together with the idea of a balance of power was born the concept of International Law. Many nations/people were horrified at the devastation of the Thirty Years War, and scholars thus laid the groundwork for modern diplomacy. Legal principles for times of peace and war were promulgated, primarily by a German Protestant, Samuel von Pufendorf, who wrote Of the Law of Nature and Nations. Pufendorf argued that only a defensive war was justified, and arbitration should be used to settle peacetime disputes. French expansionism was a major concern to the surrounding nations of Europe during the reign of Louis XIV, who kept France at war for thirty three years, half the time of his personal rule. He had created a modern professional army, and took personal command of it himself.

In 1667, Louis used an excuse to invade Flanders, which was part of the Spanish Netherlands. He acquired twelve towns including Lille, and Tournai. Five years later, he led an army into Holland; the Dutch saved themselves only by opening the dikes and flooding the countryside. At the end of the war, Louis gained additional Flemish towns. Encouraged by his success, he seized the city of Strasbourg and later the province of Lorraine. He seemed invincible at this point.

Louis’ successes led to an alliance against him. William of Orange the Dutch prince, became King of England in 1688, and joined the League of Augsburg, which included the Holy Roman Emperor, the Kings of Spain and Sweden and the electors of several German principalities. The ensuing conflict was the War of the League of Augsburg, fought in North America as King William’s War, one of the four French and Indian Wars. Those allied against him also had considerably stronger financial support that Louis. To raise money for the war, Louis ordered the entire nation’s silverware be handed over to the mint to be melted down; but this was not nearly enough. Again, the weight of taxation fell on the peasants.
The burden of taxation and a series of bad harvest resulting in famine led to widespread peasant revolts. Statistics indicate that as much as one tenth the population died. The problem was exacerbated by a decline in the French economy, and Louis was forced to sue for peace at any price. The peace only lasted for five years.

**The War of the Spanish Succession:** It was an open secret in Europe that the King of Spain, Charles II was mentally incompetent and sexually impotent. In 1698, the European powers, including France, agreed to a treaty in which they agreed to divide Spain’s possessions between France and the Holy Roman Emperor, who was Charles II’s brothers-in-law. But when Charles died in 1700, his will left the Spanish throne and all of Spain’s worldwide empire to Philip of Anjou, Louis’ grandson, then aged seventeen. Louis saw the opportunity to join Spain and France under a single ruler, and thus reneged on the treaty of 1698, and accepted the terms of the will. Louis claimed that he was following both Spanish and French national interests in doing so. He once introduced his grandson to the Spanish ambassador and said, "You may salute him as your king." Obviously the juncture of the French and Spanish thrones under a single ruler would upset the balance of power, and the other European powers had no intention of allowing this to happen. In 1701, the English, Dutch, Austrians and Prussians formed the Grand Alliance against Louis. They claimed that they were fighting to prevent France from becoming too strong in Europe. A secondary motive was the expansion of French territory in North America, which they hoped to stop.

In the war which followed two important soldiers dominated the alliance against France: Eugene, Prince of Savoy represented the Holy Roman Empire, and John Churchill, later the Duke of Marlborough, represented England. Louis suffered several defeats at the hand of each. The war was also fought in North America where it was known as Queen Anne’s War. The war concluded with the Treaty of Utrecht (1713). Under the terms of peace, Louis’ grandson became the first Bourbon king of Spain, but there was an understanding that the French and Spanish crowns would never be united. France surrendered Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, and the Hudson Bay territory to England, which also acquired Gibraltar, Minorca, and control of the African slave trade from the Spanish. The Peace of Utrecht represented the balance of power principal in operation.

Louis XIV kept France at war for thirty three of his fifty-four years of personal reign. He is reputed to have said on his deathbed, "I have gone to war too lightly, and pursued it for vanity's sake." There is some thought that he made this statement as part of his last confession knowing that his end was near. Under any circumstances, there can be no question but that he acted in accordance with his earlier observation that "the character of a conqueror is regarded as the noblest and highest of titles."

The Peace of Utrecht marked the end of French expansionism and Louis quest for military glory. The legacy of his efforts was widespread misery in France. To raise revenue to fight his wars (since European Bankers charged France such high rates of interest) Louis sold 40,000 additional offices, which increased the number of families exempt from future taxation. By 1715, France was on the brink of bankruptcy. Louis died on September 1, 1715, at which time one of his critics wrote: Those....wearyed by the heavy and oppressive rule of the King and his ministers, felt a delighted freedom...Paris...found relief in the hope of liberation---The provinces...quivered with delight...[and] the people, ruined, abused, despairing, now thanked God for a deliverance which answered their most ardent desires.
French Classicism under Louis XIV: The artists and writers of late seventeenth century France deliberately imitated the subject matter and style of classical antiquity. Their work resembled that of Renaissance Italy and contained the classical qualities of discipline, balance, and restraint. Although Louis made it the official style of his court, Classicism had peaked before 1661, the year in which he began his personal reign.

Nicholas Poussin (1594 - 1665) is generally considered the best example of French classicist painting. Most of his work was done before 1661. He spent most of his creative life in Rome because he did not care for the atmosphere of Paris. His masterpiece, The Rape of the Sabine Women, exhibits the qualities of noble action in a logical and orderly but not realistic fashion.

After Louis' ascension to the throne, absolutism influenced French classicism. Works of art were required to glorify the state as personified by the king, rather than expressions of individualism. Precise rules governed all aspects of culture; the goal being "formal and restrained perfection." Louis' contemporaries said that he never ceased playing the part of the grand monarch on the stage of his court. He never fully relaxed from the part he considered himself playing, but did enjoy music and the theatre, and occasionally used them as backdrops for his court.

Louis favored the music and orchestral works of Jean-Baptiste Lully (1632-1687) who composed court ballets and several operas. Another favorite was Mac-Antoine Charpentier (1634-1704) who wrote several Te Deums ("praise to thee, O God") as thanksgiving to celebrate French military victories. Louis loved the stage, particularly the plays of Moliere and Racine.

Moliere was born Jean-Baptiste Poquelin, the son of a prosperous tapestry maker. He refused to join his father's business and took the stage name Moliere. His work often exposed the hypocrisies and follies of society through caricature. Among his works were the Bourgeois Gentilhomme, and Les Femmes Savantes ("The Learned Women.") While he made fun of social mores, his contemporary, Jean Racine, analyzed the power of love. He based his dramas on Greek and Roman legends, with a persistent theme of the conflict of good and evil. Among his works are Andromaque, Berence, and Britannicus. The latter was one of Louis' favorites because of the grandeur of its themes.

Absolute Monarchy in Prussia

The credit for establishing absolute monarchy in Prussia goes to Frederick, the Great of Prussia (1740-86), who was one of the most enlightened despots of the age. In the words of Prof. C.J.H. Hayes, "Enlightened despotism was brilliantly exemplified by Frederick the Great of Prussia and it was at least an ideal for most of his monarchical contemporaries." Frederick II put forth the ideals of a good ruler quite emphatically.

Frederick said, "The Princes is to the nation he governs, what the head is to the man; it is his duty to see, think and act for the whole community, that he may procure it every advantage of which it is capable." Again, he said, "The monarch is not the absolute master, but only the first servant of the state." He argued "the people are not there for the sake of the rulers but the rulers for the sake of the people." Motivated by these ideals Frederick II tried to promote the good of the people in every possible manner. He encouraged trade, commerce and industry and held firm faith in the theory of mercantilism. Therefore, he erected high tariff walls to check foreign imports and encourage indigenous industry. He also tried to promote agriculture and made available free seeds, Cattle and
Horses to the poor peasants to enable them to cultivate their farms. He provided tax relief to people who suffered during the national wars.

Frederick re-organized the judicial administration and forbade the use of torture except for special cases. Death penalty was awarded very rarely. He streamlined the judicial administration by introducing uniform legal fees throughout the country, and ensured that all the judicial cases were disposed off within one year. Unlike other contemporary rulers; Frederick suppressed religious fanaticism and granted freedom of religion to people. They were left free to pursue any religion and state did not interfere in religious matters. Above all, Frederick like other absolute monarchs of his age tried to promote arts, sciences and learning. He revitalized the Berlin Academy of Science and extended every possible patronage to the intellectuals. Voltaire, the great French philosopher was Frederick's personal friend. Frederick also patronized music, poetry and literature. Like Louis XIV of France he also built a palace of Potsdam with a part of Sans Souci which looked like the glittering city of Versailles.

Apart from outstanding achievements in the domestic sphere which won him the admiration of the people, he sought to win international fame and glory by undertaking wars of conquest. Soon after assumption of throne he marched into Silesia, a rich province of Austria, because there was a dispute regarding the succession of Marie Theresa, the daughter of Charles VI, as Queen of Austria. The Austrian troops were routed and Silesia was occupied by the Prussian forces. In 1742 Frederick withdrew his troops after Maria Theresa ceded Silesia to him. This, however, roused the jealousy of other nations like Spain, France, Bavaria, Savoy and Saxony and they all jumped into the War of Austrian Succession in the hope of some gains.

On the other hand, England and Holland intervened on behalf of Maria Theresa. This obliged Frederick to enter the war in defence of his newly won province. In the war he proved the military superiority of Prussia and forced Maria Theresa to leave him as master of Silesia in 1745. The War of Austrian Succession also extended to colonies where struggle began between the French and the English. Ultimately the war was brought to a close by the Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle (1748). In terms of this treaty Frederick was allowed to retain Silesia and Marie Theresa was recognised as the Queen of Austria. Thus Prussia alone gained advantage out of the year long war of Austrian Succession.

Frederick was involved in yet another war which lasted from 1756-63 and is popularly known as Seven Years War. This war was caused because Maria Theresa formed an alliance with Austria, France, Russia and Saxony to crush the rising power of Prussia. On the other hand, England sided with Frederick. After a prolonged war lasting for seven years the Peace of Hubertsburg was concluded in 1763 which maintained status quo. Thus Silesia remained with Prussia. In terms of the losses in men and money, the war did not produce any positive results except that it established position of equality for Prussia with Austria, Germany and Prussia emerged as the first military power of Europe. In 1772 Frederick II in co-operation with Marie Theresa of Austria and Catherine II of Russia seized Poland and secured a part of it for Prussia. Thus he rounded off the Prussian territory by additions of Silesia and part of territory of Poland.

It indeed goes to the credit of Frederick II that he continued the work of predecessors of building a powerful Prussian state at home and brought it into the arena of European politics. But what is creditable about him that he behaved like a true father of his nation and did every thing possible for the welfare and happiness of his subjects. Indeed he was model of an enlightened despot.
Absolutism in Russia

Peter I or Peter the Great was another notable ruler who tried to establish absolute monarchy in Europe and earned the reputation of being the most celebrated and the most controversial absolute monarch in the history of Russia. Peter ascended the throne of Russia in 1689 when he was only seventeen years of age. At the time of succession, Russia was quite a backward country and did not possess any strong government or an effective army. Peter was convinced that Russia could not attain position of importance unless western customs and institutions were introduced there and Russia acquired windows to the sea.

Soon after assumption of throne, Peter asserted that Tsar was sovereign and autocratic and was not responsible to anyone in the world. In this regard he went much ahead of other rulers of purpose none of whom put forth such a claim with ruthless skill. He suppressed with firmness the mutiny of his bodyguards and hanged or beheaded several thousand mutineers. He replaced the old feudal army by a new national army on the pattern of European countries. These soldiers were picked and paid to do whatever he commanded. Peter also paid attention to the building of navy because he was convinced that Russia could not become a great power unless she had a strong navy. He built a navy consisting of 48 large warships, 800 smaller vessels and raised about 30,000 sailors.

Peter tried to bring the Russian Orthodox Church under his control by abolishing the office of the Patriarch and placed the church under a committee known as Holy Synod. The Procurator General, who was an agent of the Tsar, acted as the President of the Holy Synod. Thus Peter established his control over the Russian Orthodox Church and eliminated a possible check to his absolutism. In fact during the next two hundred years the church served as one of the most powerful agents and supporters of Russian absolutism.

Peter removed all vestiges of local self-government and carried out numerous reforms in administration to strengthen his absolute authority. He did away with the Parliament and replaced it by a small advisory body. He himself appointed its members. He established a secret police to unearth the plots and conspiracies against the government. He punished those who dared to resist his authority with barbarity. He is said to have executed many nobles and churchmen who rebelled against the introduction of European customs.

In the foreign sphere also Peter pursued an ambitious policy and tried to enhance his prestige. Realizing that Russia did not have any sea port which generally hampered her trading and commercial links with the western powers, Peter tried to wrest a port of the Baltic Sea from Sweden and a port on the Black Sea from Turkey. In pursuance of this policy, he formed an alliance with Poland, Denmark and Saxony and attacked Sweden in 1700. However, Charles XII, the ruler of Sweden, inflicted a defeat on Russia at the battle of Narva. Thereafter Charles XII got busy against Poland. After defeating Poland in 1707 Charles turned against Russia and sent his troops across the Russian border in 1708.

Peter, who had improved his army since the defeat at Narva defeated the Swedish forces at Pultowa in 1709. As a result of this victory Peter secured Karelia, Ingria, Estonia and Livonia from Sweden by the Treaty of Nystad. Russia secured eastern shores of the Baltic which paved way for Russia's maritime trade and free communication with the western powers. Before Peter died in 1725 he had firmly established absolute monarchy in Russia. He had raised Russia to a position wherefrom she could play an important role in the European politics.
Under the successors of Peter the Russian monarchy suffered a setback, till Catherine II came to the Russian throne in 1762. She has been described as "the greatest woman, probably, who ever sat on a throne." She continued internal reforms along the lines laid down by Peter the Great and vastly increased Russian territories through successful wars and diplomacy. She waged a successful war against the decaying Ottoman empire and took the Russian southern boundary to the shores of the Black Sea. She also plotted with the rulers of Prussia and Austria and annexed half of Poland thereby pushing the Russian frontier westward into Central Europe. By the time Catherine died in 1796 Russia had emerged as a major European power.

**ABSOLUTISM IN ENGLAND**

James I of England and VI of Scotland was born in 1566, the son of Mary, Queen of Scots, and Henry, Lord Darnley. James had to face difficulties from his earliest years—his mother was an incompetent ruler who quarrelled with politicians and churchmen such as John Knox, and she may have been involved in the murder of her husband Darnley, himself a worthless character. The murder was carried out partly to avenge the slaying of Mary's secretary and possible lover, David Rizzio or Riccio, in which Darnley played a part (before James's birth), and it also enabled Mary to marry her current lover, the Earl of Bothwell. Mary was deposed by the Scottish lords in 1567, and fled to England, where she sought the protective custody of Elizabeth I, who clapped her in prison and had her beheaded twenty years later.

James grew up under various regencies and a couple of notable tutors, the poet, dramatist and humanist George Buchanan, and Peter Young, whose good nature and enthusiasm for lighter reading somewhat offset the formidable learning and sometimes overbearing seriousness teaching methods of Buchanan. James chafed against Buchanan and disliked him, but in later years would boast that he had been the great man's pupil. Buchanan instilled in James political theories which included the idea that the king is beholden to the people for his power, a belief which James later came to reject in favour of Divine Right kingship. From Young he learned to appreciate poetry (Buchanan wrote Latin poetry of a largely didactic nature, and encouraged James to read mostly Latin and Greek books) and delved deeply into his mother's library of French verse and romances. James developed a genuine love of learning (he was not, as many authors have claimed, a mere pedant), some skill in writing poetry, and a lively prose style. He also showed an interest in plays, including those of Shakespeare and Jonson, and was particularly fond of the masque, which would become the leading form of court entertainment when James became King of England in 1603. His marriage to Anne of Denmark, herself a great patron of masques and a connoisseur of literature, may have piqued his interest in this particularly royal form of entertainment, with its music, dancing, singing and elaborate sets designed by Inigo Jones. Of the children of King James and Queen Anne, only three survived to adulthood: Henry, Prince of Wales, who died untimely in 1612, possibly of typhoid fever, Charles, who succeeded his father as king, and Princess Elizabeth, who married Frederick V, Elector Palatine.

James published his first book in 1584, entitled The Essays of a Prentice in the Divine Art of Poesy, which he followed up in 1591 with His Majesties Poetical Exercises at Vacant Hours. In the first book James included some translations he had made from du Bartas, whose Uranie takes the muse Urania and transforms her into a Christian figure representing the Holy Spirit, an idea which appealed to James at the time, because he thought he could employ poetry for the dissemination of his religious and political beliefs. As a King, James had a special relationship with God and could therefore write religious poetry from a special viewpoint. James's poetry is competent, and
sometimes he manages a striking line or two; one of his best poems is the sonnet he wrote prefacing his book Basilikon Doron (1599).

The majority of James's written works are concerned with theology and the justification of the theory of Divine Right, and for those reasons he must be considered as a major writer of political philosophy. In lively style and with considerable learning he defended the Oath of Allegiance which Catholics were required to take, disputed it with the great Cardinal Bellarmine, wrote two books on Divine Right, one, Basilikon Doron, for the edification of his son Prince Henry (1594-1612) and the other, The True Law of Free Monarchies, was a simple explanation of his theories for the general literate public. D.H. Willson, one of James's biographers, calls the first book "entertaining and quotable" and also cites Francis Bacon as finding that it "filled the whole realm as with a good perfume or incense, being excellently written and having nothing of affectation". James's comment on Bacon's Advancement of Learning was "it was like the peace of God, which passeth all understanding". James also wrote some rather moving "Meditations on the Lord's Prayer" and a justly famous essay, "A Counterblast to Tobacco" (1604), one of the first, and surely one of the best attacks on smoking ever written. Smoking, James tells us, is "a custom loathsome to the eye, hateful to the nose, harmful to the brain, dangerous to the lungs, and in the black, stinking fume thereof, nearest resembling the horrible Stygian smoke of the pit that is bottomless."

James's interest in literature was tied in with a shrewd sense of propaganda. He realised that books, masques, sermons, and plays could all be employed in the service of the king, that they were the media which could best disseminate his views of kingship and impress upon a large number of people its power and majesty. The court masque, expensive and elaborate, baroque and ritualistic, symbolised that power and majesty, and the king's physical place as the focal point of the entertainment reinforced it further. Thus James and Queen Anne patronised Ben Jonson and Inigo Jones, the great architect and designer of the sets for Jonson's masques. The publication of sermons, also, was of particular interest to the theologically-minded king, and his personal encouragement of the church career of John Donne, whom James appointed Dean of St. Paul's Cathedral, was no accident, for Donne was a staunch supporter of kingly power and majesty, and often preached before the King himself, as did his eminent colleague Lancelot Andrewes, another of James's favourite divines.

James's political accomplishments (or lack thereof) as King do not concern us here, but suffice it to say that he has had a mixed reception from historians. Most agree that he was a success in Scotland but a partial failure in England, although recently his English kingship has undergone massive studies by Conrad Russell and others which have tended to show James in a much more favourable light. For example, he consistently strove for peace both at home and abroad, with varying success, but was determined never to go to war if it could be helped.

James I's impact on English literature is considerable, not least because of his encouragement of and participation in the translation of the Bible into English (1611), the translation that many people still consider the best, and which bears his name, the King James Bible. That, above everything he wrote, is James's monument, but his literary works deserve some credit, and he is always a pleasure to read.
MERCANTILISM

Mercantilism was an economic "system" that developed in Europe during the period of the new monarchies (1500) and culminated with the rise of the absolutist states (1600–1700). Mercantilism was not characterized by the blind adherence to a single, precisely defined economic theorem. Rather, its adherents embraced, in various degrees, parts of a set of commonly held theoretical beliefs or tendencies that were best suited to the needs of a particular time and state. The underlying principles of mercantilism included (1) the belief that the amount of wealth in the world was relatively static; (2) the belief that a country's wealth could best be judged by the amount of precious metals or bullion it possessed; (3) the need to encourage exports over imports as a means for obtaining a favorable balance of foreign trade that would yield such metals; (4) the value of a large population as a key to self-sufficiency and state power; and (5) the belief that the crown or state should exercise a dominant role in assisting and directing the national and international economies to these ends. As such, mercantilism developed logically from the changes inherent in the decline of feudalism, the rise of strong national states, and the development of a world market economy.

The shift from payments in kind, characteristic of the feudal period, to a money economy was one key development in this process. By the late 15th century, as regional, national, and international trade continued to blossom, European currencies expanded as well; circulation was more common, widespread, and vital. The early mercantilists recognized the seminal fact of this period. Money was wealth *sui generis*; it gave its holder the power to obtain other commodities and services. Precious metals, especially gold, were in universal demand as the surest means to obtain other goods and services. At the same time the rise of more powerful European states with burgeoning bureaucracies, frequent dynastic wars that required larger and more expensive armies and more lavish court expenditures exacerbated this fundamental need for money in the form of precious metals. Foreign trade, not domestic trade, was viewed as the preferred method for obtaining bullion, while manufacturing, which provided the goods for such trade, was favored over agriculture. Finally, the discovery of the New World by Columbus in 1492 and the discovery of the sea route to India by Vasco da Gama in 1497–1499 also provided fertile ground for obtaining such wealth while creating an ever greater need for wealth to conquer and protect these colonies and their imperial trade. All of these factors ensured that the rising late medieval and early modern states embraced mercantilism as an economic theory that allowed them to adapt to and seek to exploit these shifting structures.

Since mercantilism at base postulated increased royal control over both the internal and external economic policies of the state, it found easy acceptance among the "new" monarchies of the late 15th century and the 16th century. In Portugal, Manuel I (ruled 1495–1521) and his successors embraced its tenets regarding bullion and colonies to help exploit their burgeoning Asian empire. In Spain both Charles I (ruled 1516–1556) and Philip II (ruled 1556–1598), given the boon of New World precious metals, also found comfort in bullionism as well as the tenets calling for the exploitation of colonies for the benefit of the mother country. In England, Henry VIII (ruled 1509–1547) and Elizabeth I (ruled 1558–1603) adhered to some mercantilist principles in an effort that was, at least in part, designed to combat the threat of universal Habsburg Monarchy and Iberian dominance in the developing world market economy.
During the 17th century, adherents of absolutism also found much to embrace in mercantilism. During the age of Stuart absolutism James I (ruled 1603–1625) and Charles I (ruled 1625–1649) found it logical to accept the premise that the monarch should not only control the political and social hierarchy but should enjoy control over the economy as well. Oliver Cromwell (1599–1658), after destroying Stuart pretensions in the Civil War, embraced both mercantilist warfare and the Navigation Acts in his commercial struggle with the Dutch. It was in France, however, that mercantilism found perhaps its greatest supporter in Jean-Baptiste Colbert (1619–1683). Colbert's career was as much a product of the sociopolitical dynamics of the absolutist state as the result of the unrivaled bureaucratic energies he displayed in the service of his early patrons and eventually the crown. His family rose through the social hierarchy based on the time-honored expedients of wealth and venality of office. Utilizing family connections, Colbert entered the service of Michel Le Tellier in 1643, soon after the latter became secretary of state in charge of military affairs. This promising foundation was solidified during Colbert's "apprenticeship" under Jules Cardinal Mazarin, a mutually advantageous relationship that began in 1651 and lasted until Mazarin's death in 1661. By the end of this decade of opportunity, Colbert had become baron de Seignelay, secretary of the orders of the queen, intendant general of the affairs of Mazarin, counselor of the king in all of his councils—not to mention a very wealthy man. Just as importantly, he had begun to create an apparatus for the implementation of his later policies by further enriching his family and arranging influential positions for a bevy of his brothers and cousins.

In this rapid ascent through the labyrinth of French political life, Colbert honed the ideas and theories that shaped his policies after 1661, the year Louis XIV (ruled 1643–1715) began his personal reign and Nicolas Fouquet was imprisoned, thus ensuring Colbert's ascent to ministerial preeminence. The basic theoretical tenets of mercantilism predated Louis XIV's reign, in some cases by half a dozen generations. Colbert was exposed to such ideas in the Paris of his youth, when the economic traditions of the first Bourbon king of France, Henry IV (ruled 1589–1610), and the theories of his able controleur général du commerce (comptroller general of finance), Barthélemy de Laffemas, were still relatively strong. Armand-Jean Du Plessis, Cardinal Richelieu (1585–1642) was still alive at that time, and Issac de Laffemas, the cardinal's creature, was in the midst of perpetuating his father's intellectual legacy. Although Colbert never referred to the writings of Antoine de Montchrestien (1575–1621) and Jean Bodin (1530–1596), he was probably familiar with their works. Mercantilism reached its apogee under Colbert not because he was a theorist but rather because he was a man of action who judged its tenets to be the only natural and logical way to achieve his most cherished goal: a powerful and wealthy France united under a glorious monarch. The primary obstacle to France's economic greatness was the overweening economic power of the Dutch. If the mercantile power of the burghers of Amsterdam could be broken in both Europe and the lucrative Asian trade, France could prosper.

Colbert's anti-Dutch strategy evolved logically from his beliefs on political economy. Foremost among his particular tenets on mercantilism was the conviction that the volume of world trade was essentially static and that, to increase its share, France would have to win part of that controlled by its rivals. In one of his most quoted mémoires (Lettres VI: 260–270) Colbert wrote, "The commerce of all Europe is carried on by ships of every size to the number of 20,000, and it is perfectly clear that this number cannot be increased." Commerce caused "perpetual combat in peace and war among the nations of Europe, as to who shall win most of it." His exaggerated estimate on the maritime strength of the major European trading nations competing in this "war" was fifteen
thousand to sixteen thousand Dutch ships, three thousand to four thousand English ships, and five
hundred to six hundred French ships. Just as importantly neither the French nor the English could
"improve their commerce save by increasing this number, save from the 20,000 . . . and
consequently by making inroads on the 15,000 to 16,000 of the Dutch." (Lettres VI: 260–270). The
bellicism inherent in such beliefs would in part culminate in the Dutch War of 1672, a war Colbert
supported. Unfortunately, despite his most careful calculations regarding this struggle in both
Europe and the Indian Ocean, Louis XIV's armies and fleets suffered increasing difficulties in the
war from 1672 to 1679. These setbacks forced Colbert to undo many of his initial reforms from
1661 that had doubled the king's revenues, forged a powerful navy, and set France on a course for
apparent dominance in Europe. By the time of his death in 1683, the kingdom was instead on the
road to bankruptcy and revolt, and Louis XIV's penchant for continued warfare in the decades
down to 1715 only exacerbated this decline.

OPPONENTS OF MERCANTILISM

During the 18th century the limits of mercantilism became increasingly obvious, and intellectual
and political critics of its basic tenets gradually emerged. First, Louis XIV's spectacular failures in
the kingdom viewed as the apogee of both absolutism and mercantilism certainly revealed the
limitations of allowing the state to direct the economy for its own frequently selfish, if not self-
destructive, purposes. At the same time, in parts of England, Holland, and northwestern France the
initial adherence to mercantilist principles created the very conditions that fostered antimercantilist
sentiments. These developments would ultimately cause the destruction of merchant capitalism. In
short, merchant capitalism reached a level within the mercantilist system where state intervention
and direction of the economy was threatening and even preventing further expansion. The critical
spirit toward existing Old Regime structures embodied in the intellectual revolution of the
Enlightenment found its antimercantilist champions in the Physiocrats. In part adapting "natural
law" doctrines to the economy, this influential group of economic theorists, including François
Quesnay (1694–1774), Jean-Claude-Marie-Vincent de Gournay (1712–1759), and Pierre-Samuel
du Pont de Nemours (1739–1817), instead argued for laissez-faire. This theory argued that the
economy functioned best when its own "natural laws" were allowed to function without
government intervention. Complementing the work of the French économistes, the Scottish
philosopher David Hume (1711–1776) sought to identify the natural advantages that various
nations enjoyed in the flow of commerce and provided a new theory on international trade. In his
Political Discourses (1752) and Essays and Treatises on Several Subjects (1753), Hume also
sought to refute some of the principal tenets of mercantilism, including confounding money with
wealth and the blind acceptance of bullionism. Yet by far the most important work criticizing
mercantilist thought was Adam Smith's (1723–1790) An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the
Wealth of Nations (1776), the first systematic economic analysis of the world market economy
created during the preceding age of mercantilism. Smith's strong advocacy of free trade and his
belief that world wealth was not static, as Colbert and others had held, did much to undermine
mercantilism. At the same time his theories and those of other Physiocrats also encouraged colonies
like British North America to reject the traditional dependence on their mother countries as defined
by the mercantilist model while furnishing intellectual fuel for the industrial revolution then taking
place in Great Britain. In France, however, only the French Revolution and Napoléon I (1769–
1821) would facilitate the destruction of the economic remnants of both the late medieval and
mercantilist periods.
FROM TRADE TO COLONIZATION - HISTORIC DYNAMICS OF THE EAST INDIA COMPANIES

"In the middle of the seventeenth century, Asia still had a far more important place in the world than Europe." So wrote J. Pirenne in his 'History of the Universe', published in Paris in 1950. He added, "The riches of Asia were incomparably greater than those of the European states. Her industrial techniques showed a subtlety and a tradition that the European handicrafts did not possess. And there was nothing in the more modern methods used by the traders of the Western countries that Asian trade had to envy. In matters of credit, transfer of funds, insurance, and cartels, neither India, Persia, nor China had anything to learn from Europe." (Quoted in Auguste Toussaint's 'History of the Indian Ocean')

Such was the situation when the East India Company began its trading activities in the early 17th century. Initially, the British traders had come to India with hopes of selling Britain's most popular export item to Continental Europe - British Broadcloth, but were disappointed to find little demand for it. Instead, like their Portuguese counterparts, they found several Indian-made items they could sell quite profitably in their homeland. Competing with other European traders, and competing with several other trade routes to Europe (the Red Sea route through Egypt, the Persian Gulf Route through Iraq, and the Northern Caravan Route through Afghanistan, Persia and Turkey), the early British Traders were in no position to dictate terms. They had to seek concessions with a measure of humility and offer trade terms that offered at least some benefits to the local rulers and merchants. While Aurangzeb (who had, perhaps, seen the connection between growing European Trade concessions and falling revenues from the overland trade) attempted to limit and control the activities of the East India Company, not all Indian rulers had as much compunction about making trade concessions. Besides, the East India Company was willing to persevere; fighting and cajoling for concessions, it built trading bases wherever it could along either side of the lengthy Indian coastline.

In this period, relations between Indian and Britisher were not lacking in cordiality and the East India Company included employees from both worlds. Friendships between the two nationalities developed not only within the context of business relations, but even beyond, to the point of inter-marriage. Unaffected by the pompous stuffiness of the British gentry, the British employees of the East India Company made the most of life in India - dressing in cool and comfortable Indian garments, enjoying Indian pastimes and absorbing local words in their dialect. With as yet unperturbed eyes, these British traders delighted in the delicate craftsmanship and attractiveness of Indian manufactures and took good advantage of their growing popularity in Britain and France. So lucrative was the trade that even though India would accept nothing but silver (or gold) in return, the East India Company prospered.

Considering the long route (around the African Cape) that the British had to take in reaching England, it was surprising that they made as much money as they did. But other factors outweighed this disadvantage. First, owing to their legally sanctioned monopoly status in England, they had substantial control on the British market. Second, by buying directly at the source, they were able to eliminate the considerable mark-up that Indian goods enjoyed en-route to Europe. Thirdly, the East India Company probably enjoyed better economies of scale since their ships were amongst the largest in the Indian Ocean. In addition, they were able to develop new markets for Indian goods in Africa, and in the Americas.
And finally, (and perhaps, most significantly), as Veronica Murphy reports in 'Europeans and the Textile Trade' (Arts of India 1550-1900), "although the East India Company was not itself engaged in the transatlantic slave trade, the link was very close and highly profitable." In fact, in the 18th century, the British dominated the Atlantic slave trade transporting more slaves than all the other European powers combined. In 1853, Henry Carey - author of 'The Slave Trade, Domestic and Foreign' wrote: "It (the British System) is the most gigantic system of slavery the world has yet seen, and therefore it is that freedom gradually disappears from every country over which England is enabled to gain control." The Atlantic slave trade was hence, a vital contributor to the financial strength of the East Indian Trading Companies.

So much so that by the middle of the 17th century, the East India Company was re-exporting Indian goods to Europe and North Africa and even Turkey! Unsurprisingly, this was to have a severely deleterious effect on the Ottomans, the Persians, the Afghans, since much of the revenues of these states came from the India trade. It also seriously impacted the revenues of the Mughals, and while the activities of the Arab and Gujarati traders were not entirely eliminated, their trade was much curtailed, and largely reduced to the inter-Asian trade which continued unabated. In any case, the Mughal state was unable to resist centrifugal forces and rapidly disintegrated. This left the East India Company with considerably more leverage and emboldened it to expand its activities, and demand even greater concessions from Indian rulers.

But even as the Indian rulers were granting more concessions, there was a rising chorus of voices bemoaning the loss of "European" silver to Asia. At the end of the 17th century, the silk and wool merchants of France and England were unwilling to put up with the competition from Indian textiles which had become the rage in the new bourgeoisie societies of Europe. Not only did they seek bans on such trading activities of the East India Company, they also sought and won restrictions on the purchase of these items in their respective nations. These prohibitions, while not entirely eliminating the smuggling of such items, nevertheless squeezed out most of the trade, impacting the revenues of the regional Indian states that had only recently broken off from the centralized Mughal state and Bengal was the first to face the consequences.

Having lost the opportunity to profit from the Indian textile trade, the East India Company was not hesitant in changing character. In 1616, Sir Thomas Roe, an envoy of the East India Company had declared to the Mughals that war and trade was incompatible. But already in 1669 (even before the bans on the textile trade), Gerald Ungier, chief of the factory at Bombay had written to his directors: "The time now requires you to manage your general commerce with the sword in your hands" In 1687 came the reply from the directors, advocating a Goa like British dominion in India. The French Dupleix was more or less of similar view. Still earlier, in 1614, the Dutch Jan Pieterzoon Coen, had written to his directors: "Trade in India must be conducted and maintained under the protection and favour of your weapons, and the weapons must be supplied from the profits enjoyed by the trade, so that trade cannot be maintained without war or war without trade." (from Auguste Toussaint's: History of the Indian Ocean)

The Opium Trade of the 18th century (which eventually led to the Opium Wars), when the Royal British Navy worked more or less hand in hand with the commercial interests of the East India Company, exemplified precisely such a link between war and trade. From the intertwining of war and trade, colonization was only a small step away. Plassey was a portentous indicator of a new dynamic in Indo-British relations.
Contrary to the views of several apologists for colonial rule, who still argue that the defeat of India had solely to do with "congenital flaws" or the centuries old "ennui" or "weak character of the Asian", or the "inability of the Indians (and other Asians) to govern themselves", R. Mukerji (in Rise and Fall of the East India Company) advanced a different thesis. He argued that there were compelling economic imperatives that drew the European India Companies into the path of imperialism. He pointed out that although monopoly rights assured the India Companies of the exclusive privileges of buying and selling, it did not guarantee that they could buy cheap. For that, political control was essential.

A second problem for the East India Company was that their profits were in direct conflict with those of their British-based competitors. Under these circumstances, as long as the profit motive was paramount (which it was), the Battle at Plassey, and the Opium Wars could be seen as logical outcomes of circumstances where continued profits by legal and honorable means were simply not possible. But, had the East Company comprised of "Gentlemen Traders" as some historians have claimed, they could not have switched so easily from trading in Indian Textiles, to trading in Opium for Tea which, in modern language - would surely be described as a form of "drug-running"! Had the traders of the East India Company been "men of honour", denied the right to profitable trade, they would have simply gone bankrupt, as so many do in the world of business!

Yet, what is even more significant is that even after The East India Company had regained sizeable profits from the Opium trade, it served as no deterrence to future acts of aggression. It had become like the proverbial man-eating tiger, that having tasted blood once, would be driven to tasting it again and again. After Plassey, the East India Company had been able to force the cultivation of opium in sufficient quantities in India, and hence, procure sufficient volumes of tea for the British market, reaping significant profits. Yet, now military attacks were also to be directed against Indian (and other Asian) ships engaged in the inter-Asian trade. These attacks were to lay the ground-work for the battles against the Coromandel rulers and the Marathas whose revenues from this trade dwindled. While Plassey may have been a matter of "survival" for the East India Company, the subsequent battles were not in that category. Some historians tried to argue that competition with the French precipitated the battles in South India, but such a view is contradicted by a Frenchman, no less!

Abbe de Pradt, author of "Les Trois Ages des colonies, Paris, 1902" wrote that with the victory at Plassey and the establishment of sovereign rights, England had demonstrated to all of Europe that it was no longer necessary for it to send precious metals obtained from the "New World" to India. She could trade on the basis of revenue acquired from taxing subjects and commodities, whereas other European countries had to trade at a "loss", with "metal currency". The extension of English sovereignty in India, would exempt Europe from sending capital into India. Specifically, Abbe de Pradt wrote: "the people who have enough control over India to reduce substantially the exportation of European metallic currency into Asia rule there as much for Europe's benefit as for their own; their empire is more common than particular, more European than British; as it expands, Europe benefits, and each of their conquests is also a real conquest for the latter." Chastizing European opponents of the British conquest, he wrote: "all the sound and fury now echoing across Europe about England's hegemony in India are the shrieks of a blind delirium, as an anti-European uproar; it might be thought that England was taking away from every European state what it was conquering from those of Asia, whereas, on the contrary, every part of Asia that she takes for herself, she, by that very fact, takes for Europe."
In fact, this view tallies quite closely with the observations of several later analysts who found it paradoxical that inter-European rivalries and conflicts reduced in the 18th century when compared to the 17th century, and decreased still further after Plassey. In essence, the race for the colonization of India had been won by the British, and what Abbe de Pradt was saying was that it was in French interest to enjoy the "general" benefits of this victory and not bemoan the loss of "specific" benefits from the British victory.

N.K Sinha, author of an "Economic History of Bengal" summarizes the situation in these words: "For more than two centuries the Europeans had found that the trade with Bengal whether carried on by companies or by the individual free traders or by illicit means had always been so much in favor of Bengal that the balance had to be supplied in cash. Now after Plassey supplies were at last found in Bengal “by means independence of commerce" - referring to the forced taxes that were extracted by the East India Company from the people of Bengal.

He continues: "The trade of the country merchant began to stagnate. Armenian, Mughal, Gujarati and Bengali merchants found their free trade daily fettered and loaded." The export, import, and manufacture of goods moved from the hands of independant Indian merchants to intermediaries hired by the British East India Company. Often this required force. Sepoys of the East India Company were sent to destroy the factories owned by Indian rivals to the East India Company. Independent weavers who refused to work for the pitiful wages that the East India Company offered had their thumbs cut off. After Plassey, the East India Company also moved to impose it's monopoly on the internal over-land trade. In a matter of three decades after Plassey, the East India Company achieved a virtual stranglehold on the economic and political life of Eastern India.

Just as Abbe de Pradt had predicted, the benefits of colonization did not go exclusively to the British. French, Dutch and Danish rivals were also able to take advantage of the trade monopoly established by the British East India Company. With the decline of the Indian merchants, they were able to buy Indian goods at lower prices. Secondly, corrupt employees of the British East India Company engaged in considerable price gouging, cheating and local thuggery. They preferred to repatriate this illegally acquired wealth from India through French and Dutch rivals to escape detection of their cheating and to avoid taxes and customs duties in Britain. Even as Indian rivals to the British East India were wiped out, European rivals continued to survive and flourish for another 30-40 years.

The American Furber who published his research on the East India Company in 1948 (in Cambridge, Mass.) pointed out that its French and Dutch rivals continued operating until 1769 and 1798. He also indicates that it was a very cosmopolitan association. At least one-fifth of its nominal capital of pound 3,200,00 was in Dutch hands, and a large proportion of that capital came from financiers in Amsterdam, Paris, Copenhagen, and Lisbon, who were also directly concerned in the company's affairs. Furber noted that the commercial activity of the French, the Dutch, and the Danes in the Indian Ocean during the eighteenth century clearly showed that "the time had arrived when Europeans at home or overseas who had a stake in the maintenance of European power anywhere on the Indian continent were one and all forced to take part in the work of building a British empire in India". What Furber was pointing out was not only the substantial and cosmopolitan nature of the backing the East India Company enjoyed, but also the motivations and direct self-interest of its backers.
Thus, Plassey was to be only the first of several assaults that no regional Indian power was able to fend off successfully. While united India had largely held off the Europeans, and divided India had temporarily held off divided Europe, divided India was no match for united Europe. The conquest of India continued with conclusive defeats of the Marathas in 1818, the Sikhs in 1848 and the annexation of Awadh in 1856. 1857 was a brave attempt to rollback the victories of the East India Company, but instead it now brought on the might of the entire British imperial government. The Indian colonies of the British East India Company became British Colonial India - and so began a new phase of colonial plunder from the sub-continent. A phase that saw constant challenges to British hegemony in the region, but it was not till 1947 that a new era could be ushered.

Hence, for almost 200 years, there was a systematic transfer of wealth from India to Europe. Although Britain may have been the primary beneficiary, it's allies in Europe and the new world benefited no less. British Banks used their Indian capital to fund industry in the US, Germany and elsewhere in Europe. The industrial revolution and the development of modern capitalism were based on the colonization of India and the rest of the world. It was the forced pauperization of the colonized world that allowed nations such as Britain, or the US to industrialize and "modernize". Any serious analysis of modern capitalism must take this into account.

**European Colonies in America**

In 1513, Jhan Ponce do Leon, a Spanish explorer led an expedition to the southeastern part of United States. He named this region: Florida, which means full of flowers in Spanish. Besides the Spanish, several other European rulers sent expeditions to the New World. In 1564, the French established a colony near what is now called Jacksonville. The colony was called fort Carolina and set up by Protestants known as Huguenots. This colony remained till the Spanish for religious reasons killed its inhabitants. The following year, the Spanish established the first permanent settlement called St. Augustine.

During the 1540s, two Spanish bands of explorers under De Soto and Francisco Vasquez de Coronado respectively, explored parts of what is the U.S. today, in search of gold. De Soto led his men from Florida into N. Carolina and reached Memphis. After Soto’s death, his men returned to Mexico by the Mississippi River. Meanwhile, Coronado and his men went northwards from Mexico and explored regions as far as Kansas. Their visit convinced them that there was no gold to be found in these areas.

By 1550, several regions in America were under Spanish control. From centers like Florida and St. Augustine, Spain converted the local Indians to Catholicism. The Spanish control over these new regions lasted for more than two and a half centuries. The Spanish power declined when the British set up colonies in the north (America). Yet, the Spanish left their legacy in the New World, where, a large number of Spanish speaking populations exists today.

The French after being thrown out by the Spaniards went towards Canada. A French trading company owned by the De Monts employed Samuel de Champlain, who visited the new continent. His men explored the St. Lawrence Basin and set up a settlement called Quebec. In later times, Quebec became the main military, political and religious center for the French. The company mainly traded in furs with the local Indians.
From Quebec, the French quickly moved towards the west. In the next 50 years, French explorers had reached almost till the Rocky Mountains. And by the 1770, the French had occupied the Gulf of Mexico and the region from the mouth of the Mississippi to the mouth of St. Lawrence rivers.

England was among the last to establish colonies in the New World. When the Spanish and French were exploring the New World, the English were preoccupied with their internal, political and religious problems. Then she was engaged in a long war with Spain. The only initial contact that England had with the New World was through trade with the Spaniards there. But in early 1660, there were several advocates like Sir Walter Raleigh and Sir Humphery Gilbert colonizing the New World.

The motive behind the demand for colonies ranged from the need for raw materials for manufacturers at home, the quest for gold and the need to shift England’s excess population through colonies abroad. Promoters of colonization also believed that it was the duty of Christians to do missionary work among the Indians.

The year 1600 saw a large number of English migrating to North America and West Indies. Some went there in search of wealth, while many went there due to the religious conflicts (Catholics v/s Protestants) at home. According to the noted historian McDonald, the British Crown encouraged migration to the New World for varied reasons. "King James I (1603 - 1625) actively promoted resettlement to maintain political and religious order at home. England had suffered a long period of poor harvest and was thought to be over populated. Sending Englishmen abroad was a way of averting the dangers inherent in that combination. But James also believed in colonization as a means of pacifying, Christianizing and civilizing native populations. (He chartered colonies on the Scottish island of Lewis and in Northern Ireland as well as in America). Charles I (1625 - 1646), seeking to establish religious uniformity both persecuted dissenters and encouraged them to emigrate. Charles II (1660 - 1685) dispensed colonial charters as a means of paying his political and monetary debts." (An American Portrait: A history of the United States Vol. 1, 2nd edition).

Apart from these political and religious reasons, most of the migration after 1689 took place because of poverty at home. A majority of them went to the New World by selling themselves into indentured servitude for a period of four to seven years. Many others, like the blacks from Africa were forcibly transported to America as slave labor.

According to Philip D. Curtin:"The Atlantic slave trade lay at the heart of a wide net of commerce and production that touched every shore of the Atlantic basin" known as the South Atlantic System. This complex had its origins in the Mediterranean areas of Europe in the wake of the crusades when Europeans were used as slaves to produce the system’s first and most important crop: sugar. It was largely Portuguese seamen who achieved revolutionary improvements in the quality of navigation and sailing ships. Nature’s gift of the trade winds made it possible to draw laborers from West Africa. This was then extended to the Azores in the Atlantic, and finally across the ocean to Brazil and elsewhere during the 1500s and later. Thus, a new kind of plantation arose in the New World, stretching from Brazil through what is now the Southern U.S., employing a new type of organization of labor hitherto unknown in either Europe or Africa. Labor became dehumanized; it became a commodity unit oriented to the export market: this is the essential difference between slavery between wherever it developed in the New World and slavery in Africa or the ancient world of Greece and Rome."
For every export crop - sugar, tobacco, coffee, cotton or rice - there was an accompanying large-scale demand for slaves. This demand led to a highly organized trade in Africa that was supplied by peaceful means or outright warfare and raids. Sufficient European merchandise was imported into Africa to support the slaving, and it was brought from ships or supply depots often by caravans or in large canoes. Once back on the coast, the purchased or captured slaves, always in coffles and yokes, were placed in forts that served temporarily as prisons until the slave ship, waiting ashore, could receive its quota. For instance, Fort Elumina on the West African coast, which had been used in the spice and gold trade, became a slave dungeon. As a fort, Elumina was well suited for the purposes of holding slaves until they were ready for the Atlantic voyage. The fort was accessible to slave-carrying ships; there were quarters upstairs for merchants and traders. For the slaves, there were tiny, dingy rooms below. Also, there was a courtyard where slaves were branded.

The slaves were brought to the New World in specially built ships, which could carry large cargo. Ships were packed with slave cargo, so much so that there was no standing space on them. Only the tops decks had some space, where the slaves, in chains, were exercised once every day and washed with cold seawater. Below this deck, there was only place for the slaves to crawl. Considering the time taken to cross the Atlantic, and the inhuman conditions in which the African slaves were made to travel, it is no wonder that many died on the way. One out of every 6 or 8 slaves died on the way to the 'new' world.

The first English settlements

The first English settlement in North America was Jamestown, in Virginia. Established in 1607, it was governed by a British governor and the House of Burgesses. The House of Burgesses was an assembly of merchants and other influential men, elected by the people of the settlement.

The Lost Colony

When the first settlements began to be set up by the English, not all met with success. For instance, the 'lost colony’, an English settlement established in 1587 on Roanoke Island, (off the coast of what is now North Carolina, U.S.A.) just disappeared with no traces. Till date no one knows what happened to the people as where they went. The lost colony was England’s second colony on Roanoke Island, America. The first colony set up by Sir Walter Raleigh was supposed to serve as a base for repairing and re-supplying English Warships. The colonists discovered that seas around the island were too shallow to provide shelter to ships. Moreover, the land was not too productive to support a colony. So the colonists had to return to England in 1586. Meanwhile, a group of ships sent by Raleigh from England set sail for the Islands. When these ships with supplies and fresh colonists reached the island, the earlier colonists had already left. As a result, the second group of colonists also headed back to England. Some persons remained on the island. In May 1587, Raleigh sent another group of colonists to America to settle on the shores of Chesapeake Bay. John White led them. Instead of reaching Chesapeake Bay, the colonists were forced to land at Roanoke Islands. This group consisted of 117 people - 91 men, 17 women and 9 children.

In August, when White returned to England for fresh supplies war between Spain and England broke out. The war prevented White from returning to Roanoke Island until 1590. When he arrived at there, the colony had already been abandoned. No European ever saw the lost colonists again. Although there is no proof, some people believe that the colonists may have married into an Indian tribe and so may have gone into oblivion. This theory supported by the fact that the word:
'CROATOAN' was carved on a tree near the settlement. The Croatoans were Indians living on the island, who were friendly with the colonists.

The pilgrims, who landed at Plymouth, set up the second settlement (Massachusetts) in 1620. The others in the group of Puritans in the New World established the Massachusetts Bay Colony at Boston in 1630.

The pilgrims had to flee their homes in Europe, because of religious persecution. They were part of a large religious group called the Puritans. The Puritans were a Christian religious group, which opposed the hierarchy and elaborate rituals of the Church. They wanted to purify the Church. Thus the name: Puritans. When Oliver Cromwell came to power in Britain (between the years 1640 to 1656), the Puritans gained ascendancy in Britain. But prior to this period, and immediately after, Puritan persecution was rampant in England.

**Puritan Influence on the Early American Society**

Early in his reign, Charles I wanted to get Puritans to settle in America. This he did by offering them generous grants for settlement in America. One such grant went to a group of puritans to settle in the Islands of West Indies. Another grant went to the Massachusetts Bay Company. The king also gave a charter to George Calvert to establish a colony in Virginia, where Roman Catholics were permitted to settle.

The Massachusetts Bay Company organized a group of rich Puritans, and landed in what is now known as New England. The Members had signed an Agreement - the Cambridge Agreement, to settle with their families in the New World. It is interesting to note that nowhere in the Charters or agreements signed is there a mention made of a government or headquarters for the colonies. The settlements that came up in the New World, due to practical needs, created self-government with the consent of the settlers.

For instance, the Massachusetts Company elected John Winthrop as its governor. With time, as the settlement grew in population, the company formed a government to conduct the business of the company. Winthrop, the governor of the company, became the governor of the colony.

Initially, when the colony was just set up, the puritan values of self-denial, discipline and hard work helped the settlers establish their colony. The Puritan government not only looked after the affairs of the company but also of the colony. It enacted into law the biblical injunctions against drunkenness, adultery, murder, and theft in an attempt to regulate the religion and morality of the people.

The colony was not a theocracy i.e. it was not run by the church. Thus the Puritan colony in the 17th century was not just a dull, pleasure denying society. The colony was involved in profitable trade, and had developed a lively social life where alcohol was consumed. Educated puritans read secular as well as religious literature. This was the basic difference between the Puritanism in England and the Puritanical values that developed in the New World.

However, the formal separation of the church from the state had not occurred yet. In both New England and the south, there was a union of church and state. In other words, the church was supported by the state. In fact, church attendance increased during the 'witch craft trials' at Salem
(1690 - 92). The period saw more than 150 people imprisoned and several women were publicly burned at stakes. Membership of the church was essential for voting or holding any public office.

**By 1733, the British had set up a total of 13 colonies in North America.**

Before the first Europeans touched the shores of North America, the Red Indians already inhabited the New World. They lived in tribes; some of them were nomadic, while the others led a settled life doing agriculture on vast pieces of land. Initially, the Indians in North America accepted the Europeans settlers in their midst. Some Indians helped the white men adjust in their new environment. However, very often conflicts broke out between the Indians and the Europeans. This was chiefly due to the European adventurers who tried to grab the lands of the Indians.

**The Colonies versus Britain**

When Charles II ascended the throne in England, in 1651, the British crown under Charles II enacted the navigation act. It was formulated to convert the scattered American settlements into a world Empire. Through this act, England wanted to make its overseas colonies, a huge trading area well protected by her powerful navy. Thus, the colonies would produce goods which could not grow or be produced in England - like lumber, fur, tobacco, indigo, sugar etc. These products could be sold or sent only to Britain, where they would enjoy complete monopoly. And as far as possible, the colonies would buy their finished products from the English. In other words, even if the products were originally manufactured in Europe, they had to go through England, to reach the colonies. Besides, merchants had to pay custom duties on all the traded goods coming from England. The goods could be carried only in British or colonial ships.

The Navigation Act was followed by the Staple Act of 1663. This Act made it necessary for all goods imported by the colonies from any part of Europe to be shipped from British ports. These acts helped the crown to increase their revenue to fill her war-drained coffers. Many colonies in America, especially Massachusetts resented and resisted these Acts. The reasons were religious well as economic.

Since the population of Massachusetts comprised mainly of Puritans, they resented the restoration of the Tudor dynasty in England. The colony secretly gave refuge to a Puritan man, an escaped convict who was condemned to death by the king for the execution of Charles I. Further, the merchants perceived the Navigation Act as restrictive to trade. Most merchants from Massachusetts ignored the Act. Moreover, it insisted on following its own set of laws, particularly those concerning religion - which were opposed to the church in England. All attempts by the king to make the colony conform to the laws and Acts of the mother country were of no avail. In many instances the laws were fiercely resisted.

The Navigation Acts were particularly resented when the price of tobacco fell in the British market. This was in 1667, when they fell to about half a penny per pound. Almost half the tobacco shipped from the colony, to Britain, was then exported to the other parts of Europe. Due to the fall in the prices, the merchants in Massachusetts did not find it profitable to send tobacco to Britain. Instead they began turning a blind eye to the laws under the Navigation Act by sending tobacco directly to Europe via Holland. Moreover, even Virginia whose inhabitants were loyal supporters of the British king, got disgruntled due to the Navigation and Staple Acts.
UNIT-III

AGE OF REASON

The 18th century is often called the Age of Reason because it was a period of enlightenment during which philosophy was in vogue throughout Europe. The Age of Reason was characterized by the elimination of ancient authority and conventions. The humanists, with their critical intellects, began to topple the authoritarian structure of medieval thought that had governed, and crippled, scientific investigation. The basic idea of the authority and autonomy of reason dominated all philosophizing in the 18th century. At the bottom, it was the consequence of Newton's work. It led to the conviction that reason had really worked for the intellectual conquest of the natural world. Given that the philosophers rejected all dogma and authority except of reason; it is no surprise that the evils of authoritarian rule were also attacked. In France, where political liberalism was most outspoken, the philosophers believed passionately in liberty for all men, not just the aristocrats. The conceptual basis of democracy came far more from the accomplishments of Newtonian thought than apart from it.

Rene Descartes had re-introduced the importance of things that were self-evident. John Locke, whose writings were broadly incorporated into the Declaration of Independence by Jefferson, worked doggedly to produce the total world of man's conceptual experience out of a set of elementary sensory building blocks (self-evident concepts) moving always from sensation towards thought and from the simple to the complex. Again, Locke was inspired in part by the success of Newtonian thought and also by other philosophers who in turn had been inspired by Newton. Jean-Jacques Rousseau wrote of the natural freedom and equality of citizens. His political theory was expressed in the language of natural and inalienable rights. Locke also held that all men have a natural right to freedom and equality. Newton’s laws were a great success for science. Newton’s laws were a great success for science. Newton’s work unified a very diverse range of seemingly unrelated phenomena by explaining all motion with only a few simple laws. Scientists became confident that our universe is indeed a rational system, governed by simple laws.

Scientists in all areas set out anew to discover the basic laws of their fields. The scientific worldview became so pervasive that a movement was started to make a science out of every human endeavor. If the physical universe was so simple, why not all branches of knowledge? The "social sciences" were created and scholars started to search for the laws that govern human behavior. Adam Smith in his ‘Wealth of Nations’ tried to define the laws of economics so that scientifically sound economic policies could be adopted. Auguste Comte tried likewise in sociology. Faith in the ultimate power of the scientific mind was the order of the day. The Kings of Europe established academies dedicated to solving all human problems. Frederick the Great of Prussia and Catherine of Russia founded scientific academies in imitation of those of Charles II in England and Louis XIV in France. They spoke of the time as an Age of Reason and of Newton as a bearer of light.

The idea that there are simple, logical rules for everything extended beyond mere scholarly pursuits. The American and French Revolutions were both dedicated to the idea that people had certain natural rights that must be honored. The architects of the new governments tried to establish laws and governing principles consistent with these natural rights. The Declaration of Independence has the same kind of axiomatic structure, with deductive logic supporting the final conclusions, as does Newton’s Principia. Benjamin Franklin, one of the best scientists of his time, wrote an essay
entitled, "On Liberty and Necessity: Man in the Newtonian Universe." Thomas Jefferson called himself a scientist and began the American tradition of governmental encouragement of the sciences. The Age of Reason was in full bloom.

**John Locke -the Glorious Revolution**

John Locke was the greatest man in the world according to Lady Mary Calverly in correspondence with him after the publication of his major treatises in 1689. People have used many superlatives, including "the most influential philosopher of his age" and "thefounder of liberalism," to describe him. Locke did not begin life in circumstances harbingering greatness nor did his early life presage his lasting influence and reputation in philosophy and politics. Though he lived through important events in the Puritan Revolution and the Cromwellian Protectorate, his early life was ordinary. How did such an ordinary life lead to preeminence among English philosophers that has lasted 300 years? An overview of Locke's life indicates that educational opportunities, choices of occupations, friends, philosophical nature, religious beliefs, and events during his career all interacted and prepared him to be the apologist for the Glorious Revolution in 1688.

**Early Life**

John Locke was born at Wrington, a pleasant village in the north of Somersetshire, August 29, 1632. Locke's family had some advantages because his grandfather was a successful businessman who built a sizable estate. Locke's father served in the Parliamentary army during the Civil War where he met Colonel Alexander Popham. After the Restoration Popham became a Member of Parliament and helped young Locke gain admission to Westminster School. From there Locke entered Christ Church, Oxford, in 1652. In 1658, the year Cromwell died, Locke received his Master of Arts degree and remained at Oxford as adon, tutoring and lecturing. John Owen, the Dean of Christ Church, advocated religious toleration and affected Locke's intellectual development. Locke's early life was Puritan and Parliamentary. His education was High Church and royalist with a dose of toleration. When the monarchy was restored in 1660, Locke was as happy as any royalist and seemed to have abandoned any ideas of toleration in favor of order and peace. In September 1659 he wrote to Henry Stubbe praising excellent reasoning in a book and wishing that Stubbe had written more about toleration. He changed his opinion after Charles II was crowned. In two tracts about government written 1660-2, he argued that rulers were not obligated to allow diversity in opinion and religion. This change was one of several vacillations as Locke developed into the prototypical liberal emphasizing individual rights.

**Two Tracts on Government**

The *First Tract on Government* was directed specifically against a colleague, Edward Bagshaw, who defended toleration. In the preface to the *First Tract*, Locke wrote that no onecould "have a greater respect and veneration for authority" than he. He was joyous that the storm of the Interregnum had passed and could not understand how anyone would "hazardagain the substantial blessings of peace and settlement in an over-zealous contention abouthings which they themselves confess." For Locke, the peace, joy, and unity pervading England under a monarch overwhelmed any argument for toleration that would result in division. In the tract he argued that "a man cannot part with his liberty and have it too, convey it by compact to the magistrate and retain it himself." His concern was not with toleration personel but with the opportunity that toleration provided for "the cunning and malice of men . . . [to build] a perpetual foundation of war and contention." He
observed that if religious men were "to use no other sword but that of the word and spirit," then "toleration might promote a quiet in the world and at last bring those glorious days that men have a great while sought after the wrong way." At the end of the Second Tract on Government he wrote, "I conclude that all laws of the magistrate, whether secular or ecclesiastical, whether dealing with life in society or with divine worship, are just and legitimate." He allowed no disobedience. Locke later changed his mind under two monarchs with absolutist and Catholic leanings and committed himself irrevocably to toleration and individual rights when he published A Letter Concerning Toleration in 1689. One aspect of his thought surfaced in the tracts and never varied—the Christian religion was inextricably tied to legitimate politics, government, ethics, and knowledge.

**An Essay Concerning Toleration**

Two years after writing the Two Tracts on Government, Locke changed significantly in his views about magisterial authority and toleration in An Essay Concerning Toleration (1667). He asserted that magistrates were entrusted with authority "for the good, preservation, and peace" of society. He said that some issues of conscience could conflict with orders by magistrates. In such cases people "ought to do what their consciences require of them, as far as without violence they can, but withal be bound at the same time quietly to submit to the penalty the law inflicts." Locke espoused non-violent civil disobedience—an important step from the absolute obedience in the Two Tracts. His views on toleration changed at least as much. He advocated that "all speculative opinions and religious worship... have a clear title to universal toleration which the magistrate ought not to entrench on." He argued that people had a right to indifferent actions that did not harm society. Locke defined government as an agent for people and used the benefit of the people as a parameter to limit the power of magistrates. By the time he wrote the Two Treatises of Government, government had become the servant of the people with its powers circumscribed by their rights. Locke may have preferred to think of himself as a detached philosopher, as some of his adherents claimed, but An Essay on Toleration was evidence of his participation in life. His first trip to the continent, to Germany in November 1665, exposed him to toleration. He went as Secretary to Sir Walter Vane, the head of the English embassy. He found almost complete religious liberty as he visited and conversed freely among Catholics, Calvinists, Lutherans, Mennonites, and Jews. In a letter to Robert Boyle he described, with appreciation and a tone of surprise, religious toleration functioning well. The residents of Cleve "quietly permit one another to choose their way to heaven; for I cannot observe any quarrels or animosities amongst them upon the account of religion." Locke incorporated that experience in the Essay and tried to persuade his countrymen to embrace toleration. He asked his readers "to consider, therefore, the state of England at present and... whether toleration or imposition be the readiest way to secure the safety and peace" of the kingdom. Locke's change toward toleration was the beginning of his liberalization that continued after 1666 when he met Anthony Ashley Cooper, later the first Earl of Shaftesbury.

**Shaftesbury**

In 1667 Shaftesbury invited Locke to live with him at Exeter and, over a sixteen year period, influenced Locke's political philosophy more than any other person. We should remember that the influence was two-way. Shaftesbury and Locke became very close and Locke served as Shaftesbury's personal counselor. Shaftesbury, a master politician in the highest levels of government, used Locke in many capacities giving the scholar pragmatic experience. Shaftesbury had been an architect of the Restoration but ended as an enemy of Charles II which broadened Locke's political experience. Locke acquired a profound understanding of national administration.
and became a philosopher as an eminent politician, not as a don. When Locke wrote his *Two Treatises on Government*, he wrote as a philosopher, but he wrote with the conviction of experience in the urgency of circumstances. The third Earl of Shaftesbury, writing from memory years later, confirmed that his grandfather saw promise in Locke and encouraged him to study religion, politics, and all matters related to administering a state. Locke more than lived up to the first Earl's expectations.

**Charles II before the Glorious Revolution**

A review of events leading to the Glorious Revolution is in order before further considering Locke's friends and activities. Charles began his reign propitiously with grants of amnesty to most opponents of the Restoration. England was happy to have peace again under a monarch. Charles was scandalous and free in his sexual behavior, yet he was the most popular king with his court since Henry VIII. He lived his life as an atheist and was inclined to toleration for religious beliefs — more tolerant than his "Cavalier" Parliament which was largely comprised of the old aristocracy. In his later years, he seemed to lean toward Catholicism, especially in grants of toleration to them. He died as a Catholic confessing to a Catholic priest. Since he had no Protestant heir, his Catholic leanings caused troubles that continued into the reign of James II. Parliament intended to keep England Protestant under a king who was the head of the Anglican Church and to consolidate its position after the Civil War as the supreme power in government. James II clashed with both intentions.

**James II**

Charles II died February 6, 1685 and the Duke of York, Charles' brother, became King James II. James enjoyed unexpected popularity in his first months as ruler. He displayed many virtues, and if he had not been so inflexible as a Catholic, he likely would have had a prosperous reign. Religion was not his only source of conflict. He was rigid in his belief that monarchs should have absolute authority and openly continued the conflict with Parliament begun by his father. He issued declarations of religious toleration, appointed Catholics to office, and sought to enlist Dissenters to his side. His actions eventually led to the trials and acquittals of seven Anglican bishops. The general populace of England saw the judgments as a victory over Papal designs. Knowledgeable leaders saw them as vindications of Parliament as the supreme law maker. James succeeded in alienating the people of England over religion and their leaders over politics. Englishmen were hesitant to abolish the traditional hereditary monarchy but were pushed too far when Louis XIV, a Catholic and an absolute monarch, announced an alliance with James II. Englishmen responded by accepting William of Orange as their new king in 1689. But now, back to Locke during the turmoil leading to this drastic event.

Locke's friends and activities, recent scholarship has placed Locke firmly in the camp of Restoration radicals. Not only did he formulate the classic vindication for the overthrow of tyranny, but he participated in revolutionary politics against Charles II and James II. By the mid 1670's Whigs feared an end to the peace and quiet of the Restoration Settlement and began producing pamphlets to influence King Charles II to cease from activities that undermined the traditional balance of the constitution. One of the first pamphlets was *A Letter from a Person of Quality to His Friend in the Country* which was anonymous but accurately summarized Shaftesbury's views. The *Letter* appeared in 1675 after Shaftesbury had been relieved as Lord High Chancellor. Many of Locke's friends believed that Lockean doctrine was involved in writing the *Letter*. Whether involved or not, Locke hurriedly left for four year stay in France a few days after the House of Lords named a
committee to determine the author of the *Letter* and punish him. Within a few years, the pamphlet literature evolved into heated debates in the Exclusion controversy.

On August 28, 1678, Titus Oakes testified about a papal plot to assassinate King Charles II and to provoke rebellion in Scotland. Meager evidence agitated Englishmen who feared Catholic control. In the wake of the Popish Plot, Lord Danby, Charles' leading minister, fell from power, and Charles dissolved Parliament. People were dismayed and discussed the plot and James II, the popish successor to the throne, who had begun openly worshiping as a Catholic in 1673. Shaftesbury requested Locke to return to England in 1679 to a political scene that was more heated than the one he left. Shortly after his return, Locke wrote the bulk of the *Two Treatises* which later became, with emendations, a justification for the Glorious Revolution. Though some people prefer to view the *Two Treatises* as lofty political philosophy, they were originally written as Exclusion literature in 1679-81, during the crisis itself. The Whig pamphlets in general tended to follow a recognizable strategy. First, they tried to reach the king himself. Second, they hinted at a popular rebellion in reaction to royal designs for absolute monarchy. Third, the writers reminded the king that English politics rested on a sharing of power between people and king. Finally, they pointed out the benefit to Charles II if he reconciled with Parliament. The king needed to separate himself from "self-serving and evil counsellors" and realign himself with his people from whence his real power issued. The final thrust of the Whig rhetoric was to restore the old constitution. Locke, who was actively associated with Whig activists, wrote the *Two Treatises* in this milieu.

**Petitioning Campaigns**

In 1679-80 many petitions requested the king to assemble Parliament. The petitioners, of whom many were Dissenters and Puritan revolutionaries, placed parliament at the center of government. In the *Second Treatise*, Locke mirrored the theme of centrality where he argued that "the Supreme Power, which is the Legislative" was established by a commonwealth "with Authority to determine all the Controversies, and redress the Injuries, that may happen to any Member." Charles II resisted the petitions and regarded his right to summon and dissolve Parliament to be part of his prerogative power that should not be usurped. Locke argued that prerogative power only existed in the absence of positive law by the legislative and as latitude to ensure continuous government between legislative sessions. The legislative could and should make positive laws to close gaps. Anyone who argued that "the People incroach'd upon the Prerogative" simply had "a very wrong Notion of Government." Locke went so far as to say that "the People . . . have a right to reinstate their Legislative in the Exercise of their Power," and "if the Executive Power being possessed of the Force of the Commonwealth, shall make use of that force to hinder the meeting and acting of the Legislative," then he placed himself into a "state of War with the People." These were the words of a man deeply involved with the revolutionary politics of his day.

Direct evidence of Locke's participation in the petitioning campaigns gives further grounds for seeing parallels between the *Second Treatise* and issues in the petitions. Locke signed a petition in London that included signatures by twenty-nine known radical dissenters of which five appeared on the same page as Locke's signature. His signature was near that of Awnsham Churchill who later published the *Two Treatises* and of Algernon Sydney who wrote *Discourses Concerning Government* in the aftermath of the Exclusion crisis. There were obvious parallels with the *Two Treatises*. It is possible, even probable, that Locke met Sydney. Sydney was tried in 1683 for his political activities. Shaftesbury died on January 23, 1683, after fleeing to Holland. Locke clearly associated with radicals and ignored a royal proclamation prohibiting such activities. In fall 1683
Locke decided to visit Holland. Since he did not return till after the Glorious Revolution was accomplished, it might be more accurate to say he slipped away into self-imposed exile because he did not want to suffer a fate similar to his friends. Before Locke left he wrote the bulk of the *Two Treatises on Government* and refuted the major arguments of Robert Filmer for an absolute monarchy.

**Filmer resurrected**

Amidst the flurry of petitions and Whig pamphlets, royalists needed justification for absolutism under Charles II and resurrected the writings of Robert Filmer. Filmer wrote around 1642 in support of Charles I defending the divine right of kings. He argued that the king's authority was from God, thus the king was not accountable to the people. Filmer died in 1653 before his major works were published. In 1679 the royalists published a collection of Filmer's works under the title, *The Free-holders Grand Inquest*. They followed these works with *Patriarcha, or The Natural Power of Kings Asserted* in 1680. Locke wrote the *Two Treatises of Government* in response to the publication of Filmer's works. The *First Treatise* was a refutation of *Patriarcha*. The *Second Treatise* dealt directly with the writings in the *Free-holder*.

**First treatise religious/overlooked**

The *Second Treatise* overshadowed the *First* in the historiography of Locke and political thought. Recent textual criticism strongly supports the idea that most of second treatise was written before the first—evidence that Locke began the treatise in 1679 in reaction to *Free-holders*. The *Second Treatise* laid out Locke's political thought that became the foundation for political liberalism. Modern readers often skip the first essay altogether. Was it worth writing? Given the purpose and setting of the *First Treatise*, it was an important work that seems to have lost relevance in a modern secular world. England in the 17th century was not secular, and religion was an inextricable part of politics. Filmer wrote an imposing book, *Patriarcha*, in accord with prevalent beliefs about patriarchal authority and used the *Bible* to build an impressive case—impressive to many Englishmen of the time—for the divine right of kings. Divine right was a cornerstone for Charles' edifice of absolutemonarchy, and Locke wrote to dislodge it. Locke's response was part of the activist literature of the day but reflected his deeper beliefs about religion and his approach to Scripture. Locke simply accepted that the *Bible* was inspired by God and was true. The *First Treatise* reads more like a theological work than a political discourse. In writing his treatise, Locke followed Filmer's argument and adopted many of his definitions of the issues. Adam, the first man in the *Bible*, was the key to Filmer's argument. According to Filmer, God divinely granted paternal authority to Adam that was perpetuated as divine authority to kings. After summarizing Filmer's argument, Locke wrote, "First, It is false that God made that Grant to Adam." He proceeded to destroy Filmer's argument with proof texts from the *Bible* including quotes in the original Hebrew and Greek languages and authoritative Latin translations. A theological tone permeated the *First Treatise*. Locke succeeded in removing Scriptural foundations for the divine right of kings. In our present world, neither divine rights for rulers nor Scriptural bases for political authority are issues, but the lack of current relevance does not detract from the importance of the essay to a people struggling with God's place in government. To a degree, the *First Treatise* was irrelevant in 1689 when it was published since the Glorious Revolution was history. However, it ensured that James II's supporters could not resurrect Filmer a second time in an effort to topple William III. Locke likely had an additional motive in publishing the *First Treatise*. It approached the *Bible* with reason—a method he followed in all his writings and completed in *The Reasonableness of Christianity*. Locke
was a founder of Enlightenment thought and the *First Treatise* was an example of an enlightened approach to Scripture. Possibly the essay was more important to the Enlightenment concerning religion than politics.

**Second treatise**

The *Two Treatises* have been "often characterized as the first secular expression of political theory in the modern era"—an irony of history. Locke firmly grounded his arguments in God and Scripture as he perceived them, including the *Second Treatise*. The first sentences in the treatise linked Adam to political authority and the law of nature. He used Scripture quotations liberally from the Old and New Testaments as proof to support his positions. Locke argued that God "made man such a creature, that in his own judgment, it was not good for him to be alone . . . to drive him into society." To keep from belaboring a point, let me summarize. Locke argued that men belonged to God. God provided them with reason which was the substance of the law of nature. He created them as gregarious beings. They came together by consent to form particular societies and governments. Any laws they made "must be conformable to the law of nature, i.e. to the will of God." Men determined the will of God by reason and revelation. People were not bound by any human law that contradicted the will of God such as arbitrary decrees tending to tyranny. Recently, Professor John Dunn wrote about the *Two Treatises* to explore "the theoretical centrality of Locke's religious preoccupations throughout the work." One of Dunn's central reasons for writing was "the intimate dependence of an extremely high proportion of Locke's arguments for their very intelligibility, let alone plausibility, on a series of theological commitments." Dunn considered all of Locke's works and concluded that Locke's theory of obligations among people "was at all times set out in theological terms, political duty was always discussed as a duty to God." How is it that "the classic expression of liberal political ideas," so obviously grounded in Christian beliefs, came to be viewed by many as part of the beginning of secular thought?

Convoluted reasoning and specious arguments, such as found in a recent article by Bluhm, Wintfeld, and Teger, exemplify how Locke has been misread. These authors correctly state that the fundamental issue is whether the God behind Locke's state of nature can be taken seriously. They answer "no" and argue that Locke did not mean what he said. As an example they point to a particular argument by Locke in the *Second Treatise* and say that since he only said it one time and did not repeat it, he did not mean it and did not intend for a sophisticated reader to believe him. Throughout the article the authors contend that Locke said many things for the "average reader" to believe but intended for the "elite to read between the lines" and understand a message that he did not say. They say the Locke had a "surface" message, what he said, and a "subterranean" message, what he did not say. The surface message was that God existed and expected lawful behavior. The subterranean message, the real message, was that God did not exist, but people needed to believe in him for political reasons. Their entire argument is that Locke did not mean what he said. He meant what he did not say, and elite people would accurately understand what he did not say.

They offer assumptions and reasoning—no positive evidence—for their position. In all of Locke's personal journals, letters, and publications, he was consistent in insisting on the reality of God and truth of the *Bible*. Overwhelming evidence indicates that Locke meant what he said and most Lockeans accept the sincerity and centrality of Locke's Christianity. Though religion was foundational to Locke, he wrote the *Second Treatise* as a political philosophy. Locke provided a complete political theory in the *Second Treatise* where he expounded "the true original, extent, and end of government." Much has been written about Locke's ideas on the state of nature, law of
nature, reason, and property, but his concept of consent should not be forgotten. The word, "consent", or a cognate appears 109 times in the Second Treatise. Consent must be voluntary for authority to be legitimate. He reminded politicians that people, who voluntarily formed government "by consent, were all equal, till, by the same consent, they set rulers over themselves. So that their politic societies all began from a voluntary union." No governmental officials could have the power to do anything that throttled to enslave the people. Officials would be "exercising a power the people never put into their hands (who can never be supposed to consent, that any body should rule over them for their harm)." Locke argued that when officials overstepped their bounds, no judge remained on Earth and the people had a "liberty to appeal to Heaven"—code for revolution. He warned kings, "'tis the thing of all others, they have most need to avoid, as of all others the most perilous." Locke further used consent to argue that the king could not use prerogative power to keep the legislative from assembling. Consent was crucial to Locke's theories and had many facets that paralleled pamphlets during the Exclusion crisis. The Second Treatise reflected Locke as a philosopher which history confirmed, but he also wrote from the perspective of a radical Whig.

**Letter/Essay to Clarke about Glorious Revolution**

Without doubt Locke supported the Glorious Revolution and the Revolution Settlement that established William III as the king of England. He allowed his Two Treatises to be published as a philosophical justification for the revolution, but he was largely silent in his published writings concerning his opinions about the actual events and aftermath. Two documents written by John Locke to Edward Clarke became available this century that shed light on Locke's attitudes about the revolution. The first document was a letter to Clarke written one to two weeks before Locke returned to London on February 12, 1689, for the coronation of William III. He told Clarke about men in Holland who misunderstood what Members of Parliament were doing in England, thinking they were merely acting as a formal Parliament. Locke said that parliamentary meetings concerning William were "something of another nature" and had "business to do of greater moment and consequence." Locke was not ambiguous. He said that the parliamentarians were "restoring our ancient government, the best possibly that ever was," and their goal was "to set up a constitution that may be lasting." He referred to them as a "convention" which was not formulating "anything less than the great frame of the government." The events transpiring in England fit well with Locke's political theories espoused in the Two Treatises which he had already written, and Locke saw them in that light. English society, formed by social compact, had not dissolved, but the government that ruled that society needed to be re instituted. Locke never clearly laid out how a government should be formed, but the course that parliamentarians and William pursued met with his approval. He probably had an advisory role in how that "convention" Parliament and William reestablished England's constitutional government. The second document to Clarke was a reasoned essay with a practical tone in which Locke assessed the mood of the country since William III accepted the crown. From Clarke's notations on the document and a reference to it by Locke in another letter, Locke apparently intended for Clarke to use his ideas in parliamentary and political forums. In the document, Locke clearly supported William III, called for unity among the English people, and supported his opinions with pragmatic reasons of survival. His call for unity involved more than mere submission which would not make the reign of William III legitimate according to his concept of consent in the Two Treatises. The people needed to voluntarily consent to the new government. Locke said that William III provided England's "delivery from popery and slavery" and was "the fence set up against popery and France." He argued that William was crucial to the alliance with various continental powers that protected Protestants and England from being conquered by France. In his call for unity behind William III, Locke concluded that if Englishmen refused the call,
then England could not stand. Locke credited Clarke with the suggestion that prompted this essay. Again Locke was influenced by friends and tried to influence the course of politics.

**A Letter Concerning Toleration**

In early 1689 Locke published the *Letter Concerning Toleration* which was the first of his three major works put out for publication that year. Locke had written the *Letter* in 1685 after being in Holland for two years where he was again influenced in a land of toleration. He solidified his thoughts but did not publish them till a tolerant king sat on the throne supported by a tolerant Parliament. Locke was always careful. The reasoning was more clear and mature than in the *Essay Concerning Toleration*. Civil society and religious society should not be joined "because the Church itself is a thing absolutely separate and distinct from the commonwealth." He was adamant that the business of government and church was separate and different. "The whole jurisdiction of the magistrate reaches only to . . . civil concerns," and the church had no jurisdiction in them. He applied his concept of "voluntary consent" to the church as a "voluntary society of men" and reached parallel conclusions to those he reached for voluntary civil societies in the *Second Treatise*. He argued that toleration should be a primary doctrine and goal of all Churches, indeed, of all religions. All toleration should "be permitted to the Presbyterians, Independents, Anabaptists, Arminians, Quakers, and others." He allowed toleration to people of other religions such as Jews and Mohammedans. Roman Catholics received full toleration in religious matters. Magistrates should interfere with them only when their allegiance to the Pope threatened the commonwealth. Locke never saw grounds for tolerating atheists. They "are not to be tolerated who deny the being of God. Promises, covenants, and oaths, which are the bonds of human society, can have no hold upon an atheist." Locke saw atheists as a danger to society since they had no ethical foundation and could not be trusted. Locke never abandoned the view of toleration expressed in this *Letter*. He was consistent in seeing the grounds for ethical behavior in Christian beliefs and using reason to reach conclusions for civil and religious conduct.

**Liberalism**

All evidence, including Locke's own writings, indicates that Locke was a conservative Englishman till he met Shaftesbury. Apparently he learned to be liberal as "a trusted political adviser to one of the shrewdest and most powerful politicians of seventeenth century England." Shaftesbury did not determine Locke's thought but seemed to act as a catalyst for his philosophical interests.

**Reasonableness of Christianity**

Locke did not publish his major works till after the Glorious Revolution in 1689, but he wrote often throughout his life and influenced many people. He based all of his importanthetical and political arguments on his Christian beliefs and the *Bible* as he understood them through reason. He "laid the foundation" for modern empiricism in *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding* and became "England's most influential philosopher." He provided a theoretical basis for the American Revolution, not just the Glorious Revolution and not to mention France. But "Locke's impact on theology, particularly in America, should be more widely realized." "Not only did Locke greatly influence the political thought of America's founders, but . . . he also helped to shape the religious thought of . . . Americans through his rationalistic interpretation of the *Bible* . . . which stands to this day." Considering the fall of Communism, Locke "may well be the most influential philosopher of the Western world." To understand Locke, one must keep in mind the importance of the Christian
beliefs that he espoused. He did not provide a well reasoned explanation of his beliefs till 1695 when he published *The Reasonableness of Christianity* in which we have mature thoughts on the religion that undergirded his previous works.

Locke believed that the *Bible* was "to be understood in the plain direct meaning of the words and phrases . . . according to the language of that time"—an approach to scripture espoused by Martin Luther in his commentary on Romans that helped shape the Protestant Reformation. Locke argued that the *Bible* taught two laws: a law of nature or works and a law of faith. "The law of works then, in short, is that law which requires perfect obedience" and is "knowable by reason." In terms of eternal salvation, "the law of faith . . . is allowed to supply the defect of full obedience" since "the law of works makes no allowance for failing on any occasion." The law of faith had only one requirement, faith that Jesus was the Messiah. The law of nature, reason, remained operative in defining how men should relate to each other. The law of nature was the legal basis for societies and governments and was distinct from the law of faith in the religious realm. Governments should concern themselves only with how men should live together reasonably. Locke said that "justification" was "the subject of this present treatise" and spent little time on the law of nature which he expounded in the *Second Treatise*. Locke's bifurcation of the world into the religious and secular with a single law underlying each is crucial in understanding his theories.

We cannot define John Locke by a single facet of his personality, a single person in his life, or a single event. He published his most important treatises late in life after many enriching experiences in which he developed mature thoughts for a new age, the Enlightenment. He was reared as a Puritan during a Puritan dominated Interregnum. He went to a university where the prime function was to prepare men for the Anglican ministry in a classical and scholastic atmosphere. Locke followed the advice of his friend, John Strachey, not to become a clergyman though he lived in a time when religion was paramount. Yet, he did not abandon his beliefs, and they pervaded his writing. Shaftesbury influenced him toward political liberalism and provided invaluable political experience. He associated with actvists among Puritan dissenters and Whig radicals. He was trusted in William III's court. Many people sought his intelligent and reasonable advice. His method was to approach everything with reason. He infused reason into his religion as he did his politics and philosophy. Reason was the unifying factor in his life, and his pursuit of it may have been his most important legacy.

**SAINT THOMAS AQUINAS**

Thomas Aquinas (1225–1274) lived at a critical juncture of western culture when the arrival of the Aristotelian *CORPUS* in Latin translation reopened the question of the relation between faith and reason, calling into question the *MODUS VIVENDI* that had obtained for centuries. This crisis flared up just as universities were being founded. Thomas, after early studies at Montecassino, moved on to the University of Paris, which had been formed out of the monastic schools on the Left Bank and the cathedral school at Notre Dame. In two stints as a regent master Thomas defended the mendicant orders and, of greater historical importance, countered both the Averroistic interpretations of Aristotle and the Franciscan tendency to reject Greek philosophy. The result was a new *MODUS VIVENDI* between faith and philosophy which survived until the rise of the new physics. The Catholic Church has over the centuries
regularly and consistently reaffirmed the central importance of Thomas's work for understanding its teachings concerning the Christian revelation, and his close textual commentaries on Aristotle represent a cultural resource which is now receiving increased recognition. The following account concentrates on Thomas the philosopher.

**Life and Works**

1. Vita Brevis

Thomas was born in 1225 at Roccasecca, a hilltop castle from which the great Benedictine abbey of Montecassino is not quite visible, midway between Rome and Naples. At the age of five, he was entered at Montecassino where his studies began. When the monastery became a battle site—not for the last time—Thomas was transferred by his family to the University of Naples. It was here that he came into contact with the “new” Aristotle and with the Order of Preachers or Dominicans, a recently founded mendicant order. He became a Dominican over the protests of his family and eventually went north to study, perhaps first briefly at Paris, then at Cologne with Albert the Great, whose interest in Aristotle strengthened Thomas's own predilections. Returned to Paris, he completed his studies, became a Master and for three years occupied one of the Dominican chairs in the Faculty of Theology. The next ten years were spent in various places in Italy, with the mobile papal court, at various Dominican houses, and eventually in Rome. From there he was called back to Paris to confront the controversy variously called Latin Averroism and Heterodox Aristotelianism. After this second three year stint, he was assigned to Naples. In 1274, on his way to the Council of Lyon, he fell ill and died on March 7 in the Cistercian abbey at Fossanova, which is perhaps twenty kilometers from Roccasecca.

2. Education

Little is known of Thomas's studies at Montecassino, but much is known of the shape that the monastic schools had taken. They were one of the principal conduits of the liberal arts tradition which stretches back to Cassiodorus Senator in the 6th century. The arts of the trivium (grammar, rhetoric, logic) and those of the quadrivium (arithmetic, geometry, music and astronomy) were fragments preserved against the ruinous loss of classical knowledge. They constituted the secular education that complemented sacred doctrine as learned from the Bible. When Thomas transferred to Naples, his education in the arts continued. Here it would have been impressed upon him that the liberal arts were no longer adequate categories of secular learning: the new translations of Aristotle spelled the end of the liberal arts tradition, although the universities effected a transition rather than a breach.

Taking Thomas's alma mater Paris as reference point, the Faculty of Arts provided the point of entry to teen-aged boys. With the attainment of the Master of Arts at about the age of 20, one could go on to study in a higher faculty, law, medicine or theology. The theological program Thomas entered in Paris was a grueling one, with the master's typically attained in the early thirties. Extensive and progressively more intensive study of the scriptures, Old and New Testament, and of the summary of Christian doctrine called the Sentences which were compiled by the 12th century Bishop of Paris, Peter Lombard. These close textual studies were complemented by public disputations and the even more unruly quodlibetal questions. With the faculty modeled more or less on the guilds, the student served a long apprenticeship, established his competence in stages, and eventually after a public examination was named a master and then gave his inaugural lecture.
3. WRITINGS

Thomas's writings by and large show their provenance in his teaching duties. His commentary on the Sentences put the seal on his student days and many of his very early commentaries on Scripture have come down to us. But from the very beginning Thomas produces writings which would not have emerged from the usual tasks of the theological master. On Being and Essence and The Principles of Nature date from his first stay at Paris, and unlike his commentaries on Boethius' On the Trinity and De Hebdomadibus, are quite obviously philosophical works. Some of his disputed questions date from his first stint as regius master at Paris. When he returned to Italy his productivity increased. He finished the Summa Contra Gentiles, wrote various disputed questions and began the Summa Theologiae. In 1268, at Rome, he began the work of commenting on Aristotle with On the Soul, and during the next five or six years commented on eleven more (not all of these are complete). During this time he was caught up in magisterial duties of unusual scope and was writing such polemical works as On the Eternity of the World and On There Being Only One Intellect.

At Naples, he was given the task of elevating the status of the Dominican House of Studies. His writing continued until he had a mystical experience which made him think of all he had done as "mere straw." At the time of his death in 1274 he was under a cloud in Paris and in 1277, 219 propositions were condemned by a commission appointed by the Bishop of Paris, among them tenets of Thomas. This was soon lifted; he was canonized and eventually was given the title of Common Doctor of the Church. But the subtle and delicate assimilation of Aristotle that characterized his work in both philosophy and theology did not survive his death, outside the Dominican Order, and has experienced ups and downs ever since.

4. PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY

Many contemporary philosophers are unsure how to read Thomas. He was in his primary and official profession a theologian. Nonetheless, we find among his writings works anyone would recognize as philosophical and the dozen commentaries on Aristotle increasingly enjoy the respect and interest of Aristotelian scholars. Even within theological works as such there are extended discussions that are easily read as possessing a philosophical character. So his best known work, the Summa Theologiae, is often cited by philosophers when Thomas's position on this or that issue is sought. How can a theological work provide grist for philosophical mills? How did Thomas distinguish between philosophy and theology?

Sometimes Thomas puts the difference this way: "... the believer and the philosopher consider creatures differently. The philosopher considers what belongs to their proper natures, while the believer considers only what is true of creatures insofar as they are related to God, for example, that they are created by God and are subject to him, and the like." Since the philosopher too, according to Thomas, considers things as they relate to God, this statement does not put the difference in a formal light.

The first and major formal difference between philosophy and theology is found in their principles, that is, starting points. The presuppositions of the philosopher, that to which his discussions and arguments are ultimately driven back, are in the public domain. They are things that everyone can know upon reflection; they are where disagreement between us must come to an end. These principles are not themselves the products of proof—which does not of course mean that they are
immune to rational analysis and inquiry—and thus they are said to be known by themselves. This is proportionately true of each of the sciences, where the most common principles just alluded to are in the background and the proper principles or starting points of the particular science function regionally as the common principles do across the whole terrain of thought and being.

By contrast, the discourse of the theologian is ultimately driven back to starting points or principles that are held to be true on the basis of faith, that is, the truths that are authoritatively conveyed by Revelation as revealed by God. Some believers reflect on these truths and see other truths implied by them, spell out their interrelations and defend them against the accusation of being nonsense. Theological discourse looks like any other discourse and is, needless to say, governed by the common principles of thought and being, but it is characterized formally by the fact that its arguments and analyses are taken to be truth-bearing only for one who accepts Scriptural revelation as true.

This provides a formal test for deciding whether a piece of discourse is philosophical or theological. If it relies only on truths anyone can be expected upon reflection to know about the world, and if it offers to lead to new truths on the basis of such truths, and only on that basis, then it is philosophical discourse. On the other hand, discourse whose cogency—not formal, but substantive—depends upon our accepting as true such claims as that there are three persons in one divine nature, that our salvation was effected by the sacrifice of Jesus, that Jesus is one person but two natures, one human, one divine, and the like, is theological discourse. Any appeal to an authoritative scriptural source as the necessary nexus in an argument is thereby other than philosophical discourse.

More will be said of this contrast later, but this is the essential difference Thomas recognizes between philosophy and theology. I will conclude this paragraph with a passage in which Thomas summarizes his position. He is confronting an objection to there being any need for theological discourse. Whatever can be the object of inquiry will qualify as a being of one sort or another; but the philosophical disciplines seem to cover every kind of being, indeed there is even a part of it which Aristotle calls theology. So what need is there for discourse beyond philosophical discourse…it should be noted that different ways of knowing (\textit{Ratio Cognoscibilis}) give us different sciences. The astronomer and the natural philosopher both conclude that the earth is round, but the astronomer does this through a mathematical middle that is abstracted from matter, whereas the natural philosopher considers middle lodged in matter. Thus there is nothing to prevent another science from treating in the light of divine revelation what the philosophical disciplines treat as knowable in the light of human reason.

For Thomas theological discourse begins with what God has revealed about Himself and His action in creating and redeeming the world and the world is understood in that light. Philosophical discourse begins with knowledge of the world, and if it speaks of God, what it says is conditioned by what is known of the world. But even given the distinction between the two, Aquinas suggests here that there are in fact elements of what God has revealed that are formally speaking philosophical and subject to philosophical discussion—though revealed they can be known and investigated without the precondition of faith. In other words, even something as a matter of fact revealed is subject to philosophical analysis, if religious faith is not necessary to know it and accept it as true. So it may happen that concerning certain subjects, as for example the nature of God, the nature of the human person, what is necessary for a human being to be good and to fulfill his or her destiny, and so on, there can be both a theological and a philosophical discussion of those subjects,
providing for a fruitful engagement between the theological and the philosophical. And for this reason, Thomas’ theological works are very often paradigms of that engagement between theological and philosophical reflection, and provide some of his very best philosophical reflection.

5. CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHY

It will be observed that the formal distinction between philosophical and theological discourse leaves untouched what has often been the mark of one who is at once a believer and a philosopher. It is not simply that he might on one occasion produce an argument that is philosophical and at another time one that is theological; his religious beliefs are clearly not put in escrow but are very much in evidence when he functions as a philosopher. Many of the questions that can be raised philosophically are such that the believer already has answers to them -- from his religious faith. How then can he be thought to be ready to follow the argument whither it listeth, as an objector might put it? Furthermore, the inquiries in which the believer who philosophizes engages will often indicate his religious interests.

When such observations turn into objections, perhaps into the accusation that a believer cannot be a proper philosopher, there is often an unexamined notion of what a proper philosopher looks like. The proper philosopher may be thought to be someone—perhaps merely some mind—without antecedents or history who first comes to consciousness posing a philosophical question the answer to which is pursued without prejudice. But of course no human being and thus no philosopher is pure reason, mind alone, without previous history as he embarks on the task of philosophizing. One has necessarily knocked about in the world for a long time before he signs up for Philosophy 101. He has at hand or rattling around in his mind all kinds of ready responses to situations and questions. He very likely engaged in some kind of inquiry about whether or not to begin the formal study of philosophy in the first place. This may be acknowledged, but with the proviso that step one in the pursuit of philosophy is to rid the mind of all such antecedents. They must be put in the dock, put in brackets, placed in doubt, regarded with suspicion. Only after appropriate epistemological cleansing is the mind equipped to make its first warranted knowledge claim. Knowledge thus becomes a deliverance of philosophy, a product of philosophizing. Outside of philosophy there is no knowledge.

The preceding paragraph has been meant to capture the salient note of much modern philosophy since Descartes. Philosophy is first of all a search for defensible knowledge claims, and for the method according to which it will be found.

As opposed to the view of philosophy described in paragraph 2, Thomas understands philosophizing to depend upon antecedent knowledge, to proceed from it, and to be unintelligible unless, in its sophisticated modes, it can be traced back to the common truths known to all. But this tracing back will pass through very different terrains, depending on the upbringing, culture and other vagaries and accidents of a given person's experience. The pre-philosophical—we refer to the formal study of philosophy—outlook of the believer will be characterizable in a given way, a way suggested above. It is more difficult to characterize the pre-philosophical attitudes and beliefs out of which the non-believer philosophizes. Let us imagine that he holds in a more or less unexamined way that all events, including thinking, are physical events. If he should, as a philosopher, take up the question of the immortality of the soul, he is going to regard with suspicion those classical proofs which rely on an analysis of thinking as a non-physical process. The Christian, on the other hand, will be well-disposed towards efforts to prove the immortality of the human soul and will
accordingly approach descriptions of thinking as non-physical sympathetically. He is unlikely to view with equanimity any claim that for human beings death is the utter end.

The importance of this is that a believer runs the risk of accepting bad proofs of the immateriality of thinking and thus of the human soul. On the other hand, a committed materialist may be too quick to accept a bad proof that thinking is just a material process. Such antecedent stances are often the reason why philosophical agreement is so hard to reach. Does it make it impossible? Do such considerations destroy any hope of philosophical objectivity on either side? Believers and non-believers should be able to agree on what counts as a good proof in a given area even if they expect different results from such a proof. Thinking either is or is not merely a physical process and antecedent expectations do not settle the question, however they influence the pursuit of that objective resolution. But the important point is that antecedent dispositions and expectations are the common condition of philosophers, believers and unbelievers alike. Of course, believers hold that they have an advantage here, since the antecedents that influence them are revealed truths, not just hearsay, received opinion, the _ZEITGEIST_ or prejudice.

6. **Thomas and Aristotle**

Given the distinction between philosophy and theology, one can then distinguish between philosophical and theological sources and influences in Aquinas' work. And as a philosopher, Thomas is emphatically Aristotelian. His interest in and perceptive understanding of the Stagyrite is present from his earliest years and certainly did not await the period toward the end of his life when he wrote his close textual commentaries on Aristotle. When Thomas referred to Aristotle as the Philosopher, he was not merely adopting a _FAÇON DE PARLER_ of the time. He adopted Aristotle's analysis of physical objects, his view of place, time and motion, his proof of the prime mover, his cosmology. He made his own Aristotle's account of sense perception and intellectual knowledge. His moral philosophy is closely based on what he learned from Aristotle and in his commentary on the _METAPHYSICS_ he provides a cogent and coherent account of what is going on in those difficult pages. But to acknowledge the primary role of Aristotle in Thomas's philosophy is not to deny other philosophical influences. Augustine is a massively important presence. Boethius, Pseudo-Dionysius and Proclus were conduits through which he learned Neo-platonism. There is nothing more obviously Aristotelian about Thomas than his assumption that there is something to be learned from any author, if only mistakes to be avoided. But he adopted many features from non-Aristotelian sources.

This has led some to suggest that what is called Thomistic philosophy is an eclectic hodgepodge, not a set of coherent disciplines. Others, struck by the prominence in Thomas of such Platonic notions as participation, have argued that his thought is fundamentally Platonic, not Aristotelian. Still others argue that there is a radically original Thomistic philosophy which cannot be characterized by anything it shares with earlier thinkers, particularly Aristotle. The recognition that Thomas is fundamentally an Aristotelian is not equivalent to the claim that Aristotle is the only influence on him. It is the claim that whatever Thomas takes on from other sources is held to be compatible with what he already holds in common with Aristotle. And, of course, to draw attention to the sources of Thomas's philosophy is not to say that everything he holds philosophically can be parsed back into historical antecedents, or that he never disagrees with his sources, Aristotle in particular.

7. **The Order of Philosophical Inquiry**
Thomas takes “philosophy” to be an umbrella term which covers an ordered set of sciences. Philosophical thinking is characterized by its argumentative structure and a science is taken to be principally the discovery of the properties of kinds of things. But thinking is sometimes theoretical and sometimes practical. The practical use of the mind has as its object the guidance of some activity other than thinking—choosing in the case of moral action, some product in the case of art. The theoretical use of the mind has truth as its object: it seeks not to change the world but to understand it. Like Aristotle, Thomas holds that there is a plurality of both theoretical and practical sciences. Ethics, economics and politics are the practical sciences, while physics, mathematics and metaphysics are the theoretical sciences.

That is one way to lay out the various philosophical disciplines. But there is another that has to do with the appropriate order in which they should be studied. That order of learning is as follows: logic, mathematics, natural philosophy, moral philosophy, and metaphysics. The primacy of logic stems from the fact that we have to know what knowledge is so we will recognize that we have met its demands in a particular case. The study of mathematics comes early because little experience of the world is required to master it. But when we turn to knowledge of the physical world, there is an ever increasing dependence upon a wide and deep experience of things. Moral philosophy requires not only experience, but good upbringing and the ordering of the passions. Metaphysics or wisdom is the culminating and defining goal of philosophical inquiry: it is such knowledge as we can achieve of the divine, the first cause of all else.

Thomas commented on two logical works of Aristotle: *ON INTERPRETATION* (incomplete) and *POSTERIOR ANALYTICS*. On mathematics, there are only glancing allusions in Thomas's writings. Thomas describes logic as dealing with “second intentions,” that is, with formal relations which attach to concepts expressive of the natures of existent things, first intentions. This means that logic rides piggy-back on direct knowledge of the world and thus incorporates the view that what is primary in our knowledge is the things of which we first form concepts. Mathematical entities are idealizations made by way of abstraction from our knowledge of sensible things. It is knowledge of sensible things which is primary and thus prior to the “order of learning” the philosophical sciences.

This epistemological primacy of knowledge of what we grasp by our senses is the basis for the primacy of the sensible in our language. Language is expressive of knowledge and thus what is first and most easily knowable by us will be what our language first expresses. That is the rule. It is interesting to see its application in the development of the philosophy of nature.

8. COMPOSITION OF PHYSICAL OBJECTS

The concern of natural science is of course natural things, physical objects, which may be described as “what come to be as the result of a change and undergo change.” The first task of natural philosophy, accordingly, is to define and analyze physical objects. The first thing to notice about this is the assumption that we begin our study of the natural world, not with the presumed ultimate alphabet with which macrocosmic things are spelled, but with a vague and comprehensive concept which encompasses whatever has come to be as the result of a change and undergoes change. The reader of Aquinas becomes familiar with this assumption. Thomas learned it from the beginning of Aristotle's *PHYSICS*.

The natural way of doing this is to start from the things which are more knowable and clear to us and to proceed towards those which are clearer and more knowable by nature; for the same things
are not knowable relatively to us and knowable without qualification. So we must follow this method and advance from what is more obscure by nature, but clearer to us, towards what is clearer and more knowable by nature. Now what is to us plain and clear at first is rather confused masses, the elements and principles of which become known to us later by analysis. Thus we must advance from universals to particulars; for it is a whole that is more knowable to sense-perception, and a universal is a kind of whole, comprehending many things within it, like parts. Much the same thing happens in the relation of the name to the formula. A name, e.g. ‘Circle’, means vaguely a sort of whole: its definition analyses this into particulars. Similarly a child begins by calling all men father, and all women mother, but later on distinguishes each of them.

Thomas calls the movement from the more to the less general in a science the “order of determination” or specification of the subject matter. The first purchase on natural things is via “physical object” or “natural thing.” The “order of demonstration” involves finding the properties of things as known through this general concept. Then, specifying the subject further, one seeks properties of things known through the less common concepts. For example, in plane geometry, one would begin with plane figure and discover what belongs to it as such. Then one would turn to, say, triangle and seek its properties, after which one would go on to scalene and isosceles. So one will, having determined what is true of things insofar as they are physical objects, go on to seek the properties of things which are physical objects of this kind or that, for example, living and non-living bodies.

Thomas emphasizes those passages in the Aristotelian natural writings which speak of the order of determination that is, of what considerations come first and are presupposed to those that come later. In several places, Thomas takes great pains to array the Aristotelian natural writings according to this Aristotelian principle, most notably perhaps at the outset of his commentary on SENSE AND SENSIBILIA. The PHYSICS is the first step in the study of the natural world and exhibits the rule that what is first and most easily known by us are generalities. The language used to express knowledge of such generalities will have, as we shall emphasize, a long career in subsequent inquiries, both in natural philosophy and beyond. What is sometimes thought of as a technical vocabulary, perhaps even as Aristotelian jargon, is seen by Thomas Aquinas as exemplifying the rule that we name things as we know them and that we come to know more difficult things after the easier things and extend the language used to speak of the easier, adjusting it to an ever expanding set of referents.

9. MATTER AND FORM

Although natural things are first thought of and analyzed in the most general of terms, there are not of course any general physical objects, only particular ones. Thus, in seeking to discern what is true of anything that has come to be as a result of a change and is subject to change until it ceases to be, Aristotle had to begin with a particular example of change, one so obvious that we would not be distracted by any difficulties in accepting it as such. “A man becomes musical.” Someone acquires a skill he did not previously have. Thomas pores over the analysis Aristotle provides of this instance of change and its product. The change may be expressed in three ways:

1. A man becomes musical.
2. What is not-musical becomes musical.
3. A not-musical man becomes musical.
These are three different expressions of the same change and they all exhibit the form A becomes B. But change can also be expressed as From A, B comes to be. Could 1, 2 and 3 be restated in that second form? To say “From the not-musical the musical comes to be” and “From a not-musical man the musical comes to be” seem acceptable alternatives, but “From a man musical comes to be” would give us pause. Why? Unlike “A becomes B” the form “From A, B comes to be” suggests that in order for B to emerge, A must cease to be. This grounds the distinction between the grammatical subject of the sentence expressing a change and the subject of the change. The definition of the subject of the change is “that to which the change is attributed and which survives the change.” The grammatical subjects of 2 and 3 do not express the subject of the change; only in 1 is the grammatical subject expressive of the subject of the change.

This makes clear that the different expressions of the change involve two things other than the subject of the change: the characteristics of the subject before (not-musical) and after (musical) the change. These elements of the change get the names that stick from another example, whittling wood. The term for wood in Greek is *HYLE* and the term for shape, the external contours of a thing, is *MORPHE*. In English, form, a synonym of shape, is used to express the characteristic that the subject acquires as the result of the change, e.g. musical. The characterization of the subject prior to the change as not having the form is called privation. Using this language as canonical, Aristotle speaks of the subject of the change as its *HYLE* or matter, the character it gains as its *MORPHE* or form, and its prior lack of the form as its privation. Any change will involve these three elements: matter, form and privation. The product of a change involves two things: matter and form.

Change takes place in the categories of quality, quantity and place, but in all cases the terminology of matter, form and privation comes to be used. So the terms applied in these different categories will be used analogously. The terms bind together similar but different kinds of change—a subject changing temperature is like a subject changing place or size.

**10. Substantial Change**

The analysis of change and the product of change begin with surface changes. Some enduring thing changes place or quality or quantity. But enduring things like men and trees and horses and the like have also come into being and are destined some day to cease to be. Such things are called substances. It is a given that there are substances and that they come to be and pass away. The question is: Can the analysis of surface change be adjusted and applied to substantial change? What would its subject be? The subject of substantial change is known on an analogy with the subject of incidental or surface change. That is, if substances come to be as the result of a change, and if our analysis of change can apply, there must be a subject of the change. The subject of a surface or incidental change is a substance. The subject of a substantial change cannot be a substance; if it were, the result would be a modification of that substance, that is, an incidental change. But we are trying to understand how a substance itself comes into being as the result of a change. There must be a matter or subject but it cannot be matter in the sense of a substance. In order to signal this, we can call the matter *PRIME MATTER*, first matter. But it is important to recognize that this prime matter is not a substance, and does not exist apart from any particular substance. It is always the matter of some substance that exists.

When the discussion moves on from what may be said of all physical objects as such to an inquiry into living physical things, the analyses build upon those already completed. Thus, “soul” will be defined as the substantial form of living bodies. The peculiar activities of living things will be
grouped under headings like nutrition and growth, sense perception and knowing and willing. Since a living thing sometimes manifests an instance of such activities and sometimes does not, they relate to it in the manner of the incidental forms of any physical object. But they are not incidental in the way that we might think of the shade of color of one's skin at any particular time, or the particular height or weight of an individual, since as activities the ability or power to engage in them proceeds from what the substance in question is. Aquinas at times will call them necessary accidents, thus using accident in a sense different from more recent philosophy. While the abilities need not be exercised at any particular time, or may be impeded from exercise by some condition, the substance nonetheless possesses them as long as it exists.

The form such a subject takes on as the result of the change cannot be an incidental form like size or location or temperature. Substances do not become or cease to be substances as a result of changes in these incidental features. As the analysis of incidental change makes clear, the substance previously existed without the form it acquires in the change and it could lose it and still be itself. In a substantial change, the substance itself simply comes to be, or ceases to be. The form in a substantial change must be that which makes the substance to be what it is. Call it *SUBSTANTIAL FORM*.

The thing to notice about this analysis is that substantial change is spoken of on an analogy with incidental change. The analysis of incidental change is presupposed and regulative. Moreover, the language used to speak of the elements of incidental change are extended to substantial change and altered in meaning so as to avoid equivocation. The philosophical vocabulary arises out of analysis of what is most obvious to us and is then progressively extended to more and more things insofar as the later is made known by appeal to the prior. Thus we can see that matter and form apply in an analogous way to the various kinds of incidental change and then to substantial change. The analysis of form and matter provides a rule for knowing and naming that will characterize Thomas's use of Latin in philosophy and in theology as well.

**11. Perception and Thought**

Focusing specifically upon perception—that is, seeing, feeling, hearing, and the like—how can we best analyze it? In continuity with what has gone before, the questions are put in this form: How best to analyze coming to see, coming to feel, coming to hear, and the like. Seeing these on the analogy of change as already analyzed, we look for a subject, a privation and a form. The sensing subject is, say, the animal, but the proximate subjects to which they are attributed are the powers of sight, touch, hearing, and the like. An instance of seeing is describable as the power's moving from not seeing to seeing. Since the object of seeing is color, the change from not seeing to seeing issues in the power having the form of color.

Consider an ordinary physical change, a substance acquiring a color. Coming to see a color is not the same kind of physical change as a substance acquiring a color. To be sure, while there are physical changes involved in sensation—the organs are altered in the way physical bodies are—that is not the change involved in perception as such. Consider again, in feeling a body my hands own temperature is altered by the contact. But feeling cannot be just that, since any two physical bodies that come into contact would undergo a similar alteration of temperature. But not all physical bodies feel the temperature. Feeling the temperature, becoming aware of it, is another sort of change, however much it involves a contemporaneous change in the organs of sense similar to ordinary physical change. Having the color or temperature in this further sense is thus made known.
and named by reference to physical change. The fundamental difference between the two ways of acquiring a form is this: in a physical change of color, the change produces a new numerical instance of the color. In grasping or sensing a color, a numerically new instance of color does not result.

We have here the basis for talk of immateriality in perception. If the acquiring of a form by matter in physical change results in a new instance of the form and this is not the case with perception, we can make the point that acquiring the form in sensation is not identical to the acquiring of the form by matter **IN THE PRIMARY SENSE**. Thus, we both want to speak of the subject of sensation on an analogy with physical change and to distinguish the former from the latter. This is done by speaking of the immaterial reception of a form. Nonetheless, the sense power is implemented in a physical organ, and thus matter for the change of form in sensation in an analogous sense. Because in sensation the sense organ is physically altered and the matter of sensation in this analogous sense, we can say that actual sensation is in some respects physical, and in another not.

But it is important to pay attention again to the order of learning and naming, and what we are justified in saying at this point about the use of the words involved in describing this change. Specifically, the use of ‘immaterial’ is introduced simply to mark the inadequacy of any analysis of sensation confined solely to the physical terms that are fully adequate for analyzing ordinary physical change that does not involve sensation. ‘Immaterial’ means ‘not-material’. But the mere applicability of such a negative term (what Aristotle calls a “negative infinite” term) does not justify us in thinking we have discovered a new property that would be referred to by the term ‘immateriality’—it does not pick out and name a particular kind of property—any more than the mere applicability of ‘not-human’ justifies us in thinking we have discovered a new particular kind of substance.

Now, in his interpretation of Aristotle's *DE ANIMA* Thomas defends a view that was as contested in his own time as it is almost an orphan in our own. Among the tenets of so-called Latin Averroism was the view, first held by Averroes, that the move from perceptive acts to intellection is not one from a lower to a higher set of capacities or faculties of the human soul. Aristotle contrasts intellection with perception and argues that the former does not employ a sense organ because it displays none of the characteristics of perception which does employ an organ. Thus insofar as sensation can be said to be in some respects material and in others immaterial, intellection is said to be completely immaterial. But on the Latin-Averroistic view, Aristotle is not thus referring to another capacity of the human soul, the intellect, but, rather, referring to a separate entity thanks to whose action human beings engage in what we call thinking. But the cause of this, the agent intellect, is not a faculty of the soul. (Aristotle distinguished two intellects, a passive and an active.) The proof for immortality which results from a wholly immaterial activity is therefore a statement about the incorruptibility of this separate entity, not a basis for arguing that each human soul is immortal because it has the capacity to perform immaterial activities. The Latin-Averroists consequently denied that Aristotle taught personal immortality.

Given this consequence, Thomas's adoption of the opposite interpretation—viz. that the agent intellect is, like the passive intellect, a faculty of the human soul—may seem merely an interested desire to enlist Aristotle's support for a position in harmony with Christian belief. Thomas is frequently said to have baptized Aristotle, which seems to mean that he fitted him to the Procrustean bed of Christian doctrine. Of course, the full Christian view is not simply that the soul survives death but that it will be reunited with body, and Thomas nowhere suggests that there is any
intimation of this in Aristotle. Oddly enough, it is often friends of St. Thomas who suggest that he

\textbf{used} Aristotle and was not chiefly concerned with what Aristotle might actually have intended.

But this is an extraordinary approach to reading Thomas. It would be less of an accusation to say
that he got a passage wrong than that he pretended it meant something he knew it did not. However,
the important point, all these centuries later, is whether Thomas's reading is or is not supported by
the text. When he commented on the \textit{DE ANIMA}, he seems not to be concerned with the flare up in
Paris over Latin Averroism. This is the basis for dating the commentary in 1268, before Thomas
returned to Paris. The commentary, accordingly, cannot be read as though it were prompted by the
controversy. Of course, some might still say that Thomas had long term interests in taming
Aristotle to behave in a Christian way. On the contrary, as it happens, during the second Parisian
period, in the thick of the Latin-Averroist controversy, Thomas wrote an opusculum dedicated to
the question: what did Aristotle actually teach? The work is called in the Latin, \textit{DE UNITATE
INTELLECTUS CONTRA AVERROISTAS, On there being only one intellect contra the
Averroists}. This little work is absolutely essential for assessing the nature of Thomas's
Aristotelianism. He provides us with an extended textual analysis to show that the rival
interpretation cannot be sustained by the text and that the only coherent reading of the \textit{DE ANIMA}
must view the agent and passive intellects as faculties of the human soul. His interpretation may
be right or wrong, but the matter must be decided on the basis of textual interpretation, not vague
remarks about Thomas's intentions.

\section{12. Body and Soul}

Philosophers nowadays will want to know how this account of substance places Aquinas on the
question of the relation of body and soul with respect to Dualism and Physicalism. Not easily.
Aquinas maintains that the soul is capable of existing apart from the living body after the death of
the body. This might suggest that he is a kind of Substance Dualist, the soul being one substance
and the body another, with the soul “interacting” as it were with the other substance, the body.
However this picture fails to recognize the Aristotelian terms of the account that Aquinas provides
of soul and body.

The soul is indeed capable of existence apart from the body death. This capacity is because the
actualities of understanding and willing are not the actualities of any bodily organ, but of the human
animal as such distinguished by the rational form. However, Aquinas merely concludes from this
that the soul is a subsistent after the death of the body. A subsistent is something capable of existing
on its own, not in another. But that capacity to exist owns its own is not distinctive of a substance.
A chair subsists. But on Aquinas' account, it is not a substance. A hand that has been detached from
a living body is also a subsistent. It is not properly speaking a human hand any longer, because it
cannot do the sorts of things that human hands do. Whatever it is, it can exist apart from the
substance of which it was formerly a part.

A substance, on the other hand, is something that is both subsistent and complete in a nature—a
nature being an intrinsic principle of movement and change in the subject. A detached human hand,
while subsistent, is not a substance because it is not complete in a nature. A human hand is defined
functionally as part of a human substance. A detached human hand is the remains of a human hand
properly speaking, and is only called human analogously. So it is subsistent but not a substance.
Similarly, a human soul is a constitutive element of the nature of a human substance. It is the
formal principle of a human substance. It is what is specified when we say what the substances is.
But it is incomplete. What it is for it to be is to be the formal part of some substance? In that sense
it is a principle of a substance, ‘principle’ being a technical term that refers back to the first entry in Aristotle's philosophical lexicon in the *Metaphysics*, and Aquinas commentary on it, as well as Aquinas *On the Principles of Nature*. As the principle of a nature, its nature is to be the formal element of a complete substance. Consequently, it is not a substance in its own right, even if it is capable of subsisting apart from the living body. It is because it is naturally incomplete as subsisting apart from the body that Aquinas sees this state as unnatural for it, and an intimation of, but not an argument for, the resurrection of the body.

However, that a principle of a substance should be capable of subsistence while not itself being a substance is no surprise for Aquinas in this account of substance. The body that remains after death is itself subsistent at least for a time. But it is not a substance. It is the material remains of a substance. And so the soul can be called ‘substance’ by analogy, insofar as it is the formal principle of a substance. In English it might be better to call it “substantial” rather than “substance.” And in that regard, it cannot be considered as forming the basis for a kind of substance dualism in Aquinas.

All of this comes out clearly in Aquinas' understanding of the mode of human activity as acting knowingly and willingly. Such acting knowingly and willing is expressed as the rational activity of an animal, that is, as animal activity distinguished formally as rational. Rationality is the distinctive form that intelligence takes in human beings as animals. Rationality involves the back and forth of argument moving from one thing known to another, and advancing in knowledge by such movement. This movement in understanding is necessary for human beings because as animals they only ever have a partial grasp of the natures of things, insofar as their knowledge depends upon always incomplete and partial sensible experience of the world. But it is sense experience, as well as the self movement that springs from it, that places human beings within the genus animal. So human understanding and willing is intrinsically bound up with the activity of an animal, sensation; as a result, *rational* is the form that it takes in that animal.

One might be tempted then to think that the intellectual principle of the human being is something distinct from the substantial form of the animal, since, as we have seen, thought or intellect does not employ a bodily organ. Aquinas raises this very question in the *Summa Theologiae*, namely, whether the intellectual principle is identical with the substantial form or soul of the human animal. He argues that it is identical. This is an important result, for it establishes that the intellectual principle of human life does not interact with the animal body, as if an efficient cause making the body acts in certain ways. On the contrary, the intellectual principle is the substantial form of the activities of the animal body. Elsewhere, echoing Aristotle, Aquinas will say that the soul is not other than the body, but simply one with it as its form, one as act to potency are one. So according to Aquinas, while it is true that the activities of intellect and will are not the actualities of any physical organs, they are nonetheless the activities of the living human animal. It is Socrates the animal who knows and wills, not his mind interacting with his body.

This point comes out clearly in Aquinas' nearly unique position in the so called Plurality of Forms argument that animated the 13th century. The so called Pluralists maintained some element of multiplicity in the formal aspects of the human animal, at the very least a form of corporeity for the body and a rational form in addition to it, with a kind of fissure between the rational life of the human animal, and the bodily features of the animal as such. Aquinas says that the Pluralists' position would be correct if the soul were related to the body as the Platonists held, namely, as something other than the body moving it like an efficient cause. But Aquinas has already rejected this position on the soul. So he rejects any such plurality, reaffirming that the intellectual principle...
of human life just is the substantial form of the body with no intermediaries between soul and body. So again, it follows from his position that rationality is the form that intelligence takes in the life of an animal, and, consequently, that while both angels and God are intelligent beings they are not rational beings. Thus reason is not an activity distinct from animal activity, and related to it as a kind of efficient cause interacting with the body. Rational is the proper formal description of the human animal activity. Reason does not cause eating as something separate from it, and as an efficient cause; on the contrary, human eating is not adequately described formally unless it is described as rational eating. To fail to eat rationally is not a failure in its cause, but in the eating itself. And the human animal is not adequately described except as a rational animal, rational providing not another substance or expression of a fissure between soul or mind and body, but the fully adequate description of the human substance. Reason does not distinguish us from animals; it distinguishes us as animals.

One consequence of this insistence on Aquinas' part is that it is inadequate and inaccurate to speak of activities we share in common with other kinds of creatures. We've already seen that applying 'intellect' to human beings and to angels is by analogy. And to be sure, there are descriptions that apply equally to what we do and what other animals do, for example the description “eating” or the description “reproducing.” But these are generic descriptions that do not adequately capture the human act as opposed to the act of a horse or dog, until they are specified formally as rational. So the goods that are the objects of human powers are not specified adequately by such generic descriptions as pursuing eating, reproducing, friendship, etc., as if human beings and other animals pursue the same goods, only humans bring reason to bear upon those same goods.

All of this might lead one to think then that, not being a dualist, Aquinas must be a physicalist, there being only two broad possible positions. Now, the difficulties of providing an adequate account of just what Physicalism is are well known. But suppose we take a minimal characterization of Physicalism as involving the claim that there is some privileged physical science or set of physical sciences, using the term 'physical' merely nominally and sociologically as we use it of certain sciences today, that ideally will provide a fully adequate account of all that exists and the fundamental characteristics of reality. Then Aquinas cannot be understood to be a physicalist, since the result of his analysis of perception and thought was to say that these activities are “immaterial,” which was to say, not adequately captured by the kinds of physical descriptions that do adequately account for much of the being and change we observe in the world. There are actually many variations on Dualism and Physicalism in play in recent philosophy. However, the difficulty of placing Aquinas in the broad outlines of that setting ought now to be clear.

13. Beyond Physics

When Aristotle rejected the Platonic Ideas or Forms, accepting some of the arguments against them that Plato himself had devised in the Parmenides, he did not thereby reject the notion that the telos of philosophical enquiry is a wisdom which turns on what man can know of God. The magnificent panorama provided at the beginning of the Metaphysics as gloss on the claim that all men naturally desire to know rises to and culminates in the conception of wisdom as knowledge of all things in their ultimate or first causes.

For much of the twentieth century, Aristotelian studies have been conducted under the influence of Werner Jaeger's evolutionary hypothesis. On this view, Aristotle began as an ardent Platonist for whom the really real lay beyond sensible reality. With maturity, however, came the sober
Macedonian empiricism which trained its attention on the things of this world and eschewed all efforts to transcend it. As for the *Metaphysics*, Jaeger saw it as an amalgam of both theories. The passage just alluded to at the beginning of the work is ascribed to the Platonic phase. Other passages have a far more modest understanding of the range and point of a science over and above natural philosophy and mathematics. *Platonicæ loquendo*, there are entities which exist separately from sensible things and they constitute the object of the higher science. The more sober view finds a role for a science beyond natural philosophy and mathematics, but it will deal with things those particular sciences leave unattended, e.g. defense of the first principle of reasoning. But these tasks do not call for, and do not imply, a range of beings over and above sensible things.

Jaeger found both these conceptions of metaphysics juxtaposed in a crucial passage of Book Six. One might indeed raise the question whether first philosophy is universal, or deals with one genus, i.e. some one kind of being; for not even the mathematical sciences are all alike in this respect,—geometry and astronomy deal with a certain particular kind of thing, while universal mathematics applies alike to all. We answer that if there is no substance other than those which are formed by nature, natural science will be the first science; but if there is an immovable substance, the science of this must be prior and must be first philosophy, and universal in this way, because it is first. And it will belong to this to consider being *qua* being—both what it is and the attributes which belong to it *qua* being.

Jaeger invites us to see here a monument to a lost hope and an abiding reluctance to bid it a definitive farewell. Aristotle mentions the possibility of an immovable substance, something existing apart from the natural realm. Without such a separate substance, natural philosophy will be first philosophy. If there is such a substance, it will be a kind of being different from material being. The science that studies it will bear on a certain kind of being, immovable substance, immaterial being not on being as being. It will be a special, not a universal, science. Jaeger sees Aristotle seeking to glue on to the special science the tasks that belong to a universal science, to make a theology into ontology.

Jaeger's hypothesis dominated interpretations of the *Metaphysics* until very recently. Giovanni Reale's book had to await English translation before it could have any impact in English circles of interpretation. By that time, people were turning from Jaeger and toward Aristotle neat, but this was only to weary of Jaeger, not to disprove him. Thomas's reading of the *Metaphysics* makes clear how mistaken Jaeger's claims are.

But let us first lay out Thomas's view of metaphysics. His question is Aristotle's: is there any science beyond natural science and mathematics? If to be and to be materials are identical, then the science of being as being will be identical with the science of material being. That is what Aristotle rejects in the passage just quoted. It is in the course of doing natural philosophy that one gains certain knowledge that not everything that is is material. At the end of the *Physics*, Aristotle argues from the nature of moved movers that they require a first unmoved mover. If successful, this proof establishes that there is a first mover of all moved movers which is not itself material. Furthermore, the discussion of intellect in *On the Soul III* to which we alluded in the preceding paragraph, points beyond the material world. If the activity of intellect provides a basis for saying that, while the human soul is the substantial form of the body, it can exist apart from the body, that is, survive death, it is an immaterial existent. The Prime Mover and the immortal souls of human beings entail that to be and to be material are not identical. Since these are acquisitions at the limit of natural philosophy, they represent possible objects of inquiry in their own right. This is pre-
eminently the case with the Prime Mover. It seems inevitable that there should be a discipline whose principal aim is to know more about the divine. How can it be described?

By common consent, Thomas's early discussion of the way theoretical sciences are distinguished from one another in the course of his exposition of the tractate of Boethius *On the Trinity* is masterful. The text speaks of three kinds of theoretical science, physics, mathematics and theology, and Thomas invokes the methodology of the *Posterior Analytics*. A *scientia* is constituted by a demonstrative syllogism. From a formal point of view, a conclusion follows necessarily from the premises in a well-formed syllogism. Still the conclusion may state a merely contingent truth. What is needed in a demonstrative syllogism is not just the necessity of the consequence but a necessary consequent, and this requires that the premises express necessary truths. That which is necessary cannot be otherwise than as it is; it cannot change. Science thus requires that it bear on immobile things. There is another requirement of the object of speculative or theoretical knowledge which stems from intellecction. The activity of the mind, as has been mentioned, is not a material event; it is immaterial. Since it is the mind that knows, science is a mode of its knowing, and will share its nature. Thomas thus states two essential characteristics of the object of speculation, the *speculable*: it must be removed both from matter and from motion. If that is the case then insofar as there are formally different ways in which *speculabilia* can be removed from matter and motion, there will be formally different speculative sciences.

By this analysis, Thomas has provided the necessary background for understanding the text of Boethius but also more importantly that of Aristotle as it is developed in the chapter from which Werner Jaeger quoted in order to display the failure of the Aristotelian project. “Now we must not fail to notice the nature of the essence and of its formula, for, without this, inquiry is but idle. Of things defined, i.e. of essences, some are like snub, and some like concave. And these differ because snub is bound up with matter (for what is snub is a concave *nose*), while concavity is independent of perceptible matter.” The objects of natural philosophy are defined like ‘snub’ and the objects of mathematics like ‘concave’. This makes it clear that the way in which natural things are separated from sensible matter is the way in which the definition common too many things abstracts from the singular characteristics of each. But it is the matter as singular that is the principle of change in things, so the common definition has the requisite necessity for science. This or that man comes to be, but what-it-is-to-be-a-man does not come to be or pass away.

Mathematical things, on the analogy of ‘concave’, do not have sensible matter in their definitions. Lines, points, numbers, triangles—these do not have sensible qualities whether stated universally or singularly. The fact that we define mathematicals without sensible matter does not commit us to the view that mathematicals actually exist apart from sensible matter.

In the commentary on Boethius to which reference has been made, Thomas has early on recalled another fundamental aspect of Aristotle's thought. The objects of thought are either simple or complex, where complex means that one thing is affirmed or denied of another. Knowledge of simples is expressed in a definition, that of the complex in a proposition. Thinking of human nature without thinking of singular characters of this man or that is a matter of definition, not of assertion, as if one were denying that human nature is found in singular matter. So too defining mathematicals without sensible matter is not tantamount to the judgment that mathematicals exist apart from sensible matter. These are both instances of abstraction, where abstraction means to think apart what does not exist apart. Thus it is that the question of metaphysics turns on what Thomas calls *separatio*. To separate differs from abstraction in this that separation is expressed in a negative
judgment, an asserted proposition: this is not that, which this exists apart from that. The relevant separation for metaphysics is the negative judgment that to be and to be materials are not the same. That is, there are things which exist apart from matter and motion—not just are defined without, but exist without matter and motion.

What then is the subject of metaphysics? “Subject” here means the subject of the conclusion of the demonstrative syllogism. The discussion of definition in effect bore on the middle terms of demonstrative syllogisms. The suggestion is that formally different modes of defining, with respect to removal from matter and motion, ground the formal difference between types of theoretical science. The subject of a demonstration in natural philosophy is defined without singular but with common or universal sensible matter; the subject of a mathematical demonstration is defined without any sensible matter. How can the subject of metaphysics be expressed? The possibility of the science depends on our knowing that some things exist apart from matter and motion. Mathematics does not presuppose the separate existence of its objects; metaphysics does. Why not then say that metaphysics deals with things separated from matter and motion that is with a particular kind of being? But that is the not the subject ever assigned to this effort by Aristotle. The methodological reasons can be found in chapter 17 of Book Seven of the METAPHYSICS: the subject of a science must always be a complex entity. That is why the subject of this discipline is being as being.

Why should we say that, in our desire to learn more about separate substances, we should take as our subject all the things that are? The short answer is this: in order to be a theology, metaphysics must first be ontology. Separate substance, divine being, is not directly accessible for our inspection or study. We come upon our first secure knowledge of God in the proof of the Prime Mover. Tantalizingly, once seen as a necessary requirement for there being any moved movers, the Prime Mover does not become a thematic object of inquiry in natural philosophy. One obvious reason for this is that such an entity is not an instance of the things which fall under the scope of the science. Knowledge of it comes about obliquely and indirectly. The same restriction is operative when the philosopher turns his culminating attention to the deity. How can he know more about the first cause of things? If the Prime Mover is known through moved movers as his effects, any further knowledge of him must be through his effects. It is by describing the effect as widely as possible that one seeks to come to knowledge of the first cause unrestricted by the characteristics of mobile things. That characterization is being as being. The subject of metaphysics is being in all its amplitude in order to acquire knowledge of the cause of being that will be correspondingly unbounded.

14. PHILOSOPHICAL AND SCRIPTURAL THEOLOGY

Earlier we indicated the difference between philosophy and theology in the writings of St. Thomas. That distinction takes theology to mean discourse that takes its rise from the revealed truths of the Bible. But there is also a theology which constitutes the defining telos of philosophical inquiry. In the following passage, Thomas contrasts the two theologies in a way which throws light on what was said in the preceding paragraph. Thus it is that divine science or theology is of two kinds, one in which divine things are considered not as the subject of the science but as principles of the subject and this is the theology that the philosophers pursue, also called metaphysics. The other considers divine things in themselves as the subject of the science, and this is the theology which is treated in Sacred Scripture. They are both concerned with things which exist separately from matter and motion, but differently, insofar as they are two ways in which something can exist separately from
matter and motion: first, such that it is of the definition of the things said to be separate, that they can never exist in matter in motion, as God and the angels are said to be separate from matter and motion; second, such that it is not part of their definition that they exist in matter and motion, because they can exist apart from matter and motion, although sometimes they are found in matter and motion, for example, substance, potency and act are separate from matter and motion because they do not require matter in order to exist as mathematical do, although they can be understood without sensible matter. Philosophical theology treats of things separate in the second way as its subjects and of things separate in the first way as the principles of its subject. But the theology of Sacred Scripture treats of things separate in the first way as its subjects, although in it some things which exist in matter and motion are considered insofar as they are needed to make the divine manifest.

Philosophical theology is not some science distinct from metaphysics; it is simply the name that can be given to metaphysics because it appeals to God as the cause of its subject. This may make it seem that knowledge of God is merely a bonus, a tangential consideration; on the contrary, it is the chief aim of the science. But the divine can only be known indirectly, through its effects. For this reason, metaphysics can be viewed as an extended effort to examine substance in order to come to knowledge of the first cause. And given the principle that we name things as we know them, this can be regarded as a prolonged effort to develop the language with which we speak of God.

15. God

Aquinas says that the truth of the proposition \textit{GOD EXISTS} is knowable in itself, because the predicate is included in the essence of the subject. But it is not knowable to us, because the essence of God is unknowable to us. He also says that the essence of God is His existence, that he is \textit{IPSUM ESSE SUBSISTENS}, and yet that we cannot know His essence. How is any of this coherent? Mustn't one know what one is talking about to deny anything of it, in particular to deny that it is knowable to us? How can he simultaneously assert what the essence of God is and deny that we know it?

In order to understand why his claims about the existence and essence of God are not incoherent, we need to place them within the context of Aristotle's \textit{POSTERIOR ANALYTICS}. According to Aristotle, one mode of \textit{PER SE} predication is that in which the predicate of the proposition is included within the definition of the subject. So if one knew the essential definition of the subject, one would immediately know that a particular proposition is \textit{PER SE} true simply by knowing that its predicate is included within that essential definition. This account provides the basis for the notion of “knowable in itself” as a kind of conditional: if one knows the essential definition of some subject, then any proposition in which the predicate is included in the essential definition of the subject is knowable in itself. For instance, Aquinas thinks that that anyone who knows the language will know the truth of a proposition like \textit{A WHOLE CONSISTS OF THE SUM OF ITS PARTS}. Because the terms are related in this fashion and so fundamental in the language, no special knowledge is necessary to grasp its truth. Such a proposition is thus knowable in itself and to us.

However, clearly this conditional account leaves open the possibility of subjects in which the essential definition is either unknown or even unknowable. For instance, if we suppose that H2O is the essential definition of water, we have to recognize that there will be many who will not know it. It will not be immediately “known to us,” but require learning. No doubt we can still refer to water in statements about it because the term ‘water’ has a nominal definition, clear-potable-odorless etc., used by the community to refer to what is in fact H2O. So that \textit{WATER IS H2O} will be knowable in
itself, even if unknowable to us, until we engage in Chemistry. Consider the mind. Clearly we use the term 'mind' meaningfully in any number of sentences. But perhaps, as Colin McGinn has argued, the actual nature of mind is incomprehensible to limited minds such as ours. In that case it might be knowable in itself, and yet strictly unknowable to us. Thus the distinction between what is knowable in itself and what is knowable to us is not incoherent. It is based upon the difference between the nominal definition of the meaning of a term used in language, and the real or essential definition of a subject referred to by that term, as well as the ease with which an essential definition may be known.

What of the claims that the essence of God is not just unknown to us, but unknowable to us, that the essence of God is His existence, and that He is *IPSUM ESSE SUBSISTENS*? Don't these remain jointly inconsistent and thus incoherent, even if the underlying distinction is not? No. In claiming that the essence of God is not knowable to us, Aquinas is talking about its accessibility to philosophical inquiry. The human mind of itself is proportioned to knowing material things. It can only know immaterial things insofar as causal arguments can be made to posit the existence of such things as necessary to the explanation of material things--causes that are only appealed to when one has excluded the possibility of a material explanation of the phenomenon. But we've already seen that to claim that something is immaterial is not to know any property of it, much less its essence. Still, it remains available to Aquinas to claim that while the knowledge of the essence of God is unknowable to philosophy, it is known to us by Revelation. Indeed, he appeals to God's revelation to Moses on Sinai to establish the claim that God's essence is *IPSUM ESSE SUBSISTENS*. And Christians believe that God further discloses His essence as consisting of three divine persons who are one being. Here, in knowing the essence of God we have an example of something that is known only through Revelation. It is not something that can be known by both Revelation and Philosophy. So the essence of God is knowable in itself, and also to the learned. But the learned are not the philosophers. Rather they are all those who know it by faith in God's revelation.

So, can the existence of God be philosophically demonstrated? If God's essence is His existence, and His essence remains in principle philosophically unknowable to us, how could it be demonstrated? In fact, Aquinas claims that it can be demonstrated that there is a god, and that there is only one god. That God's essence remains in principle philosophically unknowable to us is the basis for Aquinas' denial that the existence of God can be demonstrated *A PRIORI*. And any reliance upon knowledge of the essence that is only known to us by faith would by that fact cease to be properly philosophical. However, we have seen that Aquinas relies upon the distinction between nominal definitions of terms and essential definitions of the subjects referred to by those terms. To demonstrate the existence of a god one may use nominal definitions that appeal to a god as the cause of various phenomena. This is to argue *A POSTERIORI*. The appeal to these nominal definitions forms the basis for Aquinas' Five Ways all of which end with some claim about how the term ‘god’ is used.

Again, some will claim that Aquinas isn't really interested in proving the existence of God in these Five Ways. After all, he already knows the existence of God by faith, and he is writing a theological work for beginners. What need is there of proving the existence of something he already knows exists? The Ways are very sketchy, and don't even necessarily conclude to a single being, much less God or the Christian God. In addition, Aquinas claims that God's essence is His existence and that we cannot know His essence, so we cannot know His existence. Aquinas must really intend the Five Ways as less than proofs; they are more like incomplete propaedeutic
considerations for thinking adequately about God in Sacred Theology. In effect, Aquinas doesn't think philosophy can in fact demonstrate the existence of God.

But as elsewhere these claims are ambiguous and suffer at the hands of Aquinas' own texts. In the first place, the objection that he already knows by faith that God exists has some merit in it, if we understand it as directed at a reading of Aquinas that would have him attempting a foundational enterprise of grounding religious faith in what is rationally demonstrable by philosophy. But that reading is anachronistic, and does not attend to the context of *Summa Theologiae*. There is no reason to think that Aquinas thinks the proofs are necessary for the rationality of religious faith. They are part of the enterprise of showing that *Sacra Doctrina* meets the condition of a science as described by Aristotle in the *Posterior Analytics*, an issue that is different from the question of the broad rationality of religious faith.

In addition, the objections end up denying what Aquinas writes immediately before the Five Ways—that the existence of a god is “demonstrable.” (*Summa Theologiae*, Ia.2.2) And his introduction of the Five Ways begins by saying that the existence of a god can be “proved” in Five Ways. To counter the objection that he must mean something informal here by “demonstrate” and “prove”, one need only recognize the explicit use of Aristotle's *Posterior Analytics* to sort through the question. He cites Aristotle's distinction between demonstrating the existence of some subject, and going on to demonstrate properties of that subject by appeal to the essence of the subject as cause of those properties. The first kind of demonstration is called demonstration *quia*, the second demonstration *propter quid*. In order to have any science at all, the subject matter must exist. So demonstration *quia* must precede demonstration *propter quid*. If you want to have a science of unicorns, you have to show me that there is at least one unicorn to be studied. There is no science of what does not exist. So there are two demonstrative stages in any science, the demonstration of the existence of the subject (*quia*), and the demonstration of the properties of the subject through its essence (*propter quid*). Aquinas' denial that the essence of God can be known philosophically is a denial that one can have *propter quid* scientific understanding of God through philosophy. It is not a denial that there can be demonstration *quia* of the existence of a god. There is no reason to deny that Aquinas thinks the Five Ways are proofs or demonstrations in the most robust sense, namely that which he appeals to as set out by Aristotle in the *Posterior Analytics*.

Notice however the back and forth between the use of ‘God’ as a proper name and the use of ‘god’ as a common noun. One source of the ambiguity in the objections come about because it is claimed that Aquinas does not think one can demonstrate the existence of God. But in terms of the *Posterior Analytics* one cannot demonstrate the existence of anything under a proper name. One can point at Socrates, and say “see, Socrates is alive.” One cannot do that with God. In addition, one cannot give a formal argument for Socrates existence using ‘Socrates’. One can only demonstrate in the relevant sense using common nouns, since such nouns are the only ones that have definitions, either nominal or essential. So strictly speaking it is true that Aquinas doesn't think one can demonstrate the existence of God in the Five Ways. But he doesn't claim that one can. He recognizes the difference between ‘God’ used as a proper noun, and ‘god’ used as a common noun. The ambiguity is pronounced in Latin which lacks the indefinite article ‘a’, where in English we can disambiguate between ‘God’ and ‘a god’. The situation is exacerbated by translations that simply translate ‘Deus in the Ways as ‘God’ in English. In the Five Ways, he does not use ‘god’ as a proper name, but as a common noun having five different nominal definitions. So each of the ways concludes that there is “a god.” So it is also true that the Five Ways do not as such
prove that there is only one god. But it is for that reason that Aquinas himself thinks one must actually argue additionally that a god must be utterly unique, and thus that there can be only one, which he does several questions after the Five Ways. Of course, once the utter uniqueness of a god has been shown, one can begin to use “God” as a proper name to refer to that utterly unique being.

It is the utter uniqueness and singularity of a god that undermines the objection that whatever the philosophical arguments terminate in, it is not the god of Judaism, Christianity, and Islam, who is only known by faith. That is simply to deny Aquinas claim that the god Jews, Christians, and Muslims believe in can be known, but only partially by philosophical analysis. If the demonstrations work, as Aquinas thinks they do, what other god would the Jew, Christians, and Muslims believe in?

Finally, the sketchy character of the Ways reflects the fact that they are directed at beginning students. However the audience of beginners that Aquinas has in mind is not beginners in Philosophy. They are beginners in SACRA DOCTRINA. As we have seen, in the medieval educational setting such beginners would be thoroughly steeped in the philosophical disciplines before ever being allowed to study SACRA DOCTRINA. So Aquinas could expect his readers to know the much more extensive and complete arguments he was gesturing at with the Five Ways, arguments to be found in detail in other figures like Aristotle, Avicenna, and so on, as well as in other works of his own, the SUMMA CONTRA GENTILES for example. In short, even if the Five Ways are judged to be unsound demonstrations, a judgment that requires close analysis and examination of the filled out arguments, there is no reason to suggest that Thomas took them any less seriously as demonstrations or proofs in the fullest sense.

Now, even though there can be no demonstration PROPTER QUID of God's properties, this does not mean that philosophical theology is left with a bare knowledge of the existence of God, and nothing more. The second stage of science will go on, but it will go on in a mode deeply indebted to Pseudo-Dionysias and Neoplatonism with the approach often called the “via negativa.” Instead of arguing positively from the essence of God to His properties, one will argue from God's effects, particularly the perfections of creatures that do not of necessity involve material embodiment, to the affirmation that God possesses these perfections. However, recognizing that the way in which God possesses these perfections must be different from the way in which creatures possess them, one must deny that God has them in the creaturely mode. Instead He must possess them in a “super eminent” fashion that we cannot comprehend. So, while on the basis of effect to cause arguments we can say that God is just, wise, good, perfect, and so on, we do not know what it is for God to be just, wise, good, and perfect. We end up denying of God the creaturely mode of these perfections. In this way God is approached negatively by denying things of Him rather than by directly knowing what God is. This account relies heavily upon the use of analogous names in talking about God and creatures.

16. ANALOGOUS NAMES

Aristotle spoke of “things said in many ways”, a notable instance of which is “being.” One of the difficulties with assigning being, or being as being as the subject of a science is that a subject must be univocally common to the things that fall under it. But ‘being’ is not univocal, as it has a plurality of meanings. Aristotle solved this problem with his account of “things said in many ways,” by observing that while they have many meanings, these form an ordered set with one of the meanings as primary and regulative. Substance is being in the primary sense, which is why the
science of being as being is effectively a science of substance. Thomas's term for such names is analogy: ‘being’ is an analogous term and its primary analogate is substance.

In the crucial middle books of the *Metaphysics*—Seven and Eight—we have an analysis of substance which takes off from material substance, which is a compound of matter and form, and arrives at a notion of substance as form alone. This definition does not fit material substance, of course, but it is devised in order to be able to apply the term substance to the immaterial things whose existence has been established in natural philosophy. This extension of names whose natural habitat is sensible things to God is another instance of analogous naming for Aquinas. Names common to God and creatures bring out another feature of our knowing. If we ask what the primary analogates of names common to God and creatures is, the answer is: the meaning of the term as it applies to creatures. The word must be refined before it can be applied to God and this means the formation of an extended meaning which leans on the primary meaning for its intelligibility.

Consider the example of ‘wise.’ Both men and God are said to be wise. What can we mean when we say that God is wise? Not the same thing as when we say that Socrates is wise. Socrates became wise and wisdom is a trait which with age and forgetfulness he could lose. Thus to be Socrates and to be wise are not the same thing. But in the case of God, ‘wise’ does not signify some incidental property He might or might not have. This is captured by noting that while we say God is wise, we also say he is wisdom. This suffices to indicate the way in which the meaning of the term as applied to God involves negating features of its meaning as it applies to men.

If God is thus named secondarily by the common name, so that the creature is primarily named by it, nonetheless God's wisdom is the cause and source of human wisdom. Ontologically, God is primary and the creature secondary. Names analogously common to God and creature thus underscore the way in which what comes to be known first for us is not first in reality, and what is first in reality is not first in our knowledge.

17. ESSENCE AND EXISTENCE

It is evident that material substances exist contingently. They come into being and they pass out of being. While they exist, their existing is not what they are. Thomas accepts from Boethius that it is self-evident that what a thing is and its existing differ (*DIVERSUM EST ESSE ET IDQUOD EST*). Material things depend upon causes to exist, both to become and to be. There is no need to dwell on this except insofar as it provides a springboard to speak of immaterial substance. Only in God is it the case that what he is and his existing are identical: God is existence. The phrase Thomas uses to express this is *IPSUM ESSE SUBSISTENS*. Of course this is paradoxical. Existence is the actuality of a substance, not itself something subsistent. This is true with material substances. But when we ask what we mean by saying that God exists, we have to negate aspects of material existence in order to avoid speaking of Him as if he were a contingent being.

The problem that Thomas now faces is how to speak of the immaterial substances which are less than God although superior to material substances, that is, angels. For a material thing to exist is for its form actually to inhere in its matter. But what is it for a pure form to exist? Since immaterial substances less than God are dependent on the divine causality in order to exist, existing cannot be what they are, of their essence. In short, in angels too there is a distinction of essence and existence. Thomas notes that a created separate substance is what it is and not another thing: that is, it has the perfection it has, but not unlimited perfection. It is a being of a kind, not being as such. Gabriel is
perfect as to his nature, but he lacks the perfection of being Raphael or Michael. Form thus operates as a restriction on existence as such. In God alone is there unrestricted existence; he is existence, IPSUM ESSE SUBSISTENS. And here we have an argument for the fact that God's essence is his existence. And yet it remains true that while we know the fact, we do not know the why of the fact because the knowledge of God's essence remains unknown to us.

18. MORA2L DOCTRINE

When Aristotle sought to isolate the human good, he employed the so-called function argument. If one knows what a carpenter is or does he has the criteria for recognizing a good carpenter. So too with bank-tellers, golfers, brain surgeons and locksmiths. If then man as such has a function, we will have a basis for deciding whether someone is a good human being. But what could this function be? Just as we do not appraise carpenters on the basis of their golf game or golfers on the basis of their being able to pick locks, we will not want to appraise the human agent on an incidental basis. So too we do not appraise the carpenter in terms of his weight, the condition of his lungs or his taste buds. No more would we appraise a human being on the basis of activities similar to those engaged in by non-human animals. The activity that sets the human agent apart from all others is rational activity. The human agent acts knowingly and willingly. If this is the human function, the human being who performs it will be a good person and be happy.

Now Aquinas distinguishes in the SUMMA THEOLOGIAE between the imperfect happiness of this life and the perfect happiness of the next life in beatitude or union with God. And on the basis of this distinction some will argue that Aquinas ultimately finds Aristotle's function argument unsatisfying, insofar as the result of the function argument is supposed to be the claim that happiness consists in a complete life lived in accord with reason and virtue. And here again it will be claimed that Aquinas in some sense rejects the fundamentals of the Aristotelian account. Insofar as he describes the life in accord with reason and virtue in this life as imperfect, he must be suggesting that is is in some sense faulty, not true or real happiness. Real happiness is something other.

But such an interpretation fails on a number of counts. In the first place it misunderstands Aquinas' use of ‘imperfect’ which does not mean “faulty” or “false”. It can mean “not as great” by comparison, as in the claim that human beings are imperfect with regard to the angels. This claim is not meant to suggest that human beings are faulty or false angels; it simply means that their perfection is not as great in the scale of being as that of the angels. It can also mean incomplete in the constitution of some overall good. So the pursuit of some limited good, say education, is imperfect because not the complete human good, even though it is partially constitutive of the human good. But it is certainly not a faulty or false human good.

In the second place, such a claim about Aquinas has to confront his own understanding of Aristotle. Aquinas claims that Aristotle understood that a complete life in accord with reason and virtue in this life is incomplete or imperfect happiness. Indeed, Aristotle himself says that perfect happiness is to be associated with the divine. Thus Aquinas does not claim for himself the distinction between imperfect and perfect happiness, but attributes it to Aristotle. And so his use of it in the SUMMA THEOLOGIAE cannot be taken to be a rejection of the analysis Aristotle provides of the formal characteristics of happiness.
Obviously, one may fault Aquinas for his understanding of Aristotle. But the claim that he misinterprets Aristotle is no argument that he rejects Aristotle. In fact, his interpretation of Aristotle on imperfect and perfect happiness embodies the thesis he expresses in the *Summa Theologiae* that we saw above. The philosophers are capable of grasping some of the things that are constitutive of or necessary for perfect happiness in beatitude. Revelation concerning even those matters they can grasp is necessary, because what they have grasped takes a long time, is very difficult, and may be filled with errors. God in his mercy makes these things known in revelation in order that perfect happiness may be attained. And yet, Aquinas never abandons the fundamental affirmation of the human capacity to understand apart from revelation the nature of happiness in formal terms and what constitutes its imperfect status in this life, even as its perfect embodiment in the next remains unattainable to philosophy without the resources of faith.

Many have come to this point, pulse quickened by the possibilities of the function-argument, only to be gripped with doubt at this final application of it. Rational activity seems too unmanageable a description to permit a function-analysis of it. Of course Aristotle agrees, having made the point himself. Rational activity is said in many ways or, as Thomas would put it, it is an analogous term. It covers an ordered set of instances. There is the activity of reason as such, there is the activity of reason in its directive or practical capacity, and there are bodily movements and the like which are rational insofar as rational provides the adequate formal description of them. If the virtue of a function is to perform it well, the analogy of “rational activity” makes clear that there is a plurality of virtues. Moral virtues are habits of appetite brought about by the direction of reason. Temperance is to seek pleasure rationally; courage is to react to the threat of harm rationally. The virtues of practical intellect are art and prudence; the virtues of theoretical intellect are insight, science and wisdom.

All this and much more enters into Thomas's moral teaching. Thomas will distinguish acts of a man from human acts, the former being activities truly found in human agents but also found in other non-human agents too. For example, the act of a man might be as important as the beating of his heart or as trivial as the nervous tapping of his fingers. The human act is one which proceeds from reason and will. Since the human act by definition is the pursuit of a known good, the question arises as to the relationship between the objects of the myriad acts that humans perform. Is there some over-all good sought by human agents? Is there an ultimate end of human action?

In commenting on chapter two of Book One of the *Nicomachean Ethics* where Aristotle argues for there being an ultimate end, Thomas points out that the argument is actually a series of *reductiones ad absurdum*. That is, the denial of an ultimate end of human action reduces to the claim that there is no end to human seeking at all, that it is pointless. This analysis has not gotten the attention it deserves: the implication is that it is self-evident that there is an ultimate end which is why denials of it must flounder in incoherence. The argument for an ultimate end that Thomas puts forth in the *Summa Theologiae* is somewhat different. Any action aims at some good. A particular good by definition shares in and is not identical with goodness itself. What binds together all the acts that humans perform is the overarching goodness they seek in this, that and the other thing. That over arching goodness, what Thomas calls the *ratio bonitatis*, is the ultimate end. It follows that anything a human agent does is done for the sake of the ultimate end.

This dissatisfies because we feel we are owed a richer account of goodness. After all, human agents differ insofar as they have different notions of what goodness is. Fame, wealth, pleasure, power, and so on seem to function as the dominant purpose of different persons. Thomas could scarcely
overlook this, let alone deny it. Can his earlier position on the unity of the ultimate end still stand? The fact that there are false or inadequate identifications of goodness does not mean that there is not a true and adequate account of what is perfecting or fulfilling of human agents. Everyone acts on the assumption that what he does will contribute to his overall good; one's overall good is the ultimate reason for doing anything. But not everything one does under this aegis actually contributes to one's overall good. Thus in one sense there is one and the same ultimate end for every human agent—the integral human good—and there are correct and mistaken notions of what actually constitutes this integral good.

This may seem like an empty claim, but it provides a basis on which to proceed. If indeed every human agent acts for the sake of his overall good, the discussion can turn to whether or not what he here and now pursues, or his general theory of what constitutes the overall good, can withstand scrutiny. It is not necessary to persuade anyone that he ought to pursue the ultimate end in the sense of his overall good. What else would he pursue? But if one is persuaded that what he pursues does not contribute to his overall good, he already has reasons for changing his ways.

19. Natural Law

Thomas's reading of Aristotle's argument for the ultimate end as a reductio and his own claim that in one sense of it everyone pursues the ultimate end since one chooses whatever he chooses sub ratione boni and as conducive to or a constituent of his fulfillment and perfection, tell us something important about Thomas's mode of procedure. We said earlier that philosophy begins from pre-philosophical principles already had by everyone. In the moral order, it is essential that one uncover the starting point, the latent presupposition of any action, clarify it and proceed from there. This procedure is equally manifest in Thomas's treatment of what he calls natural law.

What is natural law? One description of it is: the peculiarly human participation in the eternal law, in providence. All creatures are ordered to an end, have natures whose fulfillment is what it is because of those natures. It is not peculiar to man that he is fashioned so as to find his good in the fulfillment of his nature. That is true of anything. But other things are ordered to ends of which they themselves are not conscious. It is peculiar to man that he becomes aware of the good and freely directs himself to it. Of course man is not free to choose the good—any choice is a choice of the good. As to what is really as opposed to only apparently his good, he is not free to make that what it is. He is free to direct himself or not to his true end, however.

A second description of natural law is: the first principles or starting points of practical reasoning. To indicate what he means by this, Thomas invokes the analogy of the starting points of reasoning as such. We have already mentioned the distinction between knowledge of the simple and knowledge of the complex. The former is a concept and is expressed in a definition or description. The latter is an affirmation or negation of one thing of another. There is something which is first in each of these orders. That is, Thomas holds that there is a conception which is prior to and presupposed by all other conceptions and a judgment that is prior to and presupposed by all other judgments. Since knowledge is expressed by language, this seems to come down to the assertion that there is a first word that everyone utters and a first statement that would appear in everyone's baby book on the appropriate page. But surely that is false. So what does Thomas mean?

He says that our first conception is of being, of that which is, and our first judgment is that you cannot affirm and deny the same thing in the same sense simultaneously. Since few if any humans
first utter ‘being’ or its equivalent and no one fashions as his first enunciation the principle of contradiction, facts as known to Thomas as ourselves, his meaning must be more subtle. It is this. Whatever concept one first forms and expresses verbally—Mama, hot, whatever ‘being’ is a specification or an instance of that which is. Aristotle has observed that children at first call all men father and all women mother. The terms then function as generic for any male or female. Even more basically, each presupposes that what is generically grasped is an instance of being. Being is prior not because it is grasped absolutely, without reference to this being or that. It is some particular being that is first of all grasped and however it is named it will mean minimally something that is.

So too with regard to the first judgment. Children express their recognition of this principle when they disagree over the location of some quite specific thing, say a baseball mitt. One accuses the other of taking it. You did. I didn't. There is a fundamental disagreement. But what they are agreed on is that if it were true that one did it could not simultaneously and in the same sense be true that he did not. The principle is latent in implicit in, any concrete judgment just as being is involved in any other conception.

It is on an analogy with these starting points of thinking as such that Thomas develops what he means by natural law. In the practical order there is a first concept analogous to being in the theoretical order and it is the good. The good means what is sought as fulfilling of the seeker. The first practical judgment is: the good should be done and pursued and evil avoided. Any other practical judgment is a specification of this one and thus includes it. Natural Law consists of this first judgment and other most general ones that are beyond contest. These will be fashioned with reference to constituents of our complete good—existence, food, drink, sex and family, society, desire to know. We have natural inclinations to such goods. Natural law precepts concerning them refer the objects of natural inclinations to our overall or integral good, which they specify.

Most moral judgments are true, if true, only by and large. They express means to achieve our overall good. But because there is not a necessary connection between the means and end, they can hold only for the most part. Thus there are innumerable ways in which men lead their lives in keeping with the ultimate end. Not all means are necessarily related to the end. Moral philosophy reposes on natural law precepts as common presuppositions, but its advice will be true only in the main.

It might be noted that when Thomas, following Aristotle, says that man is by nature a social or political animal, he does not mean that each of us has a tendency to enter into social contracts or the like. The natural in this sense is what is not chosen, but given, and what is given about human life is that we are in the first place born into the community of the family, are dependent on it for years in order to survive, and that we flourish as human beings within various larger social and political communities. The moral consists in behaving well in these given settings.

20. Thomism

Thomas's teaching came under attack, largely by Franciscans, immediately after his death. Dominicans responded. This had the effect of making Dominicans Thomists and Franciscans non-Thomists—Bonaventurians, Scotists, Ockhamists. The Jesuits were founded after the Reformation and they tended to be Thomists, often with a Suarezian twist. When in 1879 Leo XIII issued the encyclical AETERNI PATRIS calling for the revival of the study of Thomas Aquinas, he was not
directing his readers to one school as opposed to others. Thomas was put forward as the paladin of philosophy in its true sense, as over and against the vagaries of modern thought since Descartes.

The response to Leo's call was global and sustained. New journals and learned societies were founded; curricula were reshaped to benefit from the thought of Thomas and this not simply in seminaries and pontifical universities but throughout the world in colleges and universities. Such giants as Jacques Maritain and Etienne Gilson may be taken to symbolize the best of this Thomistic revival.

Vatican II, the ecumenical council that met from 1962–1965 drew this stage of the Thomistic Revival to a close. It was widely held that the Council had dethroned Thomas in favor of unnamed contemporary philosophers. (When they were named, quarrels began.) In the post-conciliar period, Catholics have adopted many contemporary philosophical trends with mixed results, as the speed with which such trends come and go has appeared to accelerate, without obvious lasting results. Now with the vogue of the notion that modernity has failed and the Enlightenment Project come a cropper, many, Catholics and non-Catholics alike, are turning to Thomas as a spur or foil for their thinking. In 1998 John Paul II issued an encyclical called FIDES ET RATIO. In its reaffirmation of the importance of Aquinas, it may be regarded as the charter of the Thomism of the third millennium.

**FRANCIS BACON (1561–1626)**

Francis Bacon was one of the leading figures in natural philosophy and in the field of scientific methodology in the period of transition from the Renaissance to the early modern era. As a lawyer, Member of Parliament, and Queen's Counsel, Bacon wrote on questions of law, state and religion, as well as on contemporary politics; but he also published texts in which he speculated on possible conceptions of society, and he pondered questions of ethics (ESSAYS) even in his works on natural philosophy (THE ADVANCEMENT OF LEARNING). After his studies at Trinity College, Cambridge and Gray's Inn, London, Bacon did not take up a post at a university, but instead tried to start a political career. Although his efforts were not crowned with success during the era of Queen Elizabeth, under James I he rose to the highest political office, Lord Chancellor. Bacon's international fame and influence spread during his last years, when he was able to focus his energies exclusively on his philosophical work, and even more so after his death, when English scientists of the Boyle circle (INVISIBLE COLLEGE) took up his idea of a cooperative research institution in their plans and preparations for establishing the Royal Society.

To the present day Bacon is well known for his treatises on empiricist natural philosophy (THE ADVANCEMENT OF LEARNING, NOVUM ORGANUM SCIENTIARUM) and for his doctrine of the idols, which he put forward in his early writings, as well as for the idea of a modern research institute, which he described in NOVA ATLANTIS.

**1. BIOGRAPHY**

Francis Bacon was born January, 22, 1561, the second child of Sir Nicholas Bacon (Lord Keeper of the Seal) and his second wife Lady Anne Cooke Bacon, daughter of Sir Anthony Cooke, tutor to Edward VI and one of the leading humanists of the age. He was educated at Trinity College, Cambridge (1573–5) and at Gray's Inn in London (1576). From 1577 to 1578 the young Bacon accompanied Sir Amias Paulet, the English ambassador, on his mission in Paris; but he returned when his father died. Bacon's small inheritance brought him into financial difficulties and since his
maternal uncle, Lord Burghley, did not help him to get a lucrative post as a government official; he embarked on a political career in the House of Commons. In 1581 he entered the Commons as a member for Cornwall, and he remained a Member of Parliament for thirty-seven years. In 1582 he became a barrister and was installed as a reader at Gray's Inn. His involvement in high politics started in 1584, when he wrote his first political memorandum, *A Letter of Advice to Queen Elizabeth*. Right from the beginning of his adult life, Bacon aimed at a revision of natural philosophy and – following his father's example – also tried to secure high political office. Very early on he tried to formulate outlines for a new system of the sciences, emphasizing empirical methods and laying the foundation for an applied science (*Scientia Operativa*). This twofold task, however, proved to be too ambitious to be realized in practice.

Bacon's ideas concerning a reform of the sciences did not meet with much sympathy from Queen Elizabeth or from Lord Burghley. Small expectations on this front led him to become a successful lawyer and Parliamentarian. From 1584 to 1617 (the year he entered the House of Lords) he was an active member in the Commons. When he lost Elizabeth's favor over the subsidy affair of 1593, Bacon turned to the Earl of Essex as a patron. He served Essex as political advisor, but distanced himself from him when Essex's failure in the Irish campaign became evident and when his rebellion against the Queen finally brought him to the executioner's block.

When in 1603 the Scottish king James VI succeeded the great Queen as James I of England, Bacon's time had come at last. He was knighted in 1603, married a young and rich heiress in 1606, and was appointed Solicitor General in 1607 and Attorney General in 1613. He reached the peak of his splendid career from 1616 onwards: he became a member of the Privy Council in 1616, was appointed Lord Keeper of the Great Seal the following year – thus achieving the same position as his father – and was granted the title of Lord Chancellor and created Baron of Verulam in 1618. In the same year, 1621, when Bacon was created Viscount of St. Albans, he was impeached by Parliament for corruption in his office as a judge. His fall was contrived by his adversaries in Parliament and by the court faction, for which he was the suitable scapegoat to save the Duke of Buckingham not only from public anger but also from open aggression. He lost all his offices and his seat in Parliament, but retained his titles and his personal property. Bacon devoted the last five years of his life entirely to his philosophical work. He tried to go ahead with his huge project, the *Instauratio Magna Scientiarum*; but the task was too big for him to accomplish in just a couple of years. Though he was able to finish important parts of the *Instauratio*, the proverb, often quoted in his works, proved true for himself: *Vita brevis, ars longa*. He died in April 1626 of pneumonia after experiments with ice.

2. **Natural Philosophy: Struggle with Tradition**

Bacon's struggle to overcome intellectual blockades and the dogmatic slumber of his age and of earlier periods had to be fought on many fronts. Very early on he criticized not only Plato, Aristotle and the Aristotelians, but also humanists and Renaissance scholars such as Paracelsus and Bernardino Telesio. Although Aristotle provided specific axioms for every scientific discipline, what Bacon found lacking in the Greek philosopher's work was a master principle or general theory of science, which could be applied to all branches of natural history and philosophy. For Bacon, Aristotle's cosmology, as well as his theory of science, had become obsolete and consequently so too had many of the medieval thinkers who followed his lead. He does not repudiate Aristotle completely, but he opposes the humanistic interpretation of him, with its emphasis on syllogism and dialectics (*Scientia Operativa* versus textual hermeneutics) and the metaphysical treatment of natural philosophy in favor of natural forms (or nature's effects as structured modes of action,
not artifacts), the stages of which correspond — in the shape of a pyramid of knowledge — to the structural order of nature itself.

If any “modern” Aristotelians came near to Bacon, it was the Venetian or Paduan branch, represented by Jacopo Zabarella. On the other hand, Bacon criticized Telesio, who — in his view — had only halfway succeeded in overcoming Aristotle's deficiencies. Although we find the debate with Telesio in an unpublished text of his middle period. Bacon began to struggle with tradition as early as 1603. In *Valerius Terminus* (1603?) he already repudiates any mixture of natural philosophy and divinity; he provides an outline of his new method and determines that the end of knowledge was “a discovery of all operations and possibilities of operations from immortality (if it were possible) to the meanest mechanical practice”. He opposes Aristotelian *Anticipatio Naturae*, which favored the inquiry of causes to satisfy the mind instead of those “as will direct him and give him light to new experiences and inventions”.

When Bacon introduces his new systematic structure of the disciplines in the *Advancement of Learning* (1605), he continues his struggle with tradition, primarily with classical antiquity, rejecting the book learning of the humanists, on the grounds that they “hunt more after words than matter”. Accordingly, he criticizes the Cambridge University curriculum for placing too much emphasis on dialectical and sophistical training asked of “minds empty and unfruitful with matter”. He reformulates and functionally transforms Aristotle's conception of science as knowledge of necessary causes. He rejects Aristotle's logic, which is based on his metaphysical theory, whereby the false doctrine is implied that the experience which comes to us by means of our senses (things as they *appear*) automatically presents to our understanding things as they *are*. Simultaneously Aristotle favors the application of general and abstract conceptual distinctions, which do not conform to things as they exist. Bacon, however, introduces his new conception of *Philosophia Prima* as a meta-level for all scientific disciplines.

From 1606 to 1612 Bacon pursued his work on natural philosophy, still under the auspices of a struggle with tradition. This tendency is exemplified in the unpublished tracts *Temporis Partus Masculus*, 1603/1608, *Cogitata et Visa*, 1607, *Redargutio Philosophiarum*, 1608, and *De Principiis atque Originibus…*, 1612. Bacon rediscovers the Pre-Socratic philosophers for himself, especially the atomists and among them Democritus as the leading figures. He gives preference to Democritus' natural philosophy in contrast to the scholastic – and thus Aristotelian – focus on deductive logic and belief in authorities. Bacon does not expect any approach based on tradition to start with a direct investigation of nature and then to ascend to empirical and general knowledge. This criticism is extended to Renaissance alchemy, magic, and astrology (*Temporis Partus Masculus*), because the “methods” of these “disciplines” are based on occasional insights, but do not command strategies to reproduce the natural effects under investigation. His criticism also concerns contemporary technical literature, in so far as it lacks a new view of nature and an innovative methodological program. Bacon takes to task the ancients, the scholastics and also the moderns. He not only criticizes Plato, Aristotle, and Galen for these failings, but also Jean Fernel, Paracelsus, and Telesio, while praising the Greek atomists and Roger Bacon.

Bacon's manuscripts already mention the doctrine of the idols as a necessary condition for constituting *Scientia Operativa*. In *Cogitata et Visa* he compares deductive logic as used by the scholastics to a spider's web, which is drawn out of its own entrails, whereas the bee is introduced as an image of *Scientia Operativa*. Like a bee, the empiricist, by means of his
inductive method, collects the natural matter or products and then works them up into knowledge in order to produce honey, which is useful for healthy nutrition.

In Bacon's follow-up paper, Redargutio Philosophiarum, he carries on his empiricist project by referring to the doctrine of twofold truth, while in De Principiis atque Originibus he rejects alchemical theories concerning the transformation of substances in favor of Greek atomism. But in the same text he sharply criticizes his contemporary Telesio for propagating non-experimental halfway house empiricism. Though Telesio proves to be a moderate “modern”, he clings to the Aristotelian framework by continuing to believe in the Quinta Essentia and in the doctrine of the two worlds, which presupposes two modes of natural law (one mode for the sublunary and another for the superlunary sphere).

3. Natural Philosophy: Theory of the Idols and the System of Sciences

3.1 The Idols

Bacon's doctrine of the idols not only represents a stage in the history of theories of error but also functions as an important theoretical element within the rise of modern empiricism. According to Bacon, the human mind is not a Tabula Rasa. Instead of an ideal plane for receiving an image of the world in toto, it is a crooked mirror, on account of implicit distortions. He does not sketch a basic epistemology but underlines that the images in our mind right from the beginning do not render an objective picture of the true objects. Consequently, we have to improve our mind, i.e., free it from the idols, before we start any knowledge acquisition.

As early as Temporis partus masculus, Bacon warns the student of empirical science not to tackle the complexities of his subject without purging the mind of its idols: “On waxen tablets you cannot write anything new until you rub out the old. With the mind it is not so; there you cannot rub out the old till you have written in the new”. In Redargutio Philosophiarum Bacon reflects on his method, but he also criticizes prejudices and false opinions, especially the system of speculation established by theologians, as an obstacle to the progress of science, together with any authoritarian stance in scholarly matters.

Bacon deals with the idols in the Second Book of The Advancement of Learning, where he discusses Arts Intellectual (Invention, Judgment, Memory, Tradition). In his paragraph on judgment he refers to proofs and demonstrations, especially to induction and invention. When he comes to Aristotle's treatment of the syllogism, he reflects on the relation between sophistical fallacies and the idols. Whereas induction, invention, and judgment presuppose “the same action of the mind”, this is not true for proof in the syllogism. Bacon, therefore, prefers his own Interpretationariae, repudiating Elenches as modes of sophistical “juggling” in order to persuade others in Redargutions (“degenerate and corrupt use … for caption and contradiction”). There is no finding without proof and no proof without finding. But this is not true for the syllogism, in which proof (syllogism: judgment of the consequent) and invention (of the “mean” or middle term) are distinct. The caution he suggests in relation to the ambiguities in Elenches is also recommended in face of the Idols: “there is yet a much more important and profound kind of fallacies in the mind of man, which I find not observed or enquired at all, and think good to place here, as that which of all others appertaineth most to rectify judgment: the force whereof is such, as it doth not dazzle or snare the understanding in some particulars, but doth more generally and inwardly infect and corrupt the state thereof. For the mind of man is far from the nature of a clear and equal glass, wherein the beams of things should reflect according to their true
incidence, nay, it is rather like an enchanted glass, full of superstition and imposture, if it be not delivered and reduced. For this purpose, let us consider the false appearances that are imposed upon us by the general nature of the mind …”

Bacon still presents a similar line of argument to his reader in 1623, namely in De Augmentis. Judgment by syllogism presupposes – in a mode agreeable to the human mind – mediated proof, which, unlike in induction, does not start from sense in primary objects. In order to control the workings of the mind, syllogistic judgment refers to a fixed frame of reference or principle of knowledge as the basis for “all the variety of disputations”. The reduction of propositions to principles leads to the middle term. Bacon deals here with the art of judgment in order to assign a systematic position to the idols. Within this art he distinguishes the “Analytic” from the detection of fallacies (sophistical syllogisms). Analytic works with “true forms of consequences in argument”, which become faulty by variation and deflection. The complete doctrine of detection of fallacies, according to Bacon, contains three segments: 1. Sophistical fallacies, 2. Fallacies of interpretation, and 3. false appearances or Idols. Concerning (1) Bacon praises Aristotle for his excellent handling of the matter, but he also mentions Plato honorably. Fallacies of interpretation (2) refer to “Adventitious Conditions or Adjuncts of Essences”, similar to the predicaments, open to physical or logical inquiry. He focuses his attention on the logical handling when he relates the detection of fallacies of interpretation to the wrong use of common and general notions, which leads to sophisms. In the last section (3) Bacon finds a place for his idols, when he refers to the detection of false appearances as “the deepest fallacies of the human mind: For they do not deceive in particulars, as the others do, by clouding and snaring the judgment; but by a corrupt and ill-ordered predisposition of mind, which as it were perverts and infects all the anticipations of the intellect”. Idols are productions of the human imagination (caused by the crooked mirror of the human mind) and thus are nothing more than “untested generalities”.

In his Preface to the Novum Organum Bacon promises the introduction of a new method, which will restore the senses to their former rank, begin the whole labor of the mind again, and open two sources and two distributions of learning, consisting of a method of cultivating the sciences and another of discovering them. This new beginning presupposes the discovery of the natural obstacles to efficient scientific analysis, namely seeing through the idols, so that the mind's function as the subject of knowledge acquisition comes into focus. According to Aphorism XXIII of the First Book, Bacon makes a distinction between the Idols of the human mind and the Ideas of the divine mind: whereas the former are for him nothing more than “certain empty dogmas”, the latter show “the true signatures and marks set upon the works of creation as they are found in nature”.

3.1.1 Idols of the Tribe

The Idols of the Tribe have their origin in the production of false concepts due to human nature, because the structure of human understanding is like a crooked mirror, which causes distorted reflections (of things in the external world).

3.1.2 Idols of the Cave

The Idols of the Cave consist of conceptions or doctrines which are dear to the individual who cherishes them, without possessing any evidence of their truth. These idols are due to the preconditioned system of every individual, comprising education, custom, or accidental or contingent experiences.
3.1.3 IDOLS OF THE MARKET PLACE

These idols are based on false conceptions which are derived from public human communication. They enter our minds quietly by a combination of words and names, so that it comes to pass that not only does reason govern words, but words react on our understanding.

3.1.4 IDOLS OF THE THEATRE

According to the insight that the world is a stage, the Idols of the Theatre are prejudices stemming from received or traditional philosophical systems. These systems resemble plays in so far as they render fictional worlds, which were never exposed to an experimental check or to a test by experience. The idols of the theatre thus have their origin in dogmatic philosophy or in wrong laws of demonstration. Bacon ends his presentation of the idols in *Novum Organum*, Book I, Aphorism LXVIII, with the remark that men should abjure and renounce the qualities of idols, “and the understanding [must be] thoroughly freed and cleansed”. He discusses the idols together with the problem of information gained through the senses, which must be corrected by the use of experiments.

3.2 SYSTEM OF SCIENCES

Within the history of occidental philosophy and science, Bacon identifies only three revolutions or periods of learning: the heyday of the Greeks and that of the Romans and Western Europe in his own time. This meager result stimulated his ambition to establish a new system of the sciences. This tendency can already be seen in his early manuscripts, but is also apparent in his first major book, *The Advancement of Learning*. In this work Bacon presents a systematic survey of the extant realms of knowledge, combined with meticulous descriptions of deficiencies, leading to his new classification of knowledge. In *The Advancement* a new function is given to *Philosophia prima*, the necessity of which he had indicated in the *Novum Organum*, I, Aphorisms LXXIX–LXXX. In both texts this function is attributed to *Philosophia naturalis*, the basis for his concept of the unity of the sciences and thus of materialism.

Natural science is split up by Bacon into physics and metaphysics. The former investigates variable and particular causes, the latter reflects on general and constant ones, for which the term *form* is used. *Forms* are more general than the four Aristotelian causes and that is why Bacon's discussion of the forms of substances as the most general properties of matter is the last step for the human mind when investigating nature. Metaphysics is distinct from *Philosophia prima*. The latter marks the position in the system where general categories of a general theory of science are treated as (1) universal categories of thought, (2) relevant for all disciplines. Final causes are discredited, since they lead to difficulties in science and tempt us to amalgamate theological and teleological points of doctrine. At the summit of Bacon's pyramid of knowledge are the laws of nature (the most general principles). At its base the pyramid starts with observations, moves on to invariant relations and then to more inclusive correlations until it reaches the stage of forms. The process of generalization ascends from natural history via physics towards metaphysics, whereas accidental correlations and relations are eliminated by the method of exclusion. It must be emphasized that *metaphysics* has a special meaning for Bacon. This concept (1) excludes the infinity of individual experience by generalization with a teleological focus and (2) opens our mind to generate more possibilities for the efficient application of general laws.
3.3 Matter Theory and Cosmology

According to Bacon, man would be able to explain all the processes in nature if he could acquire full insight into the hidden structure and the secret workings of matter. Bacon's conception of structures in nature, functioning according to its own working method, concentrates on the question of how natural order is produced, namely by the interplay of matter and motion. In *De Principiis atque Originibus*, his materialistic stance with regard to his conception of natural law becomes evident. The *Summary Law of Nature* is virtus (matter-cum-motion) or power in accordance with matter theory, or “the force implanted by God in these first particles, form the multiplication thereof of all the variety of things proceeds and is made up”. Similarly, in *De Sapientia Veterum* he attributes to this force an “appetite or instinct of primal matter; or to speak more plainly, the natural motion of the atom; which is indeed the original and unique force that constitutes and fashions all things out of matter”. Suffice it to say here that Bacon, who did not reject mathematics in science, was influenced by the early mathematical version of chemistry developed in the 16th century, so that the term “instinct” must be seen as a keyword for his theory of nature. The natural philosopher is urged to inquire into the “appetites and inclination of things by which all that variety of effects and changes which we see in the works of nature and art is brought about”. Bacon's theory of active or even vivid force in matter accounts for what he calls Cupid in *De Principiis atque Originibus*. Since his theory of matter aims at an explanation of the reality which is the substratum of appearances, he digs deeper than did the mechanistic physics of the 17th century. Bacon's ideas concerning the *Quid Facti* of reality presuppose the distinction “between understanding how things are made up and of what they consist… and by what force and in what manner they come together, and how they are transformed”. This is the point in his work where it becomes obvious that he tries to develop an explanatory pattern in which his theory of matter, and thus his atomism, is related to his cosmology, magic, and alchemy.

In *De Augmentis*, Bacon not only refers to Pan and his nymphs in order to illustrate the permanent atomic movement in matter but in addition revives the idea of magic in a “honourable meaning” as “the knowledge of the universal consents of things …. I … understand [magic] as the science which applies the knowledge of hidden forms to the production of wonderful operations; and by uniting (as they say) actives with passives, displays the wonderful works of nature”. Bacon's notion of form is made possible by integration into his matter theory, which (ideally) reduces the world of appearances to some minimal parts accessible and open to manipulation by the knower/maker. In contrast to Aristotle, Bacon's knowing-why type of definition points towards the formulation of an efficient knowing-how type. In this sense a convergence between the scope of definition and that of causation takes place according to a “constructivist epistemology”. The fundamental research of G. Rees has shown that Bacon's special mode of cosmology is deeply influenced by magic and semi-Paracelsian doctrine. For Bacon, matter theory is the basic doctrine, not classical mechanics as it is with Galileo. Consequently, Bacon's purified and modified versions of chemistry, alchemy, and physiology remain primary disciplines for his explanation of the world.

According to Rees, the *Instauratio Magna* comprises two branches: (1) Bacon's famous scientific method, and (2) his semi-Paracelsian world system as “a vast, comprehensive system of speculative physics”. For (2) Bacon conjoins his specific version of Paracelsian cosmic chemistry to Islamic celestial kinematics. The chemical world system is used to support Bacon's explanation of celestial motion in the face of contemporary astronomical problems. There are thus two sections in Bacon's *Instauratio*, which imply the modes of their own explanation. Bacon's speculative cosmology and matter theory had been planned to constitute Part 5 of *Instauratio Magna*. The
theory put forward refers in an eclectic vein to atomism, criticizes Aristotelians and Copernicans, but also touches on Galileo, Paracelsus, William Gilbert, Telesio, and Arabic astronomy. For Bacon, “magic” is classified as applied science, while he generally subsumes under “science” pure science and technology. It is never identified with black magic, since it represents the “ultimate legitimate power over nature”. Whereas MAgIa was connected to crafts in the 16th and 17th centuries, Bacon's science remains the knowledge of forms in order to transform them into operations. Knowledge in this context, however, is no longer exclusively based on formal proof.

Bacon's cosmological system — a result of thought experiments and speculation, but not proven in accordance with the inductive method — presupposes a finite universe, a geocentric plenum, which means that the earth is passive and consists of TANGIBLE matter. The remaining universe is composed of active or PNEUMATIC matter. Whereas the interior and tangible matter of the earth is covered by a crust which separates it from the pneumatic heaven, the zone between earth and the “middle region of the air” allows a mixture of pneumatic and tangible matter, which is the origin of organic and non-organic phenomena. Bacon speaks here of “attached spirit”, while otherwise he assumes four kinds of free spirit: air and terrestrial fire, which refer to the sublunary realm; ether and sidereal fire, which are relevant to the celestial realm. Ether is explained as the medium in which planets move around the central earth. Air and ether, as well as watery non-inflammable bodies, belong to Bacon's first group of SUBSTANCE or to the MERCURY QUATERNION.

Terrestrial fire is presented as the weak variant of sidereal fire; it joins with oily substances and sulfur, for all of which Bacon introduces the Sulphur Quaternion. These quaternions comprise antithetical qualities: air and ether versus fire and sidereal fire. The struggle between these qualities is determined by the distance from the earth as the absolute center of the world system. Air and ether become progressively weaker as the terrestrial and sidereal fire grow stronger. The quaternion theory functions in Bacon's thought as a constructive element for constituting his own theory of planetary movement and a general theory of physics. This theory differs from all other contemporary approaches, even though Bacon states that “many theories of the heavens may be supposed which agree well enough with the phenomena and yet differ with each other”.

The diurnal motion of the world system (9th sphere) is driven by sympathy; it carries the heavens westward around the earth. The sidereal fire is powerful and, accordingly, sidereal motion is swift (the stars complete their revolution in 24 hours). Since the sidereal fire becomes weaker if it burns nearer to the earth, the lower planets move more slowly and unevenly than the higher ones (in this way Bacon, like Alpetragius, accounts for irregular planetary movement without reference to Ptolemy's epicycle theory). He applies his theory of consensual motion to physics generally (e.g., wind and tides) and thus comes into conflict with Gilbert's doctrine of interstellar vacuum and Galileo's theory of the tides (for Bacon, the cycle of tides depends on the diurnal motion of the heavens, but for Galileo, on the earth's motion).

Bacon's bi-quaternion theory necessarily refers to the sublunary as well as to the superlunary world. Although the quaternion theory is first mentioned in ThEma COELI, he provides a summary in his NOVUM ORGANUM: “it has not been ill observed by the chemists in their triad of first principles, that sulfur and mercury run through the whole universe … in these two one of the most general consents in nature does seem to be observable. For there is consent between sulfur, oil and greasy exhalation, flame, and perhaps the body of a star. So is there between mercury, water and watery vapors, air, and perhaps the pure and intersiderial ether. Yet these two quaternions or great tribes of
things (each within its own limits) differ immensely in quantity of matter and density, but agree very well in configuration”. Bacon regarded his cosmological worldview as a system of anticipations, which was open to revision on the grounds of further scientific results based on the inductive method. It was primarily a qualitative system holding the field against both mathematical astronomers and Paracelsian chemists. It thus emphasized the priority which he gave to physics over mathematics in his general system of the sciences.

4. Scientific Method: The Project of the Instauratio Magna

The Great Instauration, Bacon's main work, was published in 1620 as Franciscus de Verulamio Summi Angliae Cancellaris Instauratio Magna. This great work remained a fragment, since Bacon was only able to finish parts of the planned outline. The volume was introduced by a Prooemium, which gives a general statement of the purpose, followed by a Dedication to the King (James I) and a Preface, which is a summary of all “directions, motifs, and significance of his life-work”. After that, Bacon printed the plan of the Instauration, before he turned to the strategy of his research program, which is known as Novum Organum Scientiarum. Altogether the 1620 book constitutes the second part of Part II of the Instauration, the first part of which is represented by De Augmentis and Book I of The Advancement of Learning. When Bacon organized his Instauration, he divided it into six parts, which reminded contemporary readers of God's work of the six days (the creation), already used by writers like Guillaume Du Bartas and Giovanni Pico della Mirandola.

Bacon sees nature as a labyrinth, whose workings cannot be exclusively explained by reference to “excellence of wit” and “repetition of chance experiments”: “Our steps must be guided by a clue, and see what way from the first perception of the sense must be laid out upon a sure plan”. Bacon's Plan of the Work runs as follows:

1. The Divisions of the Sciences.
2. The New Organon; or Directions Concerning the Interpretation of Nature.
3. The Phenomena of the Universe; or a Natural and Experimental History for the Foundation of Philosophy.
4. The Ladder of Intellect.
5. The Forerunners; or Anticipations of the New Philosophy.
6. The New Philosophy; or Active Science.

Part 1 contains the general description of the sciences including their divisions as they presented themselves in Bacon's time. Here he aimed at a distinction between what was already invented and known in contrast to “things omitted which ought to be there”. This part could be taken from The Advancement of Learning (1605) and from the revised and enlarged version De Dignitate et Augmentis Scientiarum (1623).

Part 2 develops Bacon's new method for scientific investigation, the Novum Organum, equipping the intellect to pass beyond ancient arts and thus producing a radical revision of the methods of knowledge; but it also introduces a new epistemology and a new ontology. Bacon calls his new art Interpretatio Naturaee, which is a logic of research going beyond ordinary logic, since his science aims at three inventions: of arts (not arguments), of principles (not of things in accordance to principles), and of designations and directions for works (not of probable reasons).
The effect Bacon looks for is to command nature in action, not to overcome an opponent in argument. The *Novum Organum* is the only part of the *Instauratio Magna* which was brought near to completion.

Part 3 was going to contain natural and experimental history or the record of the phenomena of the universe. According to *De Augmentis Scientarum*, 275), natural history is split up into narrative and inductive, the latter of which is supposed “to minister and be in order to the building up of philosophy”. These functional histories support human memory and provide the material for research, or the factual knowledge of nature, which must be certain and reliable. Natural history starts from and emphasizes the subtlety of nature or her structural intricacy, but not the complexity of philosophical systems, since they have been produced by the human mind. Bacon sees this part of *Instauratio Magna* as a foundation for the reconstruction of the sciences in order to produce physical and metaphysical knowledge. Nature in this context is studied under experimental conditions, not only in the sense of the history of bodies, but also as a history of virtues or original passions, which refer to the desires of matter. This knowledge was regarded by Bacon as a preparation for Part 6, the *Second Philosophy* or *Active Science*, for which he gave only the one example of *Historia Ventorum* (1622); but – following his plan to compose six prototypical natural histories – he also wrote *Historia Vitae et Mortis* (1623) and the *Historia Densi*, which was left in manuscript. The text, which develops the idea of Part 3, is called *Parasceve ad Historiam Naturalem et Experimentalem*.

Part 4, which Bacon called *The Ladder of Intellecct* or *Scala Intellecctus*, was intended to function as a link between the method of natural history and that of Second Philosophy/Active Science. It consists not only of the fragment *Filum Labyrinthi*, but also includes the *Abecedarium Novum Naturae*, which was planned as a preface to all of section 4 “[to] demonstrate the whole process of the mind”. *Filum Labyrinthi* is similar to, but not identical with, *Cogitata et Visa*. Speaking of himself in an authorial voice, Bacon reflects on the state of science and derives his construction of a research program from the gaps and deficiencies within the system of disciplines: sciences of the future should be examined and further ones should be discovered. Emphasis must be laid on new matter (not on controversies). It is necessary to repudiate superstition, zealous religion, and false authorities. Just as the Fall was not caused by knowledge of nature, but rather by moral knowledge of good and evil, so knowledge of natural philosophy is for Bacon a contribution to the magnifying of God's glory, and, in this way, his plea for the growth of scientific knowledge becomes evident.

Part 5 deals with the forerunners or anticipations of the new philosophy, and Bacon emphasizes that the “big machinery” of the *Instauratio Magna* needs a good deal of time to be completed. Anticipations are ways to come to scientific inferences without recourse to the method presented in the *Novum Organum*. Meanwhile, he has worked on his speculative system, so that portions of his Second Philosophy are treated and finished: *De Fluxu et Refluxu Maris* and *Thema Coeli*. For this part of the *Great Instauration*, texts are planned that draw philosophical conclusions from collections of facts which are not yet sufficient for the use or application of Bacon's inductive method.

Part 6 was scheduled to contain Bacon's description of the new philosophy, as the last part of his *Great Instauration*; but nothing came of this plan, so that there is no extant text at all from this part of the project.
5. Scientific Method: Novum Organum and the Theory of Induction

Already in his early text *Cogitata et VISA* (1607) Bacon dealt with his scientific method, which became famous under the name of induction. He repudiates the syllogistic method and defines his alternative procedure as one “which by slow and faithful toil gathers information from things and brings it into understanding”. When later on he developed his method in detail, namely in his *Novum Organum* (1620), he still noted that “[of] induction the logicians seem hardly to have taken any serious thought, but they pass it by with a slight notice, and hasten to the formulae of disputation. I on the contrary reject demonstration by syllogism…”

Bacon's method appears as his conceptual plot, “applied to all stages of knowledge, and at every phase the whole process has to be kept in mind”. Induction implies ascending to axioms, as well as a descending to works, so that from axioms new particulars are gained and from these new axioms. The inductive method starts from sensible experience and moves via natural history (providing sense-data as guarantees) to lower axioms or propositions, which are derived from the tables of presentation or from the abstraction of notions. Bacon does not identify experience with everyday experience, but presupposes that method corrects and extends sense-data into facts, which go together with his setting up of tables (tables of presence and of absence and tables of comparison or of degrees, i.e., degrees of absence or presence). The last type can be supplemented by tables of counter-instances, which may suggest experiments: “To move from the sensible to the real requires the correction of the senses, the tables of natural history, the abstraction of propositions and the induction of notions. In other words, the full carrying out of the inductive method is needed”.

The sequence of methodical steps does not, however, end here, because Bacon assumes that from lower axioms more general ones can be derived (by induction). The complete process must be understood as the joining of the parts into a systematic chain. From the more general axioms Bacon strives to reach more fundamental laws of nature (knowledge of forms), which lead to practical deductions as new experiments or works. The decisive instruments in this process are the middle or “living axioms,” which mediate between particulars and general axioms. For Bacon, induction can only be efficient if it is eliminative by exclusion, which goes beyond the remit of induction by simple enumeration. The inductive method helps the human mind to find a way to ascertain truthful knowledge.

*Novum Organum*, I, Aphorism CXV, 103) ends the “pulling down” of “the signs and causes of the errors” within the sciences, achieved by means of three refutations, which constituted the condition for a rational introduction of method: refutation of “natural human reason” (idols); refutation of “demonstrations” (syllogisms) and refutation of “theories” (traditional philosophical systems).

The Second Part of the *Novum Organum* deals with Bacon's rule for interpreting nature, even if he provides no complete or universal theory. He contributes to the new philosophy by introducing his *Tables of Discovery*, by presenting an example of particulars, and by observations on history. It is well known that he worked hard in the last five years of his life to make progress on his natural history, knowing that he could not always come up to the standards of legitimate interpretation.

Bacon's method presupposes a double empirical and rational starting-point. True knowledge is acquired if we proceed from lower certainty to higher liberty and from lower liberty to higher
certainty. The rule of certainty and liberty in Bacon converges with his repudiation of Aristotle's old logic, which determined true propositions by the criteria of generality, essentiality, and universality. For Bacon, making knows and knowing is making. Following the maxim “command nature ... by obeying her”, the exclusion of superstition, imposture, error, and confusion are obligatory. Bacon introduces variations into “the maker's knowledge tradition” when the discovery of the forms of a given nature provide him with the task of developing his method for acquiring factual and proven knowledge.

Form is for Bacon a structural constituent of a natural entity or a key to truth and operation, so that it comes near to natural law without being reducible to causality. This appears all the more important, since Bacon – who aims exclusively at causes necessary and sufficient for their effects – rejects Aristotle's four causes (his four kinds of explanations for a complete understanding of a phenomenon) on the grounds that they are not well distributed into material, formal, efficient, and final, and that they fail to advance the sciences (especially final, efficient, and material causes): “There are and can be only two ways of searching into and discovering truth. The one flies from the senses and particulars to the most general axioms, and from these principles, the truth of which it takes for settled and immovable, proceeds to judgment and to the discovery of middle axioms. And this way is now in fashion. The other derives axioms from the senses and particulars, rising by a gradual and unbroken ascent, so that it arrives at the most general axioms at last. This is the true way, but as yet untried”.

Since for Bacon the formal necessity of the syllogism does not suffice to set up first principles, his method comprises two basic tasks: (1) the discovery of forms, and (2) the transformation of concrete bodies. The discovery from every case of generation and motion refers to a latent process according to which efficient and material causes lead to forms, but there is also the discovery of latent configurations of bodies at rest and not in motion. Bacon's new mode of using human understanding implies a parallelism between striving towards human power and constituting human knowledge. Technical know-how leads to successful operations, which converge with the discovery of forms. At this point the idea of SCIENTIAOPERATIVA comes in again, since the direction for a true and perfect rule of operation is parallel to the discovery of a true form. Bacon's specific non-Aristotelian Aristotelianism is one of the main features of his theory. Other indispensable influences on Bacon, apart from a modified version of Aristotle, are Hermeticism, rhetoric and alchemy.

Two kinds of axioms correspond to the following division of philosophy and the sciences: the investigation of forms or METAPHYSICS; and the investigation of efficient cause and matter, which leads to the latent process and configuration in PHYSICS. Physics itself is split up by Bacon into MECHANICS, i.e., the practical, and MAGIC, i.e., the metaphysical. Nowadays the view that Bacon “made little first-hand contribution to science” no longer coincides with the opinion that we have to assume an underestimation of the “place of hypothesis and mathematics” in his work. But there were few doubts in the past that Bacon “encouraged detailed and methodical experimentation”; and he did this on account of his new inductive method, which implied the need for negative instances and refuting experiments. Bacon saw that confirming instances could not suffice to analyze the structure of scientific laws, since this task presupposed a hypothetical-deductive system, which, according to L. Jardine, is closely connected to “the logical and linguistic backgrounds from which Bacon's New Logic proceeds ...”
Bacon's *Interpretation of Nature* uses “Tables and Arrangements of Instances” concerning the natural phenomena under investigation, which function as a necessary condition for cracking the code of efficient causation. His *Prerogative Instances* are not examples or phenomena simply taken from nature but rather imply information with inductive potential which show priority conducive to knowledge or to methodological relevance when inserted into tables. The instances do not represent the order of sensible things, but instead express the order of qualities (natures). These qualities provide the working basis for the order of abstract natures. Bacon's tables have a double function: they are important for *Natural History*, collecting the data on bodies and virtues in nature; and they are also indispensable for *Induction*, which makes use of these data.

Already in *Temporis Partus Masculus* (1603) Bacon had displayed a “facility of shrewd observation” concerning his ideas on induction. In his *Novum Organum* the nature of all human science and knowledge was seen by him as proceeding most safely by negation and exclusion, as opposed to affirmation and inclusion. Even in his early tracts it was clear to Bacon that he had to seek a method of discovering the right forms, the best known of which was *Heat* or “the famous trial investigation of the form of heat”. In his “[m]ethod of analysis by exclusion”, negation proved to be “one of Bacon's strongest contributions to modern scientific method”. Most important were his tables of degrees and of exclusion. They were needed for the discovery of causes, especially for supreme causes, which were called forms. The method of induction works in two stages:

1. Learned experience from the known to the unknown has to be acquired, and the tables (of presence, absence, degrees) have to be set up before their interpretation can take place according to the principle of exclusion. After the three tables of the first presentation have been judged and analyzed, Bacon declares the *First Vintage* or the first version of the interpretation of nature to be concluded.

2. The second phase of the method concentrates on the process of exclusion. The aim of this procedure is the reduction of the empirical character of experience, so that the analysis converges with an anatomy of things. Here, too, tables of presence and of absence are set up. The research work proper consists of finding the relationship of the two natures of qualities. Here exclusion functions as the process of determination. Bacon's method starts from material determination in order to establish the formal determination of real causes, but does not stop there, because it aims at the progressive generalization of causes. Here, again, the central element of the inductive method is the procedure of exclusion.

Forms, as the final result of the methodical procedure, are “nothing more than those laws and determinations of absolute actuality which govern and constitute any simple nature, as heat, light, weight, in every kind of matter and subject that is susceptible of them”; they are not identical with natural law, but with definitions of simple natures (elements) or ultimate ingredients of things from which the basic material structure has been built. Forms are the structures constituted by the elements in nature (microphysics). This evokes a cross-reference to Bacon's atomism, which has been called the “constructivist component” of his system, including an alchemical theory about basic kinds of matter. He aims at “understanding the basic structures of things … as a means to transforming nature for human purposes”; and thus he “ends” the unfinished *Novum Organum* with a list of things which still have to be achieved or with a catalogue of phenomena which are important and indispensable for a future natural history.

Historians of science, with their predilection for mathematical physics, used to criticize Bacon's approach, stating that “the Baconian concept of science, as an inductive science, has nothing to do
with and even contradicts today's form of science”. In reaching this verdict, however, they overlooked the fact that a natural philosophy based on a theory of matter cannot be assessed on the grounds of a natural philosophy or science based on mechanics as the fundamental discipline. One can account for this chronic mode of misunderstanding as a specimen of the paradigmatic fallacy.

Bacon came to the fundamental insight that FACTS cannot be collected from nature, but must be constituted by methodical procedures, which have to be put into practice by scientists in order to ascertain the empirical basis for inductive generalizations. His induction, founded on collection, comparison, and exclusion of factual qualities in things and their interior structure, proved to be a revolutionary achievement within natural philosophy, for which no example in classical antiquity existed. His SCALA INTELLECTUS has two contrary movements “upwards and downwards: from AXIOMATA to EXPERIMENTA and OPERA and back again”. Bacon's induction was construed and conceived as an instrument or method of discovery. Above all, his emphasis on negative instances for the procedure of induction itself can claim a high importance with regard to knowledge acquisition and has been acclaimed as an innovation by scholars of our time. Some have detected in Bacon a forerunner of Karl Popper in respect of the method of falsification. Finally, it cannot be denied that Bacon's methodological program of induction includes aspects of deduction and abstraction on the basis of negation and exclusion. Contemporary scholars have praised his inauguration of the theory of induction. This theory has been held in higher esteem since the 1970s than it was for a long period before, at least since the heyday of positivism.

6. SCIENCE AND SOCIAL PHILOSOPHY

In Bacon's thought we encounter a relation between science and social philosophy, since his ideas concerning a utopian transformation of society presuppose integration into the social framework of his program concerning natural philosophy and technology as the two forms of the maker's knowledge. From his point of view, which was influenced by Puritan conceptions, early modern society has to make sure that losses caused by the Fall are compensated for, primarily by man's enlargement of knowledge, providing the preconditions for a new form of society which combines SCIENTIANOVA and the millennium, according to the prophecy of Daniel 12:4. Science as a social endeavor is seen as a collective project for the improvement of social structures. On the other hand, a strong collective spirit in society may function as a CONDITIO SINE QUA NON for reforming natural philosophy. Bacon's famous argument that it is wise not to confound the Book of Nature with the Book of God comes into focus, since the latter deals with God's will (inscrutable for man) and the former with God's work, the scientific explanation or appreciation of which is a form of Christian divine service. Successful operations in natural philosophy and technology help to improve the human lot in a way which makes the hardships of life after the fall obsolete. It is important to note that Bacon's idea of a – to a certain extent – Christian society by no means conveys Christian pessimism in the vein of patristic thinkers but rather displays a clear optimism as the result of compounding the problem of truth with the scope of human freedom and sovereignty.

7. THE ETHICAL DIMENSION IN BACON'S THOUGHT

Since Bacon's philosophy of science tries to answer the question of how man can overcome the deficiencies of earthly life resulting from the fall, he enters the realm of ethical reflection. The improvement of mankind's lot by means of philosophy and science does not start from a narrow utilitarian point of view, involving sheer striving for profit and supporting the power or influence of select groups of men, but instead emphasizes the construction of a better world for mankind, which
might come into existence through the ascertaining of truths about nature's workings. Thus, the perspective of the universal in Bacon's ethical thought is given predominance. The range of science and technology in their ethical meaning transcends the realm of the application of tools and/or instruments, in so far as the aim is the transformation of whole systems. Since causality and finality can interact on the basis of human will and knowledge, a plurality of worlds becomes feasible.

Thus, for Bacon, the acquisition of knowledge does not simply coincide with the possibility of exerting power. His scientific knowledge is a condition for the expansion and differentiation of civilization as a process. Therefore, knowledge and charity cannot be kept separate: “I humbly pray … that knowledge being now discharged of that venom which the serpent infused into it, and which makes the mind of man to swell, we may not be wise above measure and sobriety, but cultivate truth in charity… Lastly, I would address one general admonition to all; that they consider what are the true ends of knowledge, and that they seek it not either for pleasure of the mind, or for contention, or for superiority to others, or for profit, or fame, or power, or any of these inferior things; but for the benefit and use of life; and that they perfect and govern it in charity. For it was from the lust of power that the angels fell, from lust of knowledge that man fell; but of charity there can be no excess, neither did angel or man ever come in danger by it.”.

Finally, the view that Bacon's *Nova Atlantis* “concerns a utopian society that is carefully organized for the purposes of scientific research and virtuous living” holds true for his entire life's work.

**HOBSES'S MORAL AND POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY**

The 17th Century English philosopher Thomas Hobbes is now widely regarded as one of a handful of truly great political philosophers, whose masterwork *Leviathan* rivals in significance the political writings of Plato, Aristotle, Locke, Rousseau, Kant, and Rawls. Hobbes is famous for his early and elaborate development of what has come to be known as “social contract theory”, the method of justifying political principles or arrangements by appeal to the agreement that would be made among suitably situated rational, free, and equal persons. He is infamous for having used the social contract method to arrive at the astonishing conclusion that we ought to submit to the authority of an absolute—undivided and unlimited—sovereign power. While his methodological innovation had a profound constructive impact on subsequent work in political philosophy, his substantive conclusions have served mostly as a foil for the development of more palatable philosophical positions. Hobbes's moral philosophy has been less influential than his political philosophy, in part because that theory is too ambiguous to have garnered any general consensus as to its content. Most scholars have taken Hobbes to have affirmed some sort of personal relativism or subjectivism; but views that Hobbes espoused divine command theory, virtue ethics, rule egoism, or a form of projectivism also find support in Hobbes's texts and among scholars. Because Hobbes held that “the true doctrine of the Lawes of Nature is the true Morall philosophie”, differences in interpretation of Hobbes's moral philosophy can be traced to differing understandings of the status and operation of Hobbes's “laws of nature”, which laws will be discussed below. The formerly dominant view that Hobbes espoused psychological egoism as the foundation of his moral theory is currently widely rejected, and there has been to date no fully systematic study of Hobbes's moral psychology.

**1. MAJOR POLITICAL WRITINGS**
Hobbes wrote several versions of his political philosophy, including *The Elements of Law, Natural and Politic* (also under the titles *Human Nature* and *De Corpore Politico*) published in 1650, *De Cive* (1642) published in English as *Philosophical Rudiments Concerning Government and Society* in 1651, the English *Leviathan* published in 1651, and its Latin revision in 1668. Others of his works are also important in understanding his political philosophy, especially his history of the English Civil War, *Behemoth* (published 1679), *De Corpore* (1655), *De Homine* (1658), *Dialogue between a Philosopher and a Student of the Common Laws of England* (1681), and *The Questions Concerning Liberty, Necessity, and Chance* (1656). All of Hobbes's major writings are collected in *The English Works of Thomas Hobbes*, edited by Sir William Molesworth (11 volumes, London 1839-45), and *Thomae Hobbes Opera Philosophica Quae Latina Scripsit Omnia*, also edited by Molesworth (5 volumes; London, 1839-45). Oxford University Press has undertaken a projected 26 volume collection of the *Clarendon Edition of the Works of Thomas Hobbes*. So far 3 volumes are available: *De Cive* (edited by Howard Warrender), *The Correspondence of Thomas Hobbes* (edited by Noel Malcolm), and *Writings on Common Law and Hereditary Right* (edited by Alan Cromartie and Quentin Skinner). Readers new to Hobbes should begin with *Leviathan*, being sure to read Parts Three and Four, as well as the more familiar and often excerpted Parts One and Two. There are many fine overviews of Hobbes's normative philosophy, some of which are listed in the following selected bibliography of secondary works.

2. The Philosophical Project

Hobbes sought to discover rational principles for the construction of a civil polity that would not be subject to destruction from within. Having lived through the period of political disintegration culminating in the English Civil War, he came to the view that the burdens of even the most oppressive government are “scarce sensible, in respect of the miseries, and horrible calamities that accompany a Civill Warre”. Because virtually any government would be better than a civil war, and, according to Hobbes's analysis, all but absolute governments are systematically prone to dissolution into civil war, people ought to submit themselves to an absolute political authority. Continued stability will require that they also refrain from the sorts of actions that might undermine such a regime. For example, subjects should not dispute the sovereign power and under no circumstances should they rebel. In general, Hobbes aimed to demonstrate the reciprocal relationship between political obedience and peace.

3. The State of Nature

To establish these conclusions, Hobbes invites us to consider what life would be like in a state of nature, that is, a condition without government. Perhaps we would imagine that people might fare best in such a state, where each decides for herself how to act, and is judge, jury and executioner in her own case whenever disputes arise—and that at any rate, this state is the appropriate baseline against which to judge the justifiability of political arrangements. Hobbes terms this situation “the condition of mere nature”, a state of perfectly private judgment, in which there is no agency with recognized authority to arbitrate disputes and effective power to enforce its decisions.

Hobbes's near descendant, John Locke, insisted in his *Second Treatise of Government* that the state of nature was indeed to be preferred to subjection to the arbitrary power of an absolute
sovereign. But Hobbes famously argued that such a “dissolute condition of masterlesse men, without subjection to Lawes, and a coercive Power to tye their hands from rapine, and revenge” would make impossible all of the basic security upon which comfortable, sociable, civilized life depends. There would be “no place for industry, because the fruit thereof is uncertain; and consequently no culture of the earth; no navigation, nor use of the commodities that may be imported by Sea; no commodious Building; no Instruments of moving and removing such things as require much force; no Knowledge of the face of the Earth; no account of Time; no Arts; no Letters; and which is worst of all, continuall feare, and danger of violent death; And the life of man, solitary, poore, nasty, brutish, and short.” If this is the state of nature, people have strong reasons to avoid it, which can be done only by submitting to some mutually recognized public authority, for “so long a man is in the condition of mere nature, (which is a condition of war,) as private appetite is the measure of good and evill.”

Although many readers have criticized Hobbes's state of nature as unduly pessimistic, he constructs it from a number of individually plausible empirical and normative assumptions. He assumes that people neither are sufficiently similar in their mental and physical attributes that no one is invulnerable nor can expect to be able to dominate the others. Hobbes assumes that people generally “shun death”, and that the desire to preserve their own lives is very strong in most people. While people have local affections, their benevolence is limited, and they have a tendency to partiality. Concerned that others should agree with their own high opinions of themselves, people are sensitive to slights. They make evaluative judgments, but often use seemingly impersonal terms like ‘good’ and ‘bad’ to stand for their own personal preferences. They are curious about the causes of events, and anxious about their futures; according to Hobbes, these characteristics incline people to adopt religious beliefs, although the content of those beliefs will differ depending upon the sort of religious education one has happened to receive.

With respect to normative assumptions, Hobbes ascribes to each person in the state of nature a liberty right to preserve herself, which he terms “the right of nature”. This is the right to do whatever one sincerely judges needful for one's preservation; yet because it is at least possible that virtually anything might be judged necessary for one's preservation, this theoretically limited right of nature becomes in practice an unlimited right to potentially anything, or, as Hobbes puts it, a right “to all things”. Hobbes further assumes as a principle of practical rationality, that people should adopt what they see to be the necessary means to their most important ends.

4. The State of Nature Is a State of War

Taken together, these plausible descriptive and normative assumptions yield a state of nature potentially fraught with divisive struggle. The right of each to all things invites serious conflict, especially if there is competition for resources, as there will surely be over at least scarce goods such as the most desirable lands, spouses, etc. People will quite naturally fear that others may (citing the right of nature) invade them, and may rationally plan to strike first as an anticipatory defense. Moreover, that minority of prideful or “vain-glorious” persons who take pleasure in exercising power over others will naturally elicit preemptive defensive responses from others. Conflict will be further fueled by disagreement in religious views, in moral judgments, and over matters as mundane as what goods one actually needs, and what respect one properly merits. Hobbes imagines a state of nature in which each person is free to decide for herself what she needs, what she's owed, what's respectful, right, pious, prudent, and also free to decide all of these
questions for the behavior of everyone else as well, and to act on her judgments as she thinks best, enforcing her views where she can. In this situation where there is no common authority to resolve these many and serious disputes, we can easily imagine with Hobbes that the state of nature would become a “state of war”, even worse, a war of “all against all”.

5. **Further Questions about the State of Nature**

In response to the natural question whether humanity ever was generally in any such state of nature, Hobbes gives three examples of putative states of nature. First, he notes that all sovereigns are in this state with respect to one another. This claim has made Hobbes the representative example of a “realist” in international relations. Second, he opined that many now civilized peoples were formerly in that state, and some few peoples—“the savage people in many places of America”, for instance—were still to his day in the state of nature. Third and most significantly, Hobbes asserts that the state of nature will be easily recognized by those whose formerly peaceful states have collapsed into civil war. While the state of nature's condition of perfectly private judgment is an abstraction, something resembling it too closely for comfort remains a perpetually present possibility, to be feared, and avoided.

Do the other assumptions of Hobbes's philosophy license the existence of this imagined state of isolated individuals pursuing their private judgments? Probably not, since, as feminist critics among others have noted, children are by Hobbes's theory assumed to have undertaken an obligation of obedience to their parents in exchange for nurturing, and so the primitive units in the state of nature will include families ordered by internal obligations, as well as individuals. The bonds of affection, sexual affinity, and friendship—as well as of clan membership and shared religious belief—may further decrease the accuracy of any purely individualistic model of the state of nature. This concession need not impugn Hobbes's analysis of conflict in the state of nature, since it may turn out that competition, diffidence and glory-seeking are disastrous sources of conflicts among small groups just as much as they are among individuals. Still, commentators seeking to answer the question how precisely we should understand Hobbes's state of nature are investigating the degree to which Hobbes imagines that to be a condition of interaction among isolated individuals.

Another important open question is that of what, exactly, it is about human beings that makes it the case (supposing Hobbes is right) that our communal life is prone to disaster when we are left to interact according only to our own individual judgments. Perhaps, while people do wish to act for their own best long-term interest, they are shortsighted, and so indulge their current interests without properly considering the effects of their current behavior on their long-term interest. This would be a type of failure of rationality. Alternative, it may be that people in the state of nature are fully rational, but are trapped in a situation that makes it individually rational for each to act in a way that is sub-optimal for all, perhaps finding themselves in the familiar ‘prisoner's dilemma’ of game theory. Or again, it may be that Hobbes's state of nature would be peaceful but for the presence of persons (just a few, or perhaps all, to some degree) whose passions overrule their calmer judgments; who are prideful, spiteful, partial, envious, jealous, and in other ways prone to behave in ways that lead to war. Such an account would understand irrational human passions to be the source of conflict. Which, if any, of these accounts adequately answers to Hobbes’s text is a matter of continuing debate among Hobbes scholars? Game theorists have been particularly active in these debates, experimenting with different models for the state of nature and the conflict it engenders.
6. The Laws of Nature

Hobbes argues that the state of nature is a miserable state of war in which none of our important human ends are reliably realizable. Happily, human nature also provides resources to escape this miserable condition. Hobbes argues that each of us, as a rational being, can see that a war of all against all is inimical to the satisfaction of her interests, and so can agree that “peace is good, and therefore also the way or means of peace are good”. Humans will recognize as imperatives the injunction to seek peace, and to do those things necessary to secure it, when they can do so safely. Hobbes calls these practical imperatives “Lawes of Nature”, the sum of which is not to treat others in ways we would not have them treat us. These “precepts”, “conclusions” or “theorems” of reason are “eternal and immutable”, always commanding our assent even when they may not safely be acted upon. They forbid many familiar vices such as iniquity, cruelty, and ingratitude. Although commentators do not agree on whether these laws should be regarded as mere precepts of prudence, or rather as divine commands, or moral imperatives of some other sort, all agree that Hobbes understands them to direct people to submit to political authority. They tell us to seek peace with willing others by laying down part of our “right to all things”, by mutually covenanting to submit to the authority of a sovereign, and further direct us to keep that covenant establishing sovereignty.

7. Establishing Sovereign Authority

When people mutually covenant each to the others to obey a common authority, they have established what Hobbes calls “sovereignty by institution”. When, threatened by a conqueror, they covenant for protection by promising obedience, they have established “sovereignty by acquisition”. These are equally legitimate ways of establishing sovereignty, according to Hobbes, and their underlying motivation is the same—namely fear—whether of one's fellows or of a conqueror. The social covenant involves both the renunciation or transfer of right and the authorization of the sovereign power. Political legitimacy depends not on how a government came to power, but only on whether it can effectively protects those who have consented to obey it; political obligation ends when protection ceases.

8. Absolutism

Although Hobbes offered some mild pragmatic grounds for preferring monarchy to other forms of government, his main concern was to argue that effective government—whatever its form—must have absolute authority. Its powers must be neither divided nor limited. The powers of legislation, adjudication, enforcement, taxation, war-making (and the less familiar right of control of normative doctrine) are connected in such a way that a loss of one may thwart effective exercise of the rest; for example, legislation without interpretation and enforcement will not serve to regulate conduct. Only a government that possesses all of what Hobbes terms the “essential rights of sovereignty” can be reliably effective, since where partial sets of these rights are held by different bodies that disagree in their judgments as to what is to be done, paralysis of effective government, or degeneration into a civil war to settle their dispute, may occur.

Similarly, to impose limitation on the authority of the government is to invite irresoluble disputes over whether it has overstepped those limits. If each person is to decide for herself whether the
government should be obeyed, factional disagreement—and war to settle the issue, or at least paralysis of effective government—are quite possible. To refer resolution of the question to some further authority, itself also limited and so open to challenge for overstepping its bounds, would be to initiate an infinite regress of non-authoritative ‘authorities’ (where the buck never stops). To refer it to a further authority itself unlimited, would be just to relocate the seat of absolute sovereignty, a position entirely consistent with Hobbes's insistence on absolutism. To avoid the horrible prospect of governmental collapse and return to the state of nature, people should treat their sovereign as having absolute authority.

9. THE LIMITS OF POLITICAL OBLIGATION

While Hobbes insists that we should regard our governments as having absolute authority, he reserves to subjects the liberty of disobeying some of their government's commands. He argues that subjects retain a right of self-defense against the sovereign power, giving them the right to disobey or resist when their lives are in danger. He also gives them seemingly broad resistance rights in cases in which their families or even their honor are at stake. These exceptions have understandably intrigued those who study Hobbes. His ascription of apparently inalienable rights—what he calls the “true liberties of subjects”—seems incompatible with his defense of absolute sovereignty. Moreover, if the sovereign's failure to provide adequate protection to subjects extinguishes their obligation to obey, and if it is left to each subject to judge for herself the adequacy of that protection, it seems that people have never really exited the fearsome state of nature. This aspect of Hobbes's political philosophy has been hotly debated ever since Hobbes's time. Bishop Bramhall, one of Hobbes's contemporaries, famously accused LEVIATHAN of being a “Rebell's Catechism.” More recently, some commentators have argued that Hobbes's discussion of the limits of political obligation is the Achilles' heel of his theory. It is not clear whether or not this charge can stand up to scrutiny, but it will surely be the subject of much continued discussion.

10. RELIGION AND SOCIAL INSTABILITY

The last crucial aspect of Hobbes's political philosophy is his treatment of religion. Hobbes progressively expands his discussion of Christian religion in each revision of his political philosophy, until it comes in LEVIATHAN to comprise roughly half the book. There is no settled consensus on how Hobbes understands the significance of religion within his political theory. Some commentators have argued that Hobbes is trying to demonstrate to his readers the compatibility of his political theory with core Christian commitments, since it may seem that Christians' religious duties forbid their affording the sort of absolute obedience to their governors which Hobbes's theory requires of them. Others have doubted the sincerity of his professed Christianity, arguing that by the use of irony or other subtle rhetorical devices, Hobbes sought to undermine his readers' religious beliefs. Howsoever his intentions are properly understood, Hobbes's obvious concern with the power of religious belief is a fact that interpreters of his political philosophy must seek to explain.

DESCARTES' LIFE AND WORKS

Descartes has been heralded as the first modern philosopher. He is famous for having made an important connection between geometry and algebra, which allowed for the solving of geometrical problems by way of algebraic equations. He is also famous for having promoted a new conception of matter, which allowed for the accounting of physical phenomena by way of mechanical explanations. However, he is most famous for having written a relatively short work,
Meditations on First Philosophy, published in 1641, in which he provides a philosophical groundwork for the possibility of the sciences.

1. Early Years

Descartes was born in La Haye on March 31, 1596 of Joachim Descartes and Jeanne Brochard. He was one of a number of surviving children (two siblings and two half-siblings). His father was a lawyer and magistrate, which apparently left little time for family. Descartes's mother died in May of the year following his birth, and he, his full brother and sister, Pierre and Jeanne, were left to be raised by their grandmother in La Haye. At around ten years of age, in 1606, he was sent to the Jesuit college of La Fleche. He studied there until 1614, and in 1615 entered the University of Poitiers, where a year later he received his Baccalaureate and License in Canon & Civil Law. For the history and the text of his thesis, see the following supplementary document:

Descartes' Law Thesis

In 1618, at the age of twenty-two, he enlisted in the army of Prince Maurice of Nassau. It is not known what his duties were exactly, though Baillet suggests that he would have very likely been drawn to what would now be called the Corps of Engineers (Baillet, Livre 1, Chapitre 9, p. 41). This division would have engaged in applied mathematics, designing a variety of structures and machines aimed at protecting and assisting soldiers in battle. Sorell, on the other hand, notes that in Breda, where Descartes was stationed, the army “doubled as military academy for young noblemen on the Continent” (Sorell, p. 6). And, Gaukroger notes that the education of the young noblemen was structured around the educational model of Lipsius (1547–1606), a highly respected Dutch political theorist who received a Jesuit education at Cologne (Gaukroger, pp. 65–6). Even so, although the historical records point to there being a military presence in Breda, there is no definitive evidence that speaks for there being a full-fledged “academy”. There are reasons for thinking that Descartes may have been a soldier, but the majority of biographers suggest that it is more likely that his duties were oriented more towards engineering or education.

While stationed at Breda, Descartes met Isaac Beeckman (1588–1637). Notes that Descartes kept related to his correspondence reveal that he and Beeckman had become more than simple acquaintances— their relationship was more one of teacher and student (Descartes being the latter). This relationship would rekindle in Descartes an intense interest in the sciences. In addition to discussions about a wide variety of topics in natural science, a direct result of certain questions posed by Beeckman compelled Descartes to write the Compendium Musicae. Among other things, the Compendium attempted to work out a theory of harmony rooted in the concepts of proportion or ratio, which (along the lines of the ancients) attempted to express the notion of harmony in mathematical terms. It would not be published during Descartes's lifetime. As for Beeckman, Descartes would later downplay his influence.

2. The World and Discourse

After Descartes left the army, in 1619, his whereabouts for the next few years are unknown. Based on what he says in the Discours de la Methode (Discourse on the Method), published in 1637, there is speculation that he spent time near Ulm (Descartes apparently attended the coronation of Ferdinand II in Frankfurt in 1619). There is some evidence suggesting that he was in France in 1622, for it was at this time that property he had inherited was sold—the proceeds of which would provide him a simple income for many years. There is some speculation that between 1623 and 1625 he visited Italy. Descartes emerges in 1625 in Paris, his notes revealing that he was
in contact with Father Marin Mersenne (1588–1648), a member of the Order of Minims. This relationship would prompt Descartes to make public his thoughts on natural philosophy (science). It is by way of Mersenne that Descartes's work would find its way into the hands of some of the best minds living in Paris—for instance, Antoine Arnauld (1612-1694), Pierre Gassendi (1592–1655), and Thomas Hobbes (1588–1679).

In 1628 Descartes left Paris. At this time he seems to have been working on the *Regulae ad Directionem Ingenii* (Rules for the Direction of the Mind), a work that he would abandon, some speculating around the time of the move from Paris. In 1630 he moved to Amsterdam. There he worked on drafts of the *Dioptrique* (the Optics) and the *Metéors* (the Meteorology), which were very likely intended to be a part of a larger work, *Le Monde* (The World). In 1632 he moved again, this time to Deventer, to apparently teach Henry Reneri (1593–1639) his physics. It is also during his stay in Deventer that Descartes probably worked on a final draft of the *Traité de l'Homme* (Treatise on Man), which in connection to the Optics and the Meteorology was probably originally intended to be a part of The World.

When *The World* had become ready for publication in 1633, upon hearing of the Church's condemnation of Galileo (1564–1642) in the same year, Descartes decided against its publication. For, the world system he had adopted in the book assumed, as did Galileo's, the heliocentric Copernican model. In a letter to Mersenne, dated November 1633, Descartes expresses his fear that were he to publish *The World*, the same fate that befell Galileo would befall him. And, although this is something that he understandably would want to avoid, some scholars question Descartes's expressed concern, for his living in the Netherlands would have kept him out of reach of Catholic authorities. *The World* appears to have been constituted of several smaller, but related, works: a treatise on physics, a treatise on mechanics (machines), a treatise on animals, and a treatise on man. Although much of *The World* has been lost, some of it seems to have survived in the form of essays attached to the *Discourse* which, as was mentioned earlier, would be published four years later, in 1637. And, some of it was published posthumously. Arguably, Constantijn Huygens (1596–1687) received what Descartes refers to as “three sheets” of *The World*, along with a letter dated 5 October 1637. These “sheets” deal primarily with mechanics.

Around 1635, Reneri began to teach “Cartesian” physics. Also during this year, a domestic servant by the name of Helene gave birth to a baby girl, Francine. Genevieve Rodis-Lewis claims that Francine was born 19 June 1635 (Rodis-Lewis, p. 40). According to a baptismal record, dated 28 July 1635, Descartes is named the father (AT I 395n). However, Gaukroger claims that the baptismal date was 7 August 1635 (Gaukroger, p. 294). In 1636 Reneri acquired an official chair in Philosophy at the University of Utrecht, and continued to build a following of students interested in Cartesian science. Around March of 1636, at the age of forty, Descartes moved to Leiden to work out the publishing of the *Discourse*. And, in 1637 it is published. With the *Discourse* out and a following of students building in Utrecht, Descartes seems to have turned his attention from career to family. In a letter dated 30 August 1637 we find him apparently working out an arrangement for Francine, but strangely refer to her as his “niece”—which suggests that he did not want certain people to know that he was a father. Gaukroger suggests that despite this apparent denial of paternity, Descartes not only corresponds with Francine, but in 1637 brings her and Helene to his new home at Santpoort or Egmond-Binnen (Gaukroger, pp. 294, 332).

The *Discourse* is the first published work of Descartes's, coming some four years after his abandonment of the publishing of *The World*. This work is important for many reasons. For
instance, it tells us what Descartes himself seems to have thought of his early education, and in particular, his early exposure to mathematics. Roger Ariew suggests that these reflections are not so much those of the historical Descartes, as much as they are those of a persona Descartes adopts in telling the story of the *Discourse* (Ariew, pp. 58–63). Uncontested, however, is the view that the *Discourse* sketches out the metaphysical underpinnings of the Cartesian system. And, as a bonus, it has three works that are attached to it that are apparently added so as to exemplify the method of inquiry it develops (though admittedly it is unclear how the method is applied in these essays). The attached essays are the *Optics*, the *Meteorology*, and *Le Géométrie* (the *Geometry*). As was suggested earlier, the *Optics* and *Meteorology* were very likely versions of works originally intended for *The World*.

It should be stressed that the three attached essays are important independent of the *Discourse*, for they contain much worth studying. In the *Optics*, for example, Descartes works out his laws of refraction, and within this context, what would later be called Snell's Law (which Descartes seems to have worked out as early as 1632). Further, although the *Geometry* would seem to have come out of nowhere, there is evidence in Descartes's notes to himself, from which Clerselier reconstructed some of Descartes's correspondence that he had been working on some version of it as early as 1619. In a letter to Beeckman, dated 26 March 1619, for example, Descartes discusses the subject matter that is found in the *Geometry*, and in a letter dated 23 April 1619; he explicitly mentions the book's title. It is in this work that Descartes shows how certain geometrical problems can be solved by way of algebraic equations.

The significance of the sort of connection that Descartes made between geometry and algebra was great indeed, for without it the mathematization of the physics and the development of the calculus might not have happened when they did—a generation later via Sir Isaac Newton (1642–1727). It should be noted, however, that as groundbreaking as this work may be, contrary to the claims of many, nowhere in the *Geometry* is a “Cartesian Coordinate System” ever developed (that is, the X-Y coordinate system taught to today's students of algebra), nor is he the originator of other mathematical concepts that bear his name, for example, the “Cartesian Product”. Carl Boyer notes that various concepts that lead to analytic geometry are found for the first time in the *Geometry*, and that the *Geometry*'s mathematical notation is still used today. But, he argues, although Cartesian geometry is taken by many to be synonymous with analytic geometry, the fact is that the fundamental aim of Descartes's system is quite different from that of contemporary analytic geometry (Boyer, pp. 370–1). And so, the claim that Descartes is the originator of analytic geometry, at least as we understand it today, overstates the case. As Boyer rightly points out, however, this does not diminish the importance of the work in the history of mathematics.

### 3. The Meditations

In 1639 Descartes began writing the *Meditations*. And, in 1640 he returned to Leiden to help work out its publication. During the year, Francine died. There is evidence suggesting that he was called away from Leiden around the time of her death, returning soon after. Some have speculated that he left Leiden to be at her side. Also during this year, Descartes's father and sister died. Descartes's relationship with his father (and brother) was of the sort that Pierre, his brother, failed to even bother him with the news of their father's death. Rather, it seems to have been in a letter from Mersenne that Descartes first learns of it. In a follow up letter to Mersenne, dated 3 December 1640, Descartes expresses regret in not having been able to see his father before his death. But, he refuses to leave Leiden to attend his father's funeral, and instead stays to complete the publishing of the *Meditations*. 
Today, the *Meditations* is by far Descartes's most popular work—though this would not have been the case in Descartes's day. This work is important to today's scholar for many reasons, not the least of which is its inclusion as an attached text written objections from some of the best minds living in Paris. Mersenne sent the *Meditations* to philosophers and theologians for criticism. The list of critics includes: Caterus, Hobbes, Arnauld, Gassendi, and Mersenne himself, with several other unnamed readers who raised their objections through Mersenne. A later edition would include an objection from Bordin. Descartes replied to each critic, and the result was an appended text referred to as “The Objections and Replies.” The second edition contains seven sets in all.

The *Meditations* opens by developing skeptical questions concerning the possibility of knowledge. Through a series of several carefully thought out meditations, the reader establishes (along with the author) the groundwork for the possibility of knowledge (scientia). Descartes is not a skeptic, as some have insisted, but uses skepticism as a vehicle to motivate his reader to “discover” by way of philosophical investigation what constitutes this ground. In the Second Replies, Descartes refers to this style of presentation as the “analytic” style. There were two styles of presentation: analytic and synthetic. It is important not to confuse these terms with those, say, used by Kant. For Descartes the analytic style of presentation (and inquiry) proceeds by beginning with what is commonly taken to be known and discovering what is necessary for such knowledge. Thus, the inquiry moves from what is commonly known to first principles. The “discovery” moves in such a way that each discovery is based on what was discovered before. By contrast, the synthetic style of presentation begins by asserting first principles and then to determining what follows. Prompted by Mersenne, Descartes sketches out in the Second Replies a synthetic rendering of the meditations.

In establishing the ground for science, Descartes was at the same time overthrowing a system of natural philosophy that had been established for centuries—a qualitative, Aristotelian physics. In a letter to Mersenne, dated 28 January 1641, Descartes says “these six meditations contain all the foundations of my physics. But please do not tell people, for that might make it harder for supporters of Aristotle to approve them. I hope that readers will gradually get used to my principles, and recognize their truth, before they notice that they destroy the principles of Aristotle.” Unlike his earlier work, *The World*, the *Meditations* parts ways with the “old” science without explicitly forwarding controversial views, like that of the Copernican heliocentric model of the solar system. Specifically, the Cartesian view denies that physics is grounded in hot, cold, wet, and dry. It argues that contrary to Aristotle's view, such “qualities” are not properties of bodies at all. Rather, the only properties of bodies with which the physicist can concern him or herself are size, shape, motion, position, and so on-those modifications that conceptually (or logically) entail extension in length, breadth, and depth. In contrast to Aristotle's “qualities,” the properties (or modes) of bodies dealt with in Cartesian physics are measurable specifically on ratio scales (as opposed to intensive scales), and hence are subject in all the right ways to mathematics (Buroker, pp. 596–7). This conception of matter, conjoined with the sort of mathematics found in the *Geometry*, allies itself with the work of such Italian natural philosophers as Tartaglia, Ubaldo, and Galileo, and helps further the movement of early thinkers in their attempts to establish a mathematical physics.

Descartes's letter to the “learned and distinguished men” of the Sorbonne, which is appended to the *Meditations*, suggests that he was trying to pitch the *Meditations* as a textbook for the university. Though the endorsement of the Learned Men would not have guaranteed that the *Meditations* would be accepted or used as a textbook, it could certainly be viewed as an
important step to getting it accepted. Unlike today's notion of a textbook, in Descartes's day “textbooks” were intended mostly for teachers, not students. Typically, at the close of a teacher's career, his notes would be published for the benefit of those who would go on to teach such course material. The awkwardness of Descartes's seeking the acceptance and use of his Meditations by teachers is amplified by the fact that he was not a teacher himself. Consequently, his seeking “textbook” status would have very likely been viewed by those Learned Men as being a bit pretentious. He was, it could be said, a freelancer with no academic or political ties to the university (outside of his connection to Mersenne). And, he certainly lacked the credentials and reputation of someone like a Eustachius, whose widely used textbook of the period is of the sort the Meditations, was in all likelihood aimed at replacing. Although the Meditations seem to have been endorsed by the Sorbonne, it was never adopted as a text for the university.

4. The Principles

Soon after his encounter with the Sorbonne, Descartes's public life was further complicated by the Dutch theologian, Gisbert Voetius (1588–1676). Voetius had attacked Regius, a Dutch physician who taught medicine at the University of Utrecht, for his having taught certain “Cartesian” ideas that conflicted with traditional theological doctrine. Regius was friend to both Reneri and Descartes, and was a strong adherent to Descartes's philosophical views. Voetius tried to have Regius removed from his position as professor, and attacked not only Descartes's work but his character. In his defense Descartes entered into the debate. The controversy would leave Regius confined to teaching medicine, and his published defense of (his conception of) Cartesian thought would be officially condemned by Voetius, who in five years time would rise to the position of University rector. At the end of the debate, which off and on lasted about five years, the situation ultimately became desperate for Descartes. He feared being expelled from the country and of seeing his books burned. He would even seek protection by asking the Prince of Orange to intervene and quell Voetius' attack.

In 1643, at the age of forty-seven, Descartes moved to Egmond du Hoef. With the Voetius controversy seemingly behind him (though, as mentioned above, it would again raise its head and climax five years down the road), Descartes and Princess Elizabeth of Bohemia began to correspond. In this exchange, Princess Elizabeth probed Descartes on the implications of his commitment to mind-body dualism. During this time, he completed a final draft of a new textbook, which he had begun three years earlier, the Principia Philosophiae (Principles of Philosophy), and in 1644 it was published. He dedicated it to Princess Elizabeth.

The Principles is an important text. The work is divided into four Parts, with five hundred and four articles. Part One develops Descartes's metaphysics. Although it would appear to be a quick run through of the Meditations, there are a number of dissimilarities. For example, the order of presentation of the proofs for God's existence, which some have argued is significant, found in the Third and Fifth Meditations, is reversed in the Principles. The principles introduced in Part Two are based on the metaphysics of Part One. And, the subsequent physics developed in Parts Three and four is based upon the principles of Part Two. Although the physics turns out to be unsound, the Principles nevertheless inspired such great thinkers as Robert Boyle (1627–1691), Edmond Halley (1656–1742), and Isaac Newton. As an important side note, it must be stressed that even though Descartes had throughout his career put a great deal of emphasis on mathematics, the physics developed in the principles does not appear to be a mathematical physics. Rather, it it traditionally taken to be a conceptual project with only a hint of empirical overtones—physics rooted entirely in metaphysics. Arguably, however, Descartes's work on enumeration, order and measure,
in the *RULES* provides the conceptual machinery necessary for establishing a ‘mathematical’ physics—a conceptual machinery that is carried over to the *PRINCIPLES* (Smith 2003). Two parts, never completed, were originally intended to deal with plants, animals, and man. In light of this and what Descartes says in a 31 January 1642 letter to the mathematician Constantijn Huygens, it is plausible to think that the principles would have looked something like *THE WORLD* had it been completed as planned.

One of the more controversial positions the *PRINCIPLES* forwarded, at least according to Newton, was that a vacuum was impossible. Descartes's rejection of the possibility of a vacuum followed from his commitment to the view that the essence of body was extension. Given that extension is an attribute, and that nothing cannot possess any attributes, it follows that “nothingness cannot possess any extension”. So, any instance of extension would entail the presence of some substance. In other words, vacuum, taken as an extended *NOTHING*, is a flat contradiction. The corporeal universe is thus a plenum, individual bodies separated only by their surfaces. Newton argued in his *DE GRAVITATIONE* and *PRINCIPIA* that the concept of motion becomes problematic if the universe is taken to be a plenum. Another controversial position was Descartes's insistence that matter is infinitely divisible. Gassendi, and later Cordemoy, argued that there must be a bottom, a ‘substance,’ to the physical universe upon which the being of all corporeal things depend. In line with the ancient atomist Epicurus, they argued that if matter was infinitely divisible, so dividing it would show that there was no bottom—and so, corporeality would not be substantial. So, if corporeality is substantial, as Descartes himself had claimed, there must be a minimum measure of extension that could not be divided (by natural means, anyway). And so, there are atoms. But, this conclusion is something that Descartes explicitly rejects in the *PRINCIPLES*.

5. **The Passions**

In 1646, as a result of the probings of Princess Elizabeth, Descartes completed a working draft of *PASSIONS DE L'AMÉ (PASSIONS OF THE SOUL)*. During this year another prominent political figure began to correspond with Descartes, Queen Christina of Sweden. And, Regius published what he took to be a new and improved version of Cartesian science, which as we now know would draw the wrath of Voetius. But Regius did not stop there, for he seemed to have found important differences between his “Cartesian” view and that of Descartes's, and attempted to separate the two, publishing a broadsheet that listed twenty-one anti-Cartesian theses (which his version of “Cartesian” science rejected). In response to this, Descartes wrote a single-page printed defense that was posted on public kiosks for all to read. Published in 1648, the *NOTAE IN PROGRAMMA QUODDAM* (NOTES ON A PROGRAM—also referred to as *COMMENTS ON A CERTAIN BROADSHEET*) is Descartes's public defense. However, as mentioned earlier, tensions mounted as a result of the public exchange and Descartes felt his way of life in the Netherlands to be threatened. As luck would have it, an admirer and friend of Descartes's—Chanut, who worked for Queen Christina's court—and Queen Christina herself began probing Descartes about the possibility of coming to Sweden. And, after a not too lengthy correspondence, Queen Christina offered Descartes a position in her court. For many reasons, which would certainly include those related to his concerns about Voetius, Descartes accepted the offer. And, in 1649 he left for Sweden.

Queen Christina at first required very little from Descartes. However, according to Gaukroger, this would change. For, after he had some time to settle in, she ordered him to do two things: first, to put all of his papers in order, and secondly, to put together designs for an academy. Arguably, Descartes had some idea of how the latter might be done by way of his experience in Breda. In January of 1650 Queen Christina began to require Descartes to give her lessons in philosophy.
These apparently would begin at five in the morning and would last for about five hours. They were given three days a week. During this time Descartes published the *Passions*, the work having emerged primarily from his correspondence with Princess Elizabeth (to whom he had dedicated the *Principles*). One aim of the *Passions* was to explain how the emotional (and thus moral) life of a human being was connected to the souls is essentially united to a body. Simply put, a ‘passion of the soul’ is a mental state (or thought) that arises as a direct result of brain activity. Such passions can move us to action. Since this is so, Descartes suggests that one needs to learn to control one's passions, for they can move one to perform vicious acts. Critics of Descartes, including Elizabeth, argued that Descartes's metaphysical commitments put real pressure on the view expounded in the *Passions*. For, according to Descartes's metaphysics, the nature of mind is to think and the nature of body is to be extended in length, breadth, and depth. One view concerning causation, a view that Descartes's critics seemed to have attributed to him, is that one thing causes another to move, for example, by way of contact. Contact, in this context, seems to be possible only by way of surfaces. Now, bodies, since they are extended and thus have surfaces, can come into contact with one another and thus can cause one another to move. However, if minds are not extended, they lack surfaces. And, if they lack surfaces, there is no way in principle for bodies to come into contact with them. Thus, there is no way in principle for bodies to move minds, and visa versa. That is, minds and bodies cannot in principle causally interact. And so, if the view expounded in the *Passions* requires that bodies and minds be capable of causal interaction, and Descartes's metaphysical commitments make such interaction impossible, Descartes's metaphysics puts a great deal of pressure on the view expounded in the *Passions*.

Although things seemed to be moving forward, they were not going as well as one would have hoped. In a letter to Bregy, for instance, dated 15 January 1650, Descartes expresses reservations about his decision to come to Sweden. He sees himself to be “out of his element,” the winter so harsh that “men's thoughts are frozen here, like the water”. Given the sentiment expressed in the letter, this remark was probably intended to be as much Descartes's take on the intellectual climate as it was about the weather. In early February, less than a month after writing Bregy, Descartes fell ill. His illness quickly turned into a serious respiratory infection. And, although at the end of a week he appeared to have made some movement towards recovery, things took a turn for the worse and he died in the early morning of 11 February 1650.

**Baron de Montesquieu, Charles-Louis de Secondat**

Montesquieu was one of the great political philosophers of the Enlightenment. Insatiably curious and mordantly funny, he constructed a naturalistic account of the various forms of government, and of the causes that made them what they were and that advanced or constrained their development. He used this account to explain how governments might be preserved from corruption. He saw despotism, in particular, as a standing danger for any government not already despotic, and argued that it could best be prevented by a system in which different bodies exercised legislative, executive, and judicial power, and in which all those bodies were bound by the rule of law. This theory of the separation of powers had an enormous impact on liberal political theory, and on the framers of the constitution of the United States of America.

**1. Life**

Charles-Louis de Secondat, Baron de La Brède et de Montesquieu, was born on January 19th, 1689 at La Brède, near Bordeaux, to a noble and prosperous family. He was educated at the Oratorian
Collège de Juilly, received a law degree from the University of Bordeaux in 1708, and went to Paris to continue his legal studies. On the death of his father in 1713 he returned to La Brède to manage the estates he inherited, and in 1715 he married Jeanne de Lartigue, a practicing Protestant, with whom he had a son and two daughters. In 1716 he inherited from his uncle the title Baron de La Brède et de Montesquieu and the office of Président à Mortier in the Parlement of Bordeaux, which was at the time chiefly a judicial and administrative body. For the next eleven years he presided over the Tournelle, the Parlement's criminal division, in which capacity he heard legal proceedings, supervised prisons, and administered various punishments including torture. During this time he was also active in the Academy of Bordeaux, where he kept abreast of scientific developments, and gave papers on topics ranging from the causes of echoes to the motives that should lead us to pursue the sciences.

In 1721 Montesquieu published the *Persian Letters*, which was an instant success and made Montesquieu a literary celebrity. (He published the *Persian Letters* anonymously, but his authorship was an open secret.) He began to spend more time in Paris, where he frequented salons and acted on behalf of the Parlement and the Academy of Bordeaux. During this period he wrote several minor works: *Dialogue de Sylla et d'Eucrate* (1724), *Réflexions sur la Monarchie Universelle* (1724), and *Le Temple de Gnide* (1725). In 1725 he sold his life interest in his office and resigned from the Parlement. In 1728 he was elected to the Académie Française, despite some religious opposition, and shortly thereafter left France to travel abroad. After visiting Italy, Germany, Austria, and other countries, he went to England, where he lived for two years. He was greatly impressed with the English political system, and drew on his observations of it in his later work.

On his return to France in 1731, troubled by failing eyesight, Montesquieu returned to La Brède and began work on his masterpiece, *The Spirit of the Laws*. During this time he also wrote *Considerations on the Causes of the Greatness of the Romans and of their Decline*, which he published anonymously in 1734. In this book he tried to work out the application of his views to the particular case of Rome, and in so doing to discourage the use of Rome as a model for contemporary governments. Parts of *Considerations* were incorporated into *The Spirit of the Laws*, which he published in 1748. Like the *Persian Letters*, *The Spirit of the Laws* was both controversial and immensely successful. Two years later he published a *Defense of the Spirit of the Laws* to answer his various critics. Despite this effort, the Roman Catholic Church placed *The Spirit of the Laws* on the Index of Forbidden Books in 1751. In 1755, Montesquieu died of a fever in Paris, leaving behind an unfinished essay on taste for the *Encyclopédie* of Diderot and D'Alembert.

2. **Major Works**

Montesquieu's two most important works are the *Persian Letters* and *The Spirit of the Laws*. While these works share certain themes -- most notably a fascination with non-European societies and a horror of despotism -- they are quite different from one another, and will be treated separately.

3. **The Persian Letters**

The *Persian Letters* is an epistolary novel consisting of letters sent to and from two fictional Persians, Usbek and Rica, who set out for Europe in 1711 and remain there at least until 1720, when the novel ends. When Montesquieu wrote the *Persian Letters*, travellers' accounts of their journeys to hitherto unknown parts of the world, and of the peculiar customs they found there, were very popular in Europe. While Montesquieu was not the first writer to try to imagine how European
culture might look to travellers from non-European countries, he used that device with particular brilliance.

Many of the letters are brief descriptions of scenes or characters. At first their humor derives mostly from the fact that Usbek and Rica misinterpret what they see. Thus, for instance, Rica writes that the Pope is a magician who can "make the king believe that three are only one, or else that the bread one eats is not bread, or that the wine one drinks is not wine, and a thousand other things of the same kind" (Letter 24); when Rica goes to the theater, he concludes that the spectators he sees in private boxes are actors enacting dramatic tableaux for the entertainment of the audience. In later letters, Usbek and Rica no longer misinterpret what they see; however, they find the actions of Europeans no less incomprehensible. They describe people who are so consumed by vanity that they become ridiculous, scholars whose concern for the minutiae of texts blinds them to the world around them, and a scientist who nearly freezes to death because lighting a fire in his room would interfere with his attempt to obtain exact measurements of its temperature.

Interspersed among these descriptive letters are the Persians' reflections on what they see. Usbek is particularly given to such musings, and he shares many of Montesquieu's own preoccupations: with the contrast between European and non-European societies, the advantages and disadvantages of different systems of government, the nature of political authority, and the proper role of law. He also seems to share many of Montesquieu's views. The best government, he says, is that "which attains its purpose with the least trouble", and "controls men in the manner best adapted to their inclinations and desires" (Letter 80). He notes that the French are moved by a love of honor to obey their king, and quotes approvingly the claim that this "makes a Frenchman, willingly and with pleasure, do things that your Sultan can only get out of his subjects by ceaseless exhortation with rewards and punishments" (Letter 89). While he is vividly aware of the importance of just laws, he regards legal reform as a dangerous task to be attempted "only in fear and trembling" (Letter 129). He favors religious toleration, and regards attempts to compel religious belief as both unwise and inhumane. In these reflections Usbek seems to be a thoughtful and enlightened observer with a deep commitment to justice.

However, one of the great themes of the Persian Letters is the virtual impossibility of self-knowledge, and Usbek is its most fully realized illustration. Usbek has left behind a harem in Persia, in which his wives are kept prisoner by eunuchs who are among his slaves. Both his wives and his slaves can be beaten, mutilated, or killed at his command, as can any outsider unfortunate enough to lay eyes on them. Usbek is, in other words, a despot in his home. From the outset he is tortured by the thought of his wives' infidelity. It is not, he writes, that he loves his wives, but that "from my very lack of feeling has come a secret jealousy which is devouring me" (Letter 6). As time goes on problems develop in the seraglio: Usbek's wives feud with each other and the eunuchs find it increasingly difficult to keep order. Eventually discipline breaks down altogether; the Chief Eunuch reports this to Usbek and then abruptly dies. His replacement is clearly obedient not to Usbek but to his wives: he contrives not to receive any of Usbek's letters, and when a young man is found in the seraglio he writes: "I got up, examined the matter, and found that it was a vision" (Letter 149). Usbek orders another eunuch to restore order: "leave pity and tenderness behind. ... Make my seraglio what it was when I left it; but begin by expiation: exterminate the criminals, and strike dread into those who contemplated becoming so. There is nothing that you cannot hope to receive from your master for such an outstanding service" (Letter 153). His orders are obeyed, and "horror, darkness, and dread rule the seraglio" (Letter 156). Finally, Roxana, Usbek's favorite wife and the only one whose virtue he trusted, is found with another man; her lover is killed, and she
commits suicide after writing Usbek a scathing letter in which she asks: "How could you have thought me credulous enough to imagine that I was in the world only in order to worship your caprices? That while you allowed yourself everything, you had the right to thwart all my desires? No: I may have lived in servitude, but I have always been free. I have amended your laws according to the laws of nature, and my mind has always remained independent" (Letter 161). With this letter the novel ends.

The *Persian Letters* is both one of the funniest books written by a major philosopher, and one of the bleakest. It presents both virtue and self-knowledge as almost unattainable. Almost all the Europeans in the *Persian Letters* are ridiculous; most of those who are not appear only to serve as a mouthpiece for Montesquieu's own views. Rica is amiable and good-natured, but this is largely due to the fact that, since he has no responsibilities, his virtue has never been seriously tested. For all Usbek's apparent enlightenment and humanity, he turns out to be a monster whose cruelty does not bring him happiness, as he himself recognizes even as he decides to inflict it. His eunuchs, unable to hope for either freedom or happiness, learn to enjoy tormenting their charges, and his wives, for the most part, profess love while plotting intrigues. The only admirable character in the novel is Roxana, but the social institutions of Persia make her life intolerable: she is separated from the man she loves and forced to live in slavery. Her suicide is presented as a noble act, but also as an indictment of the despotic institutions that make it necessary.

4. The Spirit of the Laws

Montesquieu's aim in *The Spirit of the Laws* is to explain human laws and social institutions. This might seem like an impossible project: unlike physical laws, which are, according to Montesquieu, instituted and sustained by God, positive laws and social institutions are created by fallible human beings who are "subject ... to ignorance and error, [and] hurried away by a thousand impetuous passions" (SL 1.1). One might therefore expect our laws and institutions to be no more comprehensible than any other catalog of human follies, an expectation which the extraordinary diversity of laws adopted by different societies would seem to confirm.

Nonetheless, Montesquieu believes that this apparent chaos is much more comprehensible than one might think. On his view, the key to understanding different laws and social systems is to recognize that they should be adapted to a variety of different factors, and cannot be properly understood unless one considers them in this light. Specifically, laws should be adapted "to the people for whom they are framed..., to the nature and principle of each government, ..., to the climate of each country, to the quality of its soil, to its situation and extent, to the principal occupation of the natives, whether husbandmen, huntsmen or shepherds: they should have relation to the degree of liberty which the constitution will bear; to the religion of the inhabitants, to their inclinations, riches, numbers, commerce, manners, and customs. In fine, they have relations to each other, as also to their origin, to the intent of the legislator, and to the order of things on which they are established; in all of which different lights they ought to be considered" (SL 1.3). When we consider legal and social systems in relation to these various factors, Montesquieu believes, we will find that many laws and institutions that had seemed puzzling or even perverse are in fact quite comprehensible.

Understanding why we have the laws we do is important in itself. However, it also serves practical purposes. Most importantly, it will discourage misguided attempts at reform. Montesquieu is not a utopian, either by temperament or conviction. He believes that to live under a stable, non-despotic government that leaves its law-abiding citizens more or less free to live their lives is a great good,
and that no such government should be lightly tampered with. If we understand our system of
government, and the ways in which it is adapted to the conditions of our country and its people, we
will see that many of its apparently irrational features actually make sense, and that to 'reform' these
features would actually weaken it. Thus, for instance, one might think that a monarchical
government would be strengthened by weakening the nobility, thereby giving more power to the
monarch. On Montesquieu's view, this is false: to weaken those groups or institutions which check
a monarch's power is to risk transforming monarchy into despotism, a form of government that is
both abhorrent and unstable.

Understanding our laws will also help us to see which aspects of them are genuinely in need of
reform, and how these reforms might be accomplished. For instance, Montesquieu believes that the
laws of many countries can be made be more liberal and more humane, and that they can often be
applied less arbitrarily, with less scope for the unpredictable and oppressive use of state power.
Likewise, religious persecution and slavery can be abolished, and commerce can be encouraged.
These reforms would generally strengthen monarchical governments, since they enhance the
freedom and dignity of citizens. If lawmakers understand the relations between laws on the one
hand and conditions of their countries and the principles of their governments on the other, they
will be in a better position to carry out such reforms without undermining the governments they
seek to improve.

4.1 Forms of Government

Montesquieu holds that there are three types of governments: republican governments, which can
take either democratic or aristocratic forms; monarchies; and despotisms. Unlike, for instance,
Aristotle, Montesquieu does not distinguish forms of government on the basis of the virtue of the
sovereign. The distinction between monarchy and despotism, for instance, depends not on the
virtue of the monarch, but on whether or not he governs "by fixed and established laws". Each form
of government has a principle, a set of "human passions which set it in motion" and each can be
corrupted if its principle is undermined or destroyed.

In a democracy, the people are sovereign. They may govern through ministers, or be advised by a
senate, but they must have the power of choosing their ministers and senators for themselves. The
principle of democracy is political virtue, by which Montesquieu means "the love of the laws and
of our country", including its democratic constitution. The form of a democratic government makes
the laws governing suffrage and voting fundamental. The need to protect its principle, however,
imposes far more extensive requirements. On Montesquieu's view, the virtue required by a
functioning democracy is not natural. It requires "a constant preference of public to private
interest"; it "limits ambition to the sole desire, to the sole happiness, of doing greater services to our
country than the rest of our fellow citizens"; and it "is a self-renunciation, which is ever arduous
and painful". Montesquieu compares it to monks' love for their order: "their rule debars them from
all those things by which the ordinary passions are fed; there remains therefore only this passion for
the very rule that torments them. ... the more it curbs their inclinations, the more force it gives to
the only passion left them". To produce this unnatural self-renunciation, "the whole power of
education is required". A democracy must educate its citizens to identify their interests with the
interests of their country, and should have censors to preserve its mores. It should seek to establish
frugality by law, so as to prevent its citizens from being tempted to advance their own private
interests at the expense of the public good; for the same reason, the laws by which property is
transferred should aim to preserve an equal distribution of property among citizens. Its territory
should be small, so that it is easy for citizens to identify with it, and more difficult for extensive private interests to emerge.

Democracies can be corrupted in two ways: by what Montesquieu calls "the spirit of inequality" and "the spirit of extreme equality". The spirit of inequality arises when citizens no longer identify their interests with the interests of their country, and therefore seek both to advance their own private interests at the expense of their fellow citizens, and to acquire political power over them. The spirit of extreme equality arises when the people are no longer content to be equal as citizens, but want to be equal in every respect. In a functioning democracy, the people choose magistrates to exercise executive power, and they respect and obey the magistrates they have chosen. If those magistrates forfeit their respect, they replace them. When the spirit of extreme equality takes root, however, the citizens neither respect nor obey any magistrate. They "want to manage everything themselves, to debate for the senate, to execute for the magistrate, and to decide for the judges". Eventually the government will cease to function, the last remnants of virtue will disappear, and democracy will be replaced by despotism.

In an aristocracy, one part of the people governs the rest. The principle of an aristocratic government is moderation, the virtue which leads those who govern in an aristocracy to restrain themselves both from oppressing the people and from trying to acquire excessive power over one another. In an aristocracy, the laws should be designed to instill and protect this spirit of moderation. To do so, they must do three things. First, the laws must prevent the nobility from abusing the people. The power of the nobility makes such abuse a standing temptation in an aristocracy; to avoid it, the laws should deny the nobility some powers, like the power to tax, which would make this temptation all but irresistible, and should try to foster responsible and moderate administration. Second, the laws should disguise as much as possible the difference between the nobility and the people, so that the people feel their lack of power as little as possible. Thus the nobility should have modest and simple manners, since if they do not attempt to distinguish themselves from the people "the people are apt to forget their subjection and weakness". Finally, the laws should try to ensure equality among the nobles themselves, and among noble families. When they fail to do so, the nobility will lose its spirit of moderation, and the government will be corrupted.

In a monarchy, one person governs "by fixed and established laws". According to Montesquieu, these laws "necessarily suppose the intermediate channels through which (the monarch's) power flows: for if there be only the momentary and capricious will of a single person to govern the state, nothing can be fixed, and, of course, there is no fundamental law". These 'intermediate channels' are such subordinate institutions as the nobility and an independent judiciary; and the laws of a monarchy should therefore be designed to preserve their power. The principle of monarchical government is honor. Unlike the virtue required by republican governments, the desire to win honor and distinction comes naturally to us. For this reason education has a less difficult task in a monarchy than in a republic: it need only heighten our ambitions and our sense of our own worth, provide us with an ideal of honor worth aspiring to, and cultivate in us the politeness needed to live with others whose sense of their worth matches our own. The chief task of the laws in a monarchy is to protect the subordinate institutions that distinguish monarchy from despotism. To this end, they should make it easy to preserve large estates undivided, protect the rights and privileges of the nobility, and promote the rule of law. They should also encourage the proliferation of distinctions and of rewards for honorable conduct, including luxuries.
A monarchy is corrupted when the monarch either destroys the subordinate institutions that constrain his will, or decides to rule arbitrarily, without regard to the basic laws of his country, or debases the honors at which his citizens might aim, so that "men are capable of being loaded at the very same time with infamy and with dignities". The first two forms of corruption destroy the checks on the sovereign's will that separate monarchy from despotism; the third severs the connection between honorable conduct and its proper rewards. In a functioning monarchy, personal ambition and a sense of honor work together. This is monarchy's great strength and the source of its extraordinary stability: whether its citizens act from genuine virtue, a sense of their own worth, a desire to serve their king, or personal ambition, they will be led to act in ways that serve their country. A monarch who rules arbitrarily, or who rewards servility and ignoble conduct instead of genuine honor, severs this connection and corrupts his government.

In despotic states "a single person directs everything by his own will and caprice". Without laws to check him, and with no need to attend to anyone who does not agree with him, a despot can do whatever he likes, however ill-advised or reprehensible. His subjects are no better than slaves, and he can dispose of them as he sees fit. The principle of despotism is fear. This fear is easily maintained, since the situation of a despot's subjects is genuinely terrifying. Education is unnecessary in despotism; if it exists at all, it should be designed to debase the mind and break the spirit. Such ideas as honor and virtue should not occur to a despot's subjects, since "persons capable of setting a value on themselves would be likely to create disturbances. Fear must therefore depress their spirits, and extinguish even the least sense of ambition". Their "portion here, like that of beasts, is instinct, compliance, and punishment", and any higher aspirations should be brutally discouraged.

Montesquieu writes that "the principle of despotic government is subject to a continual corruption, because it is even in its nature corrupt". This is true in several senses. First, despotic governments undermine themselves. Because property is not secure in a despotic state, commerce will not flourish, and the state will be poor. The people must be kept in a state of fear by the threat of punishment; however, over time the punishments needed to keep them in line will tend to become more and more severe, until further threats lose their force. Most importantly, however, the despot's character is likely to prevent him from ruling effectively. Since a despot's every whim is granted, he "has no occasion to deliberate, to doubt, to reason; he has only to will". For this reason he is never forced to develop anything like intelligence, character, or resolution. Instead, he is "naturally lazy, voluptuous, and ignorant", and has no interest in actually governing his people. He will therefore choose a vizier to govern for him, and retire to his seraglio to pursue pleasure. In his absence, however, intrigues against him will multiply, especially since his rule is necessarily odious to his subjects, and since they have so little to lose if their plots against him fail. He cannot rely on his army to protect him, since the more power they have, the greater the likelihood that his generals will themselves try to seize power. For this reason the ruler in a despotic state has no more security than his people.

Second, monarchical and republican governments involve specific governmental structures, and require that their citizens have specific sorts of motivation. When these structures crumble, or these motivations fail, monarchical and republican governments are corrupted, and the result of their corruption is that they fall into despotism. But when a particular despotic government falls, it is not generally replaced by a monarchy or a republic. The creation of a stable monarchy or republic is extremely difficult: "a masterpiece of legislation, rarely produced by hazard, and seldom attained by prudence". It is particularly difficult when those who would have both to frame the laws of such
a government and to live by them have previously been brutalized and degraded by despotism. Producing a despotic government, by contrast, is relatively straightforward. Despotism requires no powers to be carefully balanced against one another, no institutions to be created and maintained in existence, no complicated motivations to be fostered, and no restraints on power to be kept in place. One need only terrify one's fellow citizens enough to allow one to impose one's will on them; and this, Montesquieu claims, "is what every capacity may reach". For these reasons despotism necessarily stands in a different relation to corruption than other forms of government: while they are liable to corruption, despotism is its embodiment.

4.2 **Liberty**

Montesquieu is among the greatest philosophers of liberalism, but his is what Shklar has called "a liberalism of fear". According to Montesquieu, political liberty is "a tranquillity of mind arising from the opinion each person has of his safety". Liberty is not the freedom to do whatever we want: if we have the freedom to harm others, for instance, others will also have the freedom to harm us, and we will have no confidence in our own safety. Liberty involves living under laws that protect us from harm while leaving us free to do as much as possible, and that enable us to feel the greatest possible confidence that if we obey those laws, the power of the state will not be directed against us.

If it is to provide its citizens with the greatest possible liberty, a government must have certain features. First, since "constant experience shows us that every man invested with power is apt to abuse it ... it is necessary from the very nature of things that power should be a check to power". This is achieved through the separation of the executive, legislative, and judicial powers of government. If different persons or bodies exercise these powers, then each can check the others if they try to abuse their powers. But if one person or body holds several or all of these powers, then nothing prevents that person or body from acting tyrannically; and the people will have no confidence in their own security.

Certain arrangements make it easier for the three powers to check one another. Montesquieu argues that the legislative power alone should have the power to tax, since it can then deprive the executive of funding if the latter attempts to impose its will arbitrarily. Likewise, the executive power should have the right to veto acts of the legislature, and the legislature should be composed of two houses, each of which can prevent acts of the other from becoming law. The judiciary should be independent of both the legislature and the executive, and should restrict itself to applying the laws to particular cases in a fixed and consistent manner, so that "the judicial power, so terrible to mankind … becomes, as it were, invisible", and people "fear the office, but not the magistrate".

Liberty also requires that the laws concern only threats to public order and security, since such laws will protect us from harm while leaving us free to do as many other things as possible. Thus, for instance, the laws should not concern offenses against God, since He does not require their protection. They should not prohibit what they do not need to prohibit: "all punishment which is not derived from necessity is tyrannical. The law is not a mere act of power; things in their own nature indifferent are not within its province". The laws should be constructed to make it as easy as possible for citizens to protect themselves from punishment by not committing crimes. They should not be vague, since if they were, we might never be sure whether or not some particular action was a crime. Nor should they prohibit things we might do inadvertently, like bumping into a statue of
the emperor, or involuntarily, like doubting the wisdom of one of his decrees; if such actions were crimes, no amount of effort to abide by the laws of our country would justify confidence that we would succeed, and therefore we could never feel safe from criminal prosecution. Finally, the laws should make it as easy as possible for an innocent person to prove his or her innocence. They should concern outward conduct, not (for instance) our thoughts and dreams, since while we can try to prove that we did not perform some action, we cannot prove that we never had some thought. The laws should not criminalize conduct that is inherently hard to prove, like witchcraft; and lawmakers should be cautious when dealing with crimes like sodomy, which are typically not carried out in the presence of several witnesses, lest they "open a very wide door to calumny".

Montesquieu's emphasis on the connection between liberty and the details of the criminal law were unusual among his contemporaries, and inspired such later legal reformers as Cesare Beccaria.

4.3 CLIMATE AND GEOGRAPHY

Montesquieu believes that climate and geography affect the temperaments and customs of a country's inhabitants. He is not a determinist, and does not believe that these influences are irresistible. Nonetheless, he believes that the laws should take these effects into account, accommodating them when necessary, and counteracting their worst effects. According to Montesquieu; a cold climate constricts our bodies' fibers, and causes coarser juices to flow through them. Heat, by contrast, expands our fibers, and produces more rarefied juices. These physiological changes affect our characters. Those who live in cold climates are vigorous and bold, phlegmatic, frank, and not given to suspicion or cunning. They are relatively insensitive to pleasure and pain; Montesquieu writes that "you must flay a Muscovite alive to make him feel". Those who live in warm climates have stronger but less durable sensations. They are more fearful, more amorous, and more susceptible both to the temptations of pleasure and to real or imagined pain; but they are less resolute, and less capable of sustained or decisive action. The manners of those who live in temperate climates are "inconstant", since "the climate has not a quality determinate enough to fix them". These differences are not hereditary: if one moves from one sort of climate to another, one's temperament will alter accordingly.

A hot climate can make slavery comprehensible. Montesquieu writes that "the state of slavery is in its own nature bad"; he is particularly contemptuous of religious and racist justifications for slavery. However, on his view, there are two types of country in which slavery, while not acceptable, is less bad than it might otherwise be. In despotic countries, the situation of slaves is not that different from the situation of the despot's other subjects; for this reason, slavery in a despotic state is "more tolerable" than in other countries. In unusually hot countries, it might be that "the excess of heat enervates the body, and renders men so slothful and dispirited that nothing but the fear of chastisement can oblige them to perform any laborious duty: slavery is there more reconcilable to reason". However, Montesquieu writes that when work can be done by freemen motivated by the hope of gain rather than by slaves motivated by fear, the former will always work better; and that in such climates slavery is not only wrong but imprudent. He hopes that "there is not that climate upon earth where the most laborious services might not with proper encouragement be performed by freemen"; if there is no such climate, then slavery could never be justified on these grounds.

The quality of a country's soil also affects the form of its government. Monarchies are more common where the soil is fertile, and republics where it is barren. This is so for three reasons. First,
those who live in fruitful countries are more apt to be content with their situation, and to value in a
government not the liberty it bestows but its ability to provide them with enough security that they
can get on with their farming. They are therefore more willing to accept a monarchy if it can
provide such security. Often it can, since monarchies can respond to threats more quickly than
republics. Second, fertile countries are both more desirable than barren countries and easier to
conquer: they "are always of a level surface, where the inhabitants are unable to dispute against a
stronger power; they are then obliged to submit; and when they have once submitted, the spirit of
liberty cannot return; the wealth of the country is a pledge of their fidelity". Montesquieu believes
that monarchies are much more likely than republics to wage wars of conquest, and therefore that a
conquering power is likely to be a monarchy. Third, those who live where the soil is barren have to
work hard in order to survive; this tends to make them "industrious, sober, inured to hardship,
courageous, and fit for war". Those who inhabit fertile country, by contrast, favor "ease,
effeminacy, and a certain fondness for the preservation of life". For this reason, the inhabitants of
barren countries are better able to defend themselves from such attacks as might occur, and to
defend their liberty against those who would destroy it.

These facts give barren countries advantages that compensate for the infertility of their soil. Since
they are less likely to be invaded, they are less likely to be sacked and devastated; and they are
more likely to be worked well, since "countries are not cultivated in proportion to their fertility, but
to their liberty". This is why "the best provinces are most frequently depopulated, while the
frightful countries of the North continue always inhabited, from their being almost uninhabitable".

Montesquieu believes that the climate and geography of Asia explain why despotism flourishes
there. Asia, he thinks, has two features that distinguish it from Europe. First, Asia has virtually no
temperate zone. While the mountains of Scandinavia shelter Europe from arctic winds, Asia has no
such buffer; for this reason its frigid northern zone extends much further south than in Europe, and
there is a relatively quick transition from it to the tropical south. For this reason "the warlike, brave,
and active people touch immediately upon those who are indolent, effeminate and timorous; the one
must, therefore, conquer, and the other be conquered". In Europe, by contrast, the climate changes
gradually from cold to hot; therefore "strong nations are opposed to the strong; and those who join
each other have nearly the same courage". Second, Asia has larger plains than Europe. Its mountain
ranges lie further apart, and its rivers are not such formidable barriers to invasion. Since Europe is
naturally divided into smaller regions, it is more difficult for any one power to conquer them all;
this means that Europe will tend to have more and smaller states. Asia, by contrast, tends to have
much larger empires, which predisposes it to despotism.

4.4 Commerce

Of all the ways in which a country might seek to enrich itself, Montesquieu believes, commerce is
the only one without overwhelming drawbacks. Conquering and plundering one's neighbors can
provide temporary infusions of money, but over time the costs of maintaining an occupying army
and administering subjugated peoples impose strains that few countries can endure. Extracting
precious metals from colonial mines leads to general inflation; thus the costs of extraction increase
while the value of the extracted metals decreases. The increased availability of money furthers the
development of commerce in other countries; however, in the country which extracts gold and
silver, domestic industry is destroyed.
Commerce, by contrast, has no such disadvantages. It does not require vast armies, or the continued subjugation of other peoples. It does not undermine itself, as the extraction of gold from colonial mines does, and it rewards domestic industry. It therefore sustains itself, and nations which engage in it, over time. While it does not produce all the virtues — hospitality, Montesquieu thinks, is more often found among the poor than among commercial peoples — it does produce some: "the spirit of commerce is naturally attended with that of frugality, economy, moderation, labor, prudence, tranquility, order, and rule". In addition, it "is a cure for the most destructive prejudices", improves manners, and leads to peace among nations.

In monarchies, Montesquieu believes, the aim of commerce is, for the most part, to supply luxuries. In republics, it is to bring from one country what is wanted in another, "gaining little" but "gaining incessantly". In despotisms, there is very little commerce of any kind, since there is no security of property. In a monarchy, neither kings nor nobles should engage in commerce, since this would risk concentrating too much power in their hands. By the same token, there should be no banks in a monarchy, since a treasure "no sooner becomes great than it becomes the treasure of the prince". In republics, by contrast, banks are extremely useful, and anyone should be allowed to engage in trade. Restrictions on which profession a person can follow destroy people's hopes of bettering their situation; they are therefore appropriate only to despotic states.

While some mercantilists had argued that commerce is a zero-sum game in which when some gain, others necessarily lose, Montesquieu believes that commerce benefits all countries except those who have nothing but their land and what it produces. In those deeply impoverished countries, commerce with other countries will encourage those who own the land to oppress those who work it, rather than encouraging the development of domestic industries and manufacture. However, all other countries benefit by commerce, and should seek to trade with as many other nations as possible, "for it is competition which sets a just value on merchandise, and establishes the relation between them".

Montesquieu describes commerce as an activity that cannot be confined or controlled by any individual government or monarch. This, in his view, has always been true: "Commerce is sometimes destroyed by conquerors, sometimes cramped by monarchs; it traverses the earth, flies from the places where it is oppressed, and stays where it has liberty to breathe". However, the independence of commerce was greatly enhanced when, during the medieval period, Jews responded to persecution and the seizure of their property by inventing letters of exchange. "Commerce, by this method, became capable of eluding violence, and of maintaining everywhere its ground; the richest merchant having none but invisible effects, which he could convey imperceptibly wherever he pleased". This set in motion developments which made commerce still more independent of monarchs and their whims.

First, it facilitated the development of international markets, which place prices outside the control of governments. Money, according to Montesquieu, is "a sign which represents the value of all merchandise". The price of merchandise depends on the quantity of money and the quantity of merchandise, and on the amounts of money and merchandise that are in trade. Monarchs can affect this price by imposing tariffs or duties on certain goods. But since they cannot control the amounts of money and merchandise that are in trade within their own countries, let alone internationally, a monarch "can no more fix the price of merchandise than he can establish by a decree that the relation 1 has to 10 is equal to that of 1 to 20". If a monarch attempts to do so, he courts disaster: "Julian's lowering the price of provisions at Antioch was the cause of a most terrible famine".
Second, it permitted the development of international currency exchanges, which place the exchange rate of a country's currency largely outside the control of that country's government. A monarch can establish a currency, and stipulate how much of some metal each unit of that currency shall contain. However, monarchs cannot control the rates of exchange between their currencies and those of other countries. These rates depend on the relative scarcity of money in the countries in question, and they are "fixed by the general opinion of the merchants, never by the decrees of the prince". For this reason "the exchange of all places constantly tends to a certain proportion, and that in the very nature of things".

Finally, the development of international commerce gives governments a great incentive to adopt policies that favor, or at least do not impede, its development. Governments need to maintain confidence in their creditworthiness if they wish to borrow money; this deters them from at least the more extreme forms of fiscal irresponsibility, and from oppressing too greatly those citizens from whom they might later need to borrow money. Since the development of commerce requires the availability of loans, governments must establish interest rates high enough to encourage lending, but not so high as to make borrowing unprofitable. Taxes must not be so high that they deprive citizens of the hope of bettering their situations, and the laws should allow those citizens enough freedom to carry out commercial affairs.

In general, Montesquieu believes that commerce has had an extremely beneficial influence on government. Since commerce began to recover after the development of letters of exchange and the reintroduction of lending at interest, he writes: it became necessary that princes should govern with more prudence than they themselves could ever have imagined; for great exertions of authority were, in the event, found to be impolitic ... We begin to be cured of Machiavelism, and recover from it every day. More moderation has become necessary in the councils of princes. What would formerly have been called a master-stroke in politics would be now, independent of the horror it might occasion, the greatest imprudence. Happy is it for men that they are in a situation in which, though their passions prompt them to be wicked, it is, nevertheless, to their interest to be humane and virtuous.

4.5 Religion

Religion plays only a minor part in the Spirit of the Laws. God is described in Book 1 as creating nature and its laws; having done so, He vanishes, and plays no further explanatory role. In particular, Montesquieu does not explain the laws of any country by appeal to divine enlightenment, providence, or guidance. In the Spirit of the Laws, Montesquieu considers religions "in relation only to the good they produce in civil society", and not to their truth or falsity. He regards different religions as appropriate to different environments and forms of government. Protestantism is most suitable to republics, Catholicism to monarchies, and Islam to despotisms; the Islamic prohibition on eating pork is appropriate to Arabia, where hogs are scarce and contribute to disease, while in India, where cattle are badly needed but do not thrive, a prohibition on eating beef is suitable. Thus, "when Montezuma with so much obstinacy insisted that the religion of the Spaniards was good for their country and his for Mexico, he did not assert an absurdity".

Religion can help to ameliorate the effects of bad laws and institutions; it is the only thing capable of serving as a check on despotic power. However, on Montesquieu's view it is generally a mistake to base civil laws on religious principles. Religion aims at the perfection of the individual; civil
laws aim at the welfare of society. Given these different aims, what these two sets of laws should require will often differ; for this reason religion "ought not always to serve as a first principle to the civil laws". The civil laws are not an appropriate tool for enforcing religious norms of conduct: God has His own laws, and He is quite capable of enforcing them without our assistance. When we attempt to enforce God's laws for Him, or to cast ourselves as His protectors, we make our religion an instrument of fanaticism and oppression; this is a service neither to God nor to our country.

If several religions have gained adherents in a country, those religions should all be tolerated, not only by the state but by its citizens. The laws should "require from the several religions, not only that they shall not embroil the state, but that they shall not raise disturbances among themselves". While one can try to persuade people to change religions by offering them positive inducements to do so, attempts to force others to convert are ineffective and inhumane. In an unusually scathing passage, Montesquieu also argues that they are unworthy of Christianity, and writes: "if anyone in times to come shall dare to assert, that in the age in which we live, the people of Europe were civilized, you (the Inquisition) will be cited to prove that they were barbarians; and the idea they will have of you will be such as will dishonor your age, and spread hatred over all your contemporaries".

JEAN-JACQUES ROUSSEAU (1712—1778)

Jean-Jacques Rousseau was one of the most influential thinkers during the Enlightenment in 18th century Europe. His first major philosophical work, A DISCOURSE ON THE SCIENCES AND ARTS, was the winning response to an essay contest conducted by the Academy of Dijon in 1750. In this work, Rousseau argues that the progression of the sciences and arts has caused the corruption of virtue and morality. This discourse won Rousseau fame and recognition, and it laid much of the philosophical groundwork for a second, longer work, THE DISCOURSE ON THE ORIGIN OF INEQUALITY. The second discourse did not win the Academy’s prize, but like the first, it was widely read and further solidified Rousseau’s place as a significant intellectual figure. The central claim of the work is that human beings are basically good by nature, but were corrupted by the complex historical events that resulted in present day civil society. Rousseau’s praise of nature is a theme that continues throughout his later works as well, the most significant of which include his comprehensive work on the philosophy of education, THE SOCIAL CONTRACT, and his major work on political philosophy, THE CONFessions, THE REVERIES OF THE SOLITARY WALKER, and ROUSSEAU: JUDGE OF JEAN-JACQUES.

Rousseau greatly influenced Immanuel Kant’s work on ethics. His novel JULIE OR THE NEW ELOISE impacted the late eighteenth century’s Romantic Naturalism movement, and his political ideals were championed by leaders of the French Revolution.

1. LIFE

A. TRADITIONAL BIOGRAPHY
Jean-Jacques Rousseau was born to Isaac Rousseau and Suzanne Bernard in Geneva on June 28, 1712. His mother died only a few days later on July 7, and his only sibling, an older brother, ran away from home when Rousseau was still a child. Rousseau was therefore brought up mainly by his father, a clockmaker, with whom at an early age he read ancient Greek and Roman literature such as the Lives of Plutarch. His father got into a quarrel with a French captain, and at the risk of imprisonment, left Geneva for the rest of his life. Rousseau stayed behind and was cared for by an uncle who sent him along with his cousin to study in the village of Bosey. In 1725, Rousseau was apprenticed to an engraver and began to learn the trade. Although he did not detest the work, he thought his master to be violent and tyrannical. He therefore left Geneva in 1728, and fled to Annecy. Here he met Louise de Warens, who was instrumental in his conversion to Catholicism, which forced him to forfeit his Genevan citizenship (in 1754 he would make a return to Geneva and publicly convert back to Calvinism). Rousseau’s relationship to Mme. de Warens lasted for several years and eventually became romantic. During this time he earned money through secretarial, teaching, and musical jobs.

In 1742 Rousseau went to Paris to become a musician and composer. After two years spent serving a post at the French Embassy in Venice, he returned in 1745 and met a linen-maid named Therese Levasseur, who would become his lifelong companion (they eventually married in 1768). They had five children together, all of whom were left at the Paris orphanage. It was also during this time that Rousseau became friendly with the philosophers Condillac and Diderot. He worked on several articles on music for Diderot and d’Alembert’s Encyclopédie. In 1750 he published the Discourse on the Arts and Sciences, a response to the Academy of Dijon’s essay contest on the question, “Has the restoration of the sciences and arts tended to purify morals?” This discourse is what originally made Rousseau famous as it won the Academy’s prize. The work was widely read and was controversial. To some, Rousseau’s condemnation of the arts and sciences in the First Discourse made him an enemy of progress altogether, a view quite at odds with that of the Enlightenment project. Music was still a major part of Rousseau’s life at this point, and several years later, his opera, Le Devin du Village (The Village Soothsayer) was a great success and earned him even more recognition. But Rousseau attempted to live a modest life despite his fame, and after the success of his opera, he promptly gave up composing music.

In the autumn of 1753, Rousseau submitted an entry to another essay contest announced by the Academy of Dijon. This time, the question posed was, “What is the origin of inequality among men, and is it authorized by the natural law?” Rousseau’s response would become the Discourse on the Origin of Inequality Among Men. Rousseau himself thought this work to be superior to the First Discourse because the Second Discourse was significantly longer and more philosophically daring. The judges were irritated by its length as well its bold and unorthodox philosophical claims; they never finished reading it. However, Rousseau had already arranged to have it published elsewhere and like the First Discourse, it also was also widely read and discussed.

In 1756, a year after the publication of the Second Discourse, Rousseau and Therese Levasseur left Paris after being invited to a house in the country by Mme. D’Epinay, a friend to the Philosophes. His stay here lasted only a year and involved an affair with a woman named Sophie d’Houdetot, the mistress of his friend Saint-Lambert. In 1757, after repeated quarrels with Mme. D’Epinay and her other guests including Diderot, Rousseau moved to lodgings near the country home of the Duke of Luxemburg at Montmorency.
It was during this time that Rousseau wrote some of his most important works. In 1761 he published a novel, *Julie or the New Heloise*, which was one of the best selling of the century. Then, just a year later in 1762, he published two major philosophical treatises: in April his definitive work on political philosophy, *The Social Contract*, and in May a book detailing his views on education, *Emile*. Paris authorities condemned both of these books, primarily for claims Rousseau made in them about religion, which forced him to flee France. He settled in Switzerland and in 1764 he began writing his autobiography, his *Confessions*. A year later, after encountering difficulties with Swiss authorities, he spent time in Berlin and Paris, and eventually moved to England at the invitation of David Hume. However, due to quarrels with Hume, his stay in England lasted only a year, and in 1767 he returned to the southeast of France incognito.

After spending three years in the southeast, Rousseau returned to Paris in 1770 and copied music for a living. It was during this time that he wrote *Rousseau: Judge of Jean-Jacques* and the *Reveries of the Solitary Walker*, which would turn out to be his final works. He died on July 3, 1778. His *Confessions* were published several years after his death; and his later political writings, in the nineteenth century.

**B. The Confessions: Rousseau’s Autobiography**

Rousseau’s own account of his life is given in great detail in his *Confessions*, the same title that Saint Augustine gave his autobiography over a thousand years earlier. Rousseau wrote the *Confessions* late in his career, and it was not published until after his death. Incidentally, two of his other later works, the “Reveries of the Solitary Walker” and “Rousseau Judge of Jean Jacques” are also autobiographical. What is particularly striking about the *Confessions* is the almost apologetic tone that Rousseau takes at certain points to explain the various public as well as private events in his life, many of which caused great controversy. It is clear from this book that Rousseau saw the *Confessions* as an opportunity to justify himself against what he perceived as unfair attacks on his character and misunderstandings of his philosophical thought.

His life was filled with conflict, first when he was apprenticed, later in academic circles with other Enlightenment thinkers like Diderot and Voltaire, with Parisian and Swiss authorities and even with David Hume. Although Rousseau discusses these conflicts, and tries to explain his perspective on them, it is not his exclusive goal to justify all of his actions. He chastises himself and takes responsibility for many of these events, such as his extra-marital affairs. At other times, however, his paranoia is clearly evident as he discusses his intense feuds with friends and contemporaries. And herein lays the fundamental tension in the *Confessions*. Rousseau is at the same time trying both to justify his actions to the public so that he might gain its approval, but also to affirm his own uniqueness as a critic of that same public.

**2. Background**

**A. The Beginnings of Modern Philosophy and the Enlightenment**

Rousseau’s major works span the mid to late eighteenth century. As such, it is appropriate to consider Rousseau, at least chronologically, as an Enlightenment thinker. However, there is dispute as to whether Rousseau’s thought is best characterized as “Enlightenment” or “counter-Enlightenment.” The major goal of Enlightenment thinkers was to give a foundation to philosophy that was independent of any particular tradition, culture, or religion: one that any rational person
would accept. In the realm of science, this project has its roots in the birth of modern philosophy, in large part with the seventeenth century philosopher, René Descartes. Descartes was very skeptical about the possibility of discovering final causes, or purposes, in nature. Yet this teleological understanding of the world was the very cornerstone of Aristotelian metaphysics, which was the established philosophy of the time. And so Descartes’ method was to doubt these ideas, which he claims can only be understood in a confused way, in favor of ideas that he could conceive clearly and distinctly. In the *Meditations*, Descartes claims that the material world is made up of extension in space, and this extension is governed by mechanical laws that can be understood in terms of pure mathematics.

**B. The State of Nature as a Foundation for Ethics and Political Philosophy**

The scope of modern philosophy was not limited only to issues concerning science and metaphysics. Philosophers of this period also attempted to apply the same type of reasoning to ethics and politics. One approach of these philosophers was to describe human beings in the “state of nature.” That is, they attempted to strip human beings of all those attributes that they took to be the results of social conventions. In doing so, they hoped to uncover certain characteristics of human nature that were universal and unchanging. If this could be done, one could then determine the most effective and legitimate forms of government.

The two most famous accounts of the state of nature prior to Rousseau’s are those of Thomas Hobbes and John Locke. Hobbes contends that human beings are motivated purely by self-interest, and that the state of nature, which is the state of human beings without civil society, is the war of every person against every other. Hobbes does say that while the state of nature may not have existed all over the world at one particular time, it is the condition in which humans would be if there were no sovereign. Locke’s account of the state of nature is different in that it is an intellectual exercise to illustrate people’s obligations to one another. These obligations are articulated in terms of natural rights, including rights to life, liberty and property. Rousseau was also influenced by the modern natural law tradition, which attempted to answer the challenge of skepticism through a systematic approach to human nature that, like Hobbes, emphasized self-interest. Rousseau therefore often refers to the works of Hugo Grotius, Samuel von Pufendorf, Jean Barbeyrac, and Jean-Jacques Burlamaqui. Rousseau would give his own account of the state of nature in the *Discourse on the Origin and Foundations of Inequality among Men*, which will be examined below.

Also influential were the ideals of classical republicanism, which Rousseau took to be illustrative of virtues. These virtues allow people to escape vanity and an emphasis on superficial values that he thought to be so prevalent in modern society. This is a major theme of the *Discourse on the Sciences and Arts*.

**3. The Discourses**

**A. Discourse on the Sciences and Arts**

This is the work that originally won Rousseau fame and recognition. The Academy of Dijon posed the question, “Has the restoration of the sciences and arts tended to purify morals?” Rousseau’s answer to this question is an emphatic “no.” The *First Discourse* won the academy’s prize as the best essay. The work is perhaps the greatest example of Rousseau as a “counter-Enlightenment”
thinker. For the Enlightenment project was based on the idea that progress in fields like the arts and sciences do indeed contribute to the purification of morals on individual, social, and political levels.

The First Discourse begins with a brief introduction addressing the academy to which the work was submitted. Aware that his stance against the contribution of the arts and sciences to morality could potentially offend his readers, Rousseau claims, “I am not abusing science...I am defending virtue before virtuous men.” (First Discourse, Vol. I, p. 4). In addition to this introduction, the First Discourse is comprised of two main parts.

The first part is largely an historical survey. Using specific examples, Rousseau shows how societies in which the arts and sciences flourished more often than not saw the decline of morality and virtue. He notes that it was after philosophy and the arts flourished that ancient Egypt fell. Similarly, ancient Greece was once founded on notions of heroic virtue, but after the arts and sciences progressed, it became a society based on luxury and leisure. The one exception to this, according to Rousseau, was Sparta, which he praises for pushing the artists and scientists from its walls. Sparta is in stark contrast to Athens, which was the heart of good taste, elegance, and philosophy. Interestingly, Rousseau here discusses Socrates, as one of the few wise Athenians who recognized the corruption that the arts and sciences were bringing about. Rousseau paraphrases Socrates’ famous speech in the Apology. In his address to the court, Socrates says that the artists and philosophers of his day claim to have knowledge of piety, goodness, and virtue, yet they do not really understand anything. Rousseau’s historical inductions are not limited to ancient civilizations, however, as he also mentions China as a learned civilization that suffers terribly from its vices.

The second part of the First Discourse is an examination of the arts and sciences themselves, and the dangers they bring. First, Rousseau claims that the arts and sciences are born from our vices: “Astronomy was born from superstition; eloquence from ambition, hate, flattery, and falsehood; geometry from avarice, physics from vain curiosity; all, even moral philosophy, from human pride.” (First Discourse, Vol. I, p. 12). The attack on sciences continues as Rousseau articulates how they fail to contribute anything positive to morality. They take time from the activities that are truly important, such as love of country, friends, and the unfortunate. Philosophical and scientific knowledge of subjects such as the relationship of the mind to the body, the orbit of the planets, and physical laws that govern particles fail to genuinely provide any guidance for making people more virtuous citizens. Rather, Rousseau argues that they create a false sense of need for luxury, so that science becomes simply a means for making our lives easier and more pleasurable, but not morally better.

The arts are the subject of similar attacks in the second part of the First Discourse. Artists, Rousseau says, wish first and foremost to be applauded. Their work comes from a sense of wanting to be praised as superior to others. Society begins to emphasize specialized talents rather than virtues such as courage, generosity, and temperance. This leads to yet another danger: the decline of military virtue, which is necessary for a society to defend itself against aggressors. And yet, after all of these attacks, the First Discourse ends with the praise of some very wise thinkers, among them, Bacon, Descartes, and Newton. These men were carried by their vast genius and were able to avoid corruption. However, Rousseau says, they are exceptions; and the great majority of people ought to focus their energies on improving their characters, rather than advancing the ideals of the Enlightenment in the arts and sciences.

B. Discourse on the Origin of Inequality
The Second Discourse, like the first, was a response to a question put forth by the academy of Dijon: “What is the origin of inequality among men; and is it authorized by the natural law?” Rousseau’s response to this question, the Discourse on the Origin of Inequality, is significantly different from the First Discourse for several reasons. First, in terms of the academy’s response, the Second Discourse was not nearly as well received. It exceeded the desired length, it was four times the length of the first and made very bold philosophical claims; unlike the First Discourse, it did not win the prize. However, as Rousseau was now a well-known and respected author, he was able to have it published independently. Secondly, if the First Discourse is indicative of Rousseau as a “counter-Enlightenment” thinker, the Second Discourse, by contrast, can rightly be considered to be representative of Enlightenment thought. This is primarily because Rousseau, like Hobbes, attacks the classical notion of human beings as naturally social. Finally, in terms of its influence, the Second Discourse is now much more widely read, and is more representative of Rousseau’s general philosophical outlook. In the Confessions, Rousseau writes that he himself sees the Second Discourse as far superior to the first.

The Discourse on the Origin of Inequality is divided into four main parts: a dedication to the Republic of Geneva, a short preface, a first part, and a second part. The scope of Rousseau’s project is not significantly different from that of Hobbes in the Leviathan or Locke in the Second Treatise on Government. Like them, Rousseau understands society to be an invention, and he attempts to explain the nature of human beings by stripping them of all of the accidental qualities brought about by socialization. Thus, understanding human nature amounts to understanding what humans are like in a pure state of nature. This is in stark contrast to the classical view, most notably that of Aristotle, which claims that the state of civil society is the natural human state. Like Hobbes and Locke, however, it is doubtful that Rousseau meant his readers to understand the pure state of nature that he describes in the Second Discourse as a literal historical account. In its opening, he says that it must be denied that men were ever in the pure state of nature, citing revelation as a source which tells us that God directly endowed the first man with understanding (a capacity that he will later say is completely undeveloped in natural man). However, it seems in other parts of the Second Discourse that Rousseau is positing an actual historical account. Some of the stages in the progression from nature to civil society, Rousseau will argue, are empirically observable in so-called primitive tribes. And so the precise historicity with which one ought to regard Rousseau’s state of nature is the matter of some debate.

Part one is Rousseau’s description of human beings in the pure state of nature, uncorrupted by civilization and the socialization process. And although this way of examining human nature is consistent with other modern thinkers, Rousseau’s picture of “man in his natural state,” is radically different. Hobbes describes each human in the state of nature as being in a constant state of war against all others; hence life in the state of nature is solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short. But Rousseau argues that previous accounts such as Hobbes’ have all failed to actually depict humans in the true state of nature. Instead, they have taken civilized human beings and simply removed laws, government, and technology. For humans to be in a constant state of war with one another, they would need to have complex thought processes involving notions of property, calculations about the future, immediate recognition of all other humans as potential threats, and possibly even minimal language skills. These faculties, according to Rousseau, are not natural, but rather, they develop historically. In contrast to Hobbes, Rousseau describes natural man as isolated, timid, peaceful, mute, and without the foresight to worry about what the future will bring.
Purely natural human beings are fundamentally different from the egoistic Hobbesian view in another sense as well. Rousseau acknowledges that self-preservation is one principle of motivation for human actions, but unlike Hobbes, it is not the only principle. If it were, Rousseau claims that humans would be nothing more than monsters. Therefore, Rousseau concludes that self-preservation, or more generally self-interest, is only one of two principles of the human soul. The second principle is pity; it is “an innate repugnance to see his fellow suffer.” It may seem that Rousseau’s depiction of natural human beings is one that makes them no different from other animals. However, Rousseau says that unlike all other creatures, humans are free agents. They have reason, although in the state of nature it is not yet developed. But it is this faculty that makes the long transition from the state of nature to the state of civilized society possible. He claims that if one examines any other species over the course of a thousand years, they will not have advanced significantly. Humans can develop when circumstances arise that trigger the use of reason.

Rousseau’s praise of humans in the state of nature is perhaps one of the most misunderstood ideas in his philosophy. Although the human being is naturally good and the “noble savage” is free from the vices that plague humans in civil society, Rousseau is not simply saying that humans in nature are good and humans in civil society are bad. Furthermore, he is not advocating a return to the state of nature, though some commentators, even his contemporaries such as Voltaire, have attributed such a view to him. Human beings in the state of nature are amoral creatures, neither virtuous nor vicious. After humans leave the state of nature, they can enjoy a higher form of goodness, moral goodness, which Rousseau articulates most explicitly in the Social Contract.

Having described the pure state of nature in the first part of the Second Discourse, Rousseau’s task in the second part is to explain the complex series of historical events that moved humans from this state to the state of present day civil society. Although they are not stated explicitly, Rousseau sees this development as occurring in a series of stages. From the pure state of nature, humans begin to organize into temporary groups for the purposes of specific tasks like hunting an animal. Very basic language in the form of grunts and gestures comes to be used in these groups. However, the groups last only as long as the task takes to be completed, and then they dissolve as quickly as they came together. The next stage involves more permanent social relationships including the traditional family, from which arises conjugal and paternal love. Basic conceptions of property and feelings of pride and competition develop in this stage as well. However, at this stage they are not developed to the point that they cause the pain and inequality that they do in present day society. If humans could have remained in this state, they would have been happy for the most part, primarily because the various tasks that they engaged in could all be done by each individual. The next stage in the historical development occurs when the arts of agriculture and metallurgy are discovered. Because these tasks required a division of labor, some people were better suited to certain types of physical labor, others to making tools, and still others to governing and organizing workers. Soon, there become distinct social classes and strict notions of property, creating conflict and ultimately a state of war not unlike the one that Hobbes describes. Those who have the most to lose call on the others to come together under a social contract for the protection of all. But Rousseau claims that the contract is specious, and that it was no more than a way for those in power to keep their power by convincing those with less that it was in their interest to accept the situation. And so, Rousseau says, “All ran to meet their chains thinking they secured their freedom, for although they had enough reason to feel the advantages of political establishment, they did not have enough experience to foresee its dangers.”
The *Discourse on the Origin of Inequality* remains one of Rousseau’s most famous works, and lays the foundation for much of his political thought as it is expressed in the *Discourse on Political Economy* and *Social Contract*. Ultimately, the work is based on the idea that by nature, humans are essentially peaceful, content, and equal. It is the socialization process that has produced inequality, competition, and the egoistic mentality.

### C. Discourse on Political Economy

The *Discourse on Political Economy* originally appeared in Diderot and d’Alembert’s Encyclopedia. In terms of its content the work seems to be, in many ways, a precursor to the *Social Contract*, which would appear in 1762. And whereas the *Discourse on the Sciences and Arts* and the *Discourse on the Origin of Inequality* look back on history and condemn what Rousseau sees as the lack of morality and justice in his own present day society, this work is much more constructive. That is, the *Discourse on Political Economy* explains what he takes to be a legitimate political regime.

The work is perhaps most significant because it is here that Rousseau introduces the concept of the “general will,” a major aspect of his political thought which is further developed in the *Social Contract*. There is debate among scholars about how exactly one ought to interpret this concept, but essentially, one can understand the general will in terms of an analogy. A political society is like a human body. A body is a unified entity though it has various parts that have particular functions. And just as the body has a will that looks after the well-being of the whole, a political state also has a will which looks to its general well-being. The major conflict in political philosophy occurs when the general will is at odds with one or more of the individual wills of its citizens.

With the conflict between the general and individual wills in mind, Rousseau articulates three maxims which supply the basis for a politically virtuous state: (1) Follow the general will in every action; (2) Ensure that every particular will is in accordance with the general will; and (3) Public needs must be satisfied. Citizens follow these maxims when there is a sense of equality among them, and when they develop a genuine respect for law. This again is in contrast to Hobbes, who says that laws are only followed when people fear punishment. That is, the state must make the penalty for breaking the law so severe that people do not see breaking the law to be of any advantage to them. Rousseau claims, instead, that when laws are in accordance with the general will, good citizens will respect and love both the state and their fellow citizens. Therefore, citizens will see the intrinsic value in the law, even in cases in which it may conflict with their individual wills.

### 4. The Social Contract

#### A. Background

The *Social Contract* is, like the *Discourse on Political Economy*, a work that is more philosophically constructive than either of the first two *Discourses*. Furthermore, the language used in the first and second *Discourses* is crafted in such a way as to make them appealing to the public, whereas the tone of the *Social Contract* is not nearly as eloquent and romantic. Another more obvious difference is that the *Social Contract* was not nearly as well-received; it was immediately banned by Paris authorities. And although the first two *Discourses* were, at the time of their publication, very popular, they are not philosophically systematic. The *Social*
CONTRACT, by contrast, is quite systematic and outlines how a government could exist in such a way that it protects the equality and character of its citizens. But although Rousseau’s project is different in scope in the SOCIAL CONTRACT than it was in the first two DISCOURSES, it would be a mistake to say that there is no philosophical connection between them. For the earlier works discuss the problems in civil society as well as the historical progression that has led to them. The DISCOURSE ON THE SCIENCES AND ARTS claims that society has become such that no emphasis is put on the importance of virtue and morality. The DISCOURSE ON THE ORIGIN OF INEQUALITY traces the history of human beings from the pure state of nature through the institution of a specious social contract that results in present day civil society. The SOCIAL CONTRACT does not deny any of these criticisms. In fact, chapter one begins with one of Rousseau’s most famous quotes, which echoes the claims of his earlier works: “Man was/is born free; and everywhere he is in chains.” But unlike the first two DISCOURSES, the SOCIAL CONTRACT looks forward, and explores the potential for moving from the specious social contract to a legitimate one.

B. THE GENERAL WILL

The concept of the general will, first introduced in the DISCOURSE ON POLITICAL ECONOMY, is further developed in the SOCIAL CONTRACT although it remains ambiguous and difficult to interpret. The most pressing difficulty that arises is in the tension that seems to exist between liberalism and communitarianism. On one hand, Rousseau argues that following the general will allows for individual diversity and freedom. But at the same time, the general will also encourages the well-being of the whole, and therefore can conflict with the particular interests of individuals. This tension has led some to claim that Rousseau’s political thought is hopelessly inconsistent, although others have attempted to resolve the tension in order to find some type of middle ground between the two positions. Despite these difficulties, however, there are some aspects of the general will that Rousseau clearly articulates. First, the general will is directly tied to Sovereignty: but not Sovereignty merely in the sense of whomever holds power. Simply having power, for Rousseau, is not sufficient for that power to be morally legitimate. True Sovereignty is directed always at the public good, and the general will, therefore, speaks always infallibly to the benefit of the people. Second, the object of the general will is always abstract, or for lack of a better term, general. It can set up rules, social classes, or even a monarchial government, but it can never specify the particular individuals who are subject to the rules, members of the classes, or the rulers in the government. This is in keeping with the idea that the general will speaks to the good of the society as a whole. It is not to be confused with the collection of individual wills which would put their own needs, or the needs of particular factions, above those of the general public. This leads to a related point. Rousseau argues that there is an important distinction to be made between the general will and the collection of individual wills: “There is often a great deal of difference between the will of all and the general will. The latter looks only to the common interest; the former considers private interest and is only a sum of private wills. But take away from these same wills the pluses and minuses that cancel each other out, and the remaining sum of the differences is the general will.” This point can be understood in an almost Rawlsian sense, namely that if the citizens were ignorant of the groups to which they would belong, they would inevitably make decisions that would be to the advantage of the society as a whole, and thus be in accordance with the general will.

c. EQUALITY, FREEDOM, AND SOVEREIGNTY

One problem that arises in Rousseau’s political theory is that the SOCIAL CONTRACT purports to be a legitimate state in one sense because it frees human beings from their chains. But if the state is to
protect individual freedom, how can this be reconciled with the notion of the general will, which looks always to the welfare of the whole and not to the will of the individual? This criticism, although not unfounded, is also not devastating. To answer it, one must return to the concepts of Sovereignty and the general will. True Sovereignty, again, is not simply the will of those in power, but rather the general will. Sovereignty does have the proper authority override the particular will of an individual or even the collective will of a particular group of individuals. However, as the general will is infallible, it can only do so when intervening will be to the benefit of the society. To understand this, one must take note of Rousseau’s emphasis on the equality and freedom of the citizens. Proper intervention on the part of the Sovereign is therefore best understood as that which secures the freedom and equality of citizens rather than that which limits them. Ultimately, the delicate balance between the supreme authority of the state and the rights of individual citizens is based on a social compact that protects society against factions and gross differences in wealth and privilege among its members.

5. The Emile

A. Background

The Emile or Education is essentially a work that details Rousseau’s philosophy of education. It was originally published just several months after the Social Contract. Like the Social Contract, the Emile was immediately banned by Paris authorities, which prompted Rousseau to flee France. The major point of controversy in the Emile was not in his philosophy of education per se, however. Rather, it was the claims in one part of the book, the Profession of Faith of the Savoyard Vicar in which Rousseau argues against traditional views of religion that led to the banning of the book. The Emile is unique in one sense because it is written as part novel and part philosophical treatise. Rousseau would use this same form in some of his later works as well. The book is written in first person, with the narrator as the tutor, and describes his education of a pupil, Emile, from birth to adulthood.

B. Education

The basic philosophy of education that Rousseau advocates in the Emile, much like his thought in the first two Discourses, is rooted in the notion that human beings are good by nature. The Emile is a large work, which is divided into five Books, and Book One opens with Rousseau’s claim that the goal of education should be to cultivate our natural tendencies. This is not to be confused with Rousseau’s praise of the pure state of nature in the Second Discourse. Rousseau is very clear that a return the state of nature once human beings have become civilized is not possible. Therefore, we should not seek to be noble savages in the literal sense, with no language, no social ties, and an underdeveloped faculty of reason. Rather, Rousseau says, someone who has been properly educated will be engaged in society, but relate to his or her fellow citizens in a natural way.

At first glance, this may seem paradoxical: If human beings are not social by nature, how can one properly speak of more or less natural ways of socializing with others? The best answer to this question requires an explanation of what Rousseau calls the two forms of self-love: Amour-Propre and Amour de Soi. Amour de Soi is a natural form of self-love in that it does not depend on others. Rousseau claims that by our nature, each of us has this natural feeling of love toward ourselves. By contrast, Amour-Propre is an unnatural self-love and is a negative product
of the socialization process. Unlike *AMOUR DE SOI, AMOUR-PROPRE* is a love of self that depends on comparing oneself with others. Essentially it consists in someone basing his or her self-worth on a perceived superiority to another. It breeds contempt, hostility, and frivolous competition. In fact, it is precisely these negative consequences that are under attack in the *DISCOURSE ON THE SCIENCES AND ARTS*.

Rousseau’s philosophy of education, therefore, is not geared simply at particular techniques that best ensure that the pupil will absorb information and concepts. It is better understood as a way of ensuring that the pupil’s character be developed in such a way as to have a healthy sense of self-worth and morality. This will allow the pupil to be virtuous even in the unnatural and imperfect society in which he lives. The character of Emile begins learning important moral lessons from his infancy, thorough childhood, and into early adulthood. His education relies on the tutor’s constant supervision. The tutor must even manipulate the environment in order to teach sometimes difficult moral lessons about humility, chastity, and honesty.

## C. WOMEN, MARRIAGE, AND FAMILY

As Emile’s is a moral education, Rousseau discusses in great detail how the young pupil is to be brought up to regard women and sexuality. He introduces the character of Sophie, and explains how her education differs from Emile’s. Hers is not as focused on theoretical matters, as men’s minds are more suited to that type of thinking. Rousseau’s view on the nature of the relationship between men and women is rooted in the notion that men are stronger and therefore more independent. They depend on women only because they desire them. By contrast, women both need and desire men. Sophie is educated in such a way that she will fill what Rousseau takes to be her natural role as a wife. She is to be submissive to Emile. And although Rousseau advocates these very specific gender roles, it would be a mistake to take the view that Rousseau regards men as simply superior to women. Women have particular talents that men do not; Rousseau says that women are cleverer than men, and that they excel more in matters of practical reason. These views are continually discussed among both feminist and Rousseau scholars.

## D. The Profession of Faith of the Savoyard Vicar

The *PROFESSION OF FAITH OF THE SAVOYARD VICAR* is part of the fourth Book of the *EMILE*. In his discussion of how to properly educate a pupil about religious matters, the tutor recounts a tale of an Italian who thirty years before was exiled from his town. Disillusioned, the young man was aided by a priest who explained his own views of religion, nature, and science. Rousseau then writes in the first person from the perspective of this young man, and recounts the Vicar’s speech.

The priest begins by explaining how, after a scandal in which he broke his vow of celibacy, he was arrested, suspended, and then dismissed. In his woeful state, the priest began to question all of his previously held ideas. Doubting everything, the priest attempts a Cartesian search for truth by doubting all things that he does not know with absolute certainty. But unlike Descartes, the Vicar is unable to come to any kind of clear and distinct ideas that could not be doubted. Instead, he follows what he calls the “Inner Light” which provides him with truths so intimate that he cannot help but accept them, even though they may be subject to philosophical difficulties. Among these truths, the Vicar finds that he exists as a free being with a free will which is distinct from his body that is not subject to physical, mechanical laws of motion. To the problem of how his immaterial will moves his physical body, the Vicar simply says “I cannot tell, but I perceive that it does so in myself; I
will to do something and I do it; I will to move my body and it moves, but if an inanimate body, when at rest, should begin to move itself, the thing is incomprehensible and without precedent. The will is known to me in its action, not in its nature.” (Emile, p. 282). The discussion is particularly significant in that it marks the most comprehensive metaphysical account in Rousseau’s thought.

The Profession of Faith also includes the controversial discussion of natural religion, which was in large part the reason why Emile was banned. The controversy of this doctrine is the fact that it is categorically opposed to orthodox Christian views, specifically the claim that Christianity is the one true religion. The Vicar claims instead that knowledge of God is found in the observation of the natural order and one’s place in it. And so, any organized religion that correctly identifies God as the creator and preaches virtue and morality, is true in this sense. Therefore, the Vicar concludes, each citizen should dutifully practice the religion of his or her own country so long as it is in line with the religion, and thus morality, of nature.

6. Other Works

A. Julie or the New Heloise

Julie or the New Heloise remains one of Rousseau’s popular works, though it is not a philosophical treatise, but rather a novel. The work tells the story of Julie d’Etange and St. Preux, who were one time lovers. Later, at the invitation of her husband, St. Preux unexpectedly comes back into Julie’s life. Although not a work of philosophy per se, Julie or the New Heloise is still unmistakably Rousseau’s. The major tenets of his thought are clearly evident; the struggle of the individual against societal norms, emotions versus reason, and the goodness of human nature are all prevalent themes.

B. Reveries of the Solitary Walker

Rousseau began writing the Reveries of the Solitary Walker in the fall of 1776. By this time, he had grown increasingly distressed over the condemnation of several of his works, most notably the Emile and the Social Contract. This public rejection, combined with rifts in his personal relationships, left him feeling betrayed and even as though he was the victim of a great conspiracy. The work is divided into ten “walks” in which Rousseau reflects on his life, what he sees as his contribution to the public good, and how he and his work have been misunderstood. It is interesting that Rousseau returns to nature, which he had always praised throughout his career. One also recognizes in this praise the recognition of God as the just creator of nature, a theme so prevalent in the Profession of Faith of the Savoyard Vicar. The Reveries of the Solitary Walker, like many of Rousseau’s other works, is part story and part philosophical treatise. The reader sees in it, not only philosophy, but also the reflections of the philosopher himself.

C. Rousseau: Judge of Jean Jacques

The most distinctive feature of this late work, often referred to simply as the Dialogues, is that it is written in the form of three dialogues. The characters in the dialogues are “Rousseau” and an interlocutor identified simply as a “Frenchman.” The subject of these characters’ conversations is the author “Jean-Jacques,” who is the actual historical Rousseau. This somewhat confusing arrangement serves the purpose of Rousseau judging his own career. The character “Rousseau,” therefore, represents Rousseau had he not written his collected works but instead had discovered
them as if they were written by someone else. What would he think of this author, represented in the _Dialogues_ as the character “Jean-Jacques?” This self-examination makes two major claims. First, like the _Reveries_, it makes clearly evident the fact that Rousseau felt victimized and betrayed, and shows perhaps even more so than the _Reveries_, Rousseau’s growing paranoia. And second, the _Dialogues_ represent one of the few places that Rousseau claims his work is systematic. He claims that there is a philosophical consistency that runs throughout his works. Whether one accepts that such a system is present in Rousseau’s philosophy or not is a question that was not only debated during Rousseau’s time, but is also continually discussed among contemporary scholars.

### 7. Historical and Philosophical Influence

It is difficult to overestimate Rousseau’s influence, both in the Western philosophical tradition, and historically. Perhaps his greatest directly philosophical influence is on the ethical thought of Immanuel Kant. This may seem puzzling at first glance. For Kant, the moral law is based on rationality, whereas in Rousseau, there is a constant theme of nature and even the emotional faculty of pity described in the _Second Discourse_. This theme in Rousseau’s thought is not to be ignored, and it would be a mistake to understand Rousseau’s ethics merely as a precursor to Kant; certainly Rousseau is unique and significant in his own respect. But despite these differences, the influence on Kant is undeniable. The _Profession of Faith of the Savoyard Vicar_ is one text in particular that illustrates this influence. The Vicar claims that the correct view of the universe is to see oneself not at the center of things, but rather on the circumference, with all people realizing that we have a common center. This same notion is expressed in the Rousseau’s political theory, particularly in the concept of the general will. In Kant’s ethics, one of the major themes is the claim that moral actions are those that can be universalized. Morality is something separate from individual happiness: a view that Rousseau undoubtedly expresses as well.

A second major influence is Rousseau’s political thought. Not only is he one of the most important figures in the history of political philosophy, later influencing Karl Marx among others, but his works were also championed by the leaders of the French Revolution. And finally, his philosophy was largely instrumental in the late eighteenth century Romantic Naturalism movement in Europe thanks in large part to _Julie or the New Heloise_ and the _Reveries of the Solitary Walker_. Contemporary Rousseau scholarship continues to discuss many of the same issues that were debated in the eighteenth century. The tension in his political thought between individual liberty and totalitarianism continues to be an issue of controversy among scholars. Another aspect of Rousseau’s philosophy that has proven to be influential is his view of the family, particularly as it pertains to the roles of men and women.

#### Denis Diderot

Denis Diderot (1713-1784) was the brightest light of the French Enlightenment—a man of intelligence, passion and genius. He yearned for knowledge as he sought the answer to the ultimate enigma of all-our Universe. He wanted to know why we are here. Why is there a universe? Why is there anything at all? He studied history and developed a great fear that knowledge would continue to be destroyed by the Christians, who had a one-thousand year's history of destroying libraries, burning books, ripping paintings, smashing marbles, and torturing anyone who voiced an unorthodox thought. To prevent it from happening in the future he produced the _Encyclopedie_, a history of what was known, and then distributed it world wide. He wrote almost a thousand of its
articles, over a 20 year period. The rest were submitted by the scholars of the world including our own Ben Franklin, Thomas Jefferson, and Benjamin Rush. It took 35 volumes and a lot of commotion to get it all together.

State and Church were immediately threatened. The Crown needed the Church to remind the people of that tidy biblical concept known as the Divine Right of Kings and the Church needed the Crown to keep its prodigious holdings (about half of Europe) tax free. If church authority was weakened, then so was the king's. They knew that knowledge could bring doubt and vainly tried to ban the first two volumes of the *Encyclopedie*. It was too popular to be stifled, and in short order it became the most used resource in all libraries and homes that were fortunate enough to possess it. Even today encyclopedias are left open and accessible, not shelved, in our libraries due to their utility.

He never found the answer of the whence and whither of humankind but he helped enlighten his world that was filled with ignorance, slaves and serviles—the children of illiteracy, superstition and piety. In sum, it was a very Christian world, consistent with Jehovah and Jesus, who never said a word in favor of education, investigation, science and art, or against the enslavement of humankind. Apparently they and the Holy Ghost were ignorant of these subjects or perhaps they were just too busy looking after the sparrows to mention them. The Vatican would howl at Diderot and routinely place his works on its *Index of Forbidden Books*, but by then, the Pope of Rome was getting as much respect as the Wizard of Oz after his curtain was lifted. Folks were realizing papal threats were just hollow pretensions and they doubted that Jesus was really upset with Diderot just because the pope was.

Diderot went about his business of investigating what really went on in the monasteries and nunneries of France and made it public. He died just before France would become so resentful at the oppressive miscegenation of royalty and clergy that they ran them both out of the country and, in their irrational zeal, chopped off their heads. Diderot was a freethinker who disregarded any dogma, tradition or authority, ecclesiastical or secular, over his mind—his right to think and express his thoughts. He never found the answer of his quest, but he described the enigma of our existence—

*LIFE:* "To be born in imbecility, in the midst of pain and crisis to be the plaything of ignorance, error, need, sickness, wickedness, and passions; to return step by step to imbecility, from the time of lisping to that of doting; to live among knaves and charlatans of all kinds; to die between one man who takes your pulse and another who troubles your head; never to know where you come from, why you come and where you are going! That is what is called the most important gift of our parents and nature. Life."

**Voltaire**

Voltaire (François-Marie Arouet) (November 21, 1694 – May 30, 1778) was a prolific writer, philosopher, poet and pamphletist, and the preeminent figure of the eighteenth-century French Enlightenment. Acerbic social critic, Voltaire condemned injustice, clerical abuses, prejudice, and fanaticism. He rejected formalized religion, which he saw as superstitious and irrational, although as a deist, he believed in a supreme being. Voltaire emphasized reason, despised democracy as the rule of the mob, and believed that an enlightened monarchy, informed by the counsels of the wise, was best suited to govern.
Though Voltaire used the weapon of his wit primarily against corrupt institutions, first and foremost the Church, his attacks also aimed at revealed religion itself. His often considerable cynicism in these matters should nevertheless be seen in the context of the abysmal condition of religious life in eighteenth-century France, particularly among the educated classes. The utilitarian deism promoted by Voltaire, with its emphasis on humanistic virtues, its rejection of dogma, and its ignorance of the inner life, was the almost inevitable response to the prevailing role of the church of his time. His rejection of church authority and conventional morality also enabled Voltaire to maintain a 16-year liaison with a 27-year-old married mother of three children.

Voltaire's and other French Enlightenment philosophes' emphasis on reason above feeling would provoke a reaction during the Romantic era in the arts and literature, as well as in religious expression, notably in such theologians as Friedrich Schleiermacher. Yet the humanistic thought of Voltaire would remain an important current in the nineteenth century. Karl Marx, Charles Darwin, Friedrich Nietzsche and other thinkers would promulgate blistering critiques of religion and advance materialist explanations of human origins, history, and the inner life that would form the basis of contentious philosophical, political, and social debate in the modern era.

Above anyone else, Voltaire has also come to embody what many consider to be the typically French qualities: wit and elegance of expression. At home and abroad, the French language is sometimes referred to as the “language of Voltaire,” and even the country is sometimes called the “country of Voltaire.”

**EARLY YEARS**

François Marie Arouet, known as Voltaire, was born in Paris as the last child of a wealth notary, François Arouet, and Marie-Marguerite Daumart or D'Aumard. Voltaire's mother died when he was seven years old. At age nine, he was sent to the Jesuit Collège Louis-le-Grand, and remained there until 1711. Though he derided the education he had received, it formed the basis of his considerable knowledge, and probably kindled his lifelong devotion to theater. Voltaire maintained a lasting friendship with some Jesuit fathers. When he graduated and returned home at the age of 17, Voltaire planned to start a career in writing, but his father opposed it. He studied law, at least nominally, and later pretended to work in a Parisian lawyer's office, but began writing libelous poems while getting involved with a high society known for its libertinism. As a result, in 1714 his father sent him to stay for nearly a year in The Hague.

Voltaire returned to Paris around the time of the death of Louis XIV. He was soon accused of composing a satire about the Regent and he was sent to the Bastille where he stayed for about a year from 1717 to 1718. There he completed his first play, Oedipe, which was also to be his first success, he began the Henriade and decided to change his name to Voltaire. The most commonly accepted hypothesis is that it is an anagram of the name "Arouet le jeune" or "Arouet l.j.," 'u' being changed to 'v' and 'j' to 'i' according to the ordinary convention.

**EXILE TO ENGLAND AND RETURN**

In late 1725, Voltaire was involved in an argument with a nobleman, the Chevalier de Rohan. As a result, he was first sent again to the Bastille based on a secret warrant called a lettre de cachet. In 1726 he chose exile in England instead of imprisonment. The incident left an indelible impression on Voltaire, and from that day onward he became an advocate for judicial reform.
Voltaire was attracted to the philosophy of John Locke and ideas of Sir Isaac Newton. He studied England's constitutional monarchy, its religious tolerance, its philosophical rationalism and the natural sciences. Voltaire also greatly admired English religious tolerance and freedom of speech, and saw these as necessary prerequisites for social and political progress. He saw England as a useful model for what he considered to be a backward France. Upon his return to France in 1729 after three years of exile, he spread the substance of his discoveries in his *Lettres philosophiques (Philosophical Letters)*. This work was considered an open attack on the Church and publicly burned. Voltaire himself was safe in the independent duchy of Lorraine where he had begun what was to be a long relationship with Émilie du Châtelet. The marquise du Châtelet was not only his lover but also his close literary and scientific collaborator.

In 1735, Voltaire was allowed to return to Paris, which at first he only did occasionally. While continuing a more and more successful career as a writer, he also reverted to the business of courtiership. A combination of both brought success (including a medal from the Pope) as well as trouble, since Voltaire was unable to lastingly control his taste for witty criticism. In 1746 Voltaire, who had been for years acknowledged the first writer in France, was at last elected to the Académie Française. In 1749, Madame du Châtelet died while giving birth to a child that was not Voltaire’s. This death, which deeply disturbed him, was another turning point in Voltaire's life. In 1751, Voltaire accepted Frederick of Prussia's invitations and moved to Berlin where he stayed at the king’s court until 1753. Inevitably, the enlightened but authoritarian king was soon and repeatedly offended by his guest. Voltaire believed the king took advantage of him, and not allowed to return to Paris, Voltaire spent an unstable period before settling in Geneva’s “Les Délices.”

**GENEVA AND FERNEY**

There, feeling safer, he set up a considerable establishment, which his great wealth made him able to easily afford. He kept open house for visitors; he had printers close at hand in Geneva; he fitted up a private theatre in which he could enjoy what was perhaps the greatest pleasure of his whole life—acting in a play of his own, stage-managed by himself. His residence at Geneva brought him into correspondence (at first quite amicable) with the most famous of its citizens, Jean-Jacques Rousseau. The two men would soon come to hate each other intensely and publicly, Voltaire using his reputation to destroy that of his opponent. Calvinist Geneva’s prohibitions of theatrical performances finally caused Voltaire to abandon the city for nearby Ferney (now called Ferney-Voltaire).

At the end of 1758 he bought the considerable property there, about four miles from Geneva, and on French soil. At Ferney, he became a complete country gentleman, and was henceforward known to all Europe as Monsieur de Voltaire, the patriarch of Ferney. His entrepreneurial spirit allowed him to greatly develop the area and to employ more than one thousand people. In his comparatively secure position, he now engaged much more strongly in public controversies. He began a series of interferences on behalf of the oppressed that is an honor to his memory, the most famous being the “Calas affair” where he tried to save a man from unjustified judicial death.

A catastrophic earthquake in Lisbon gave Voltaire an opportunity to ridicule the fashionable optimism of the philosopher Gottfried Leibniz (“we live in the best possible world”) in the comic novella *Candide* (1759), One of the most widely read satires in the Western literature, the book was widely banned because of its scandalous political and religious criticisms and libertine adventures.
RETURN TO PARIS AND DEATH

Voltaire returned to a hero's welcome in Paris at age 83 in time to see his last play, Irene, produced. The excitement of the trip was too much for him and he died in Paris on May 30, 1778. Because of his criticism of the Church, Voltaire was denied burial in church ground. He was finally buried at an abbey in Champagne. In 1791 his remains were moved to a resting place at The Panthéon in Paris, where he lies alongside his nemesis Rousseau.

VOLTAIRE AND THE ENLIGHTENMENT

Voltaire was a philosopher in the sense of the French eighteenth-century *philosophes*, free thinkers in an age where freedom of thought was emerging sufficiently to stimulate challenges to the established order. The *philosophes*, including Voltaire, Montesquieu, d’Alembert and Diderot, were not philosophers in the technical sense of the word, neither were they academically trained scholars operating in the official institutions of their time. Through their background, many were fortunate enough to enjoy the best education available and their talent allowed them to make full use of it. Their philosophical writings are the forerunners of what today would be called ideology, i.e., the polemical use of ideas to promote a cause, often with little in-depth exploration. Such was the project of the *Encyclopédie*, to which Voltaire contributed numerous articles.

Voltaire is well known for his defense of civil liberties, including freedom of religion and the right to a fair trial. He was an outspoken supporter of social reform despite strict censorship laws in France and harsh penalties for those who broke them. A satirical polemist, he frequently made use of his works to criticize Church dogma and the French institutions of his day. His polemics against the Church could be quite devastating. Though his wit was sharper than any other, Voltaire was, however, far from being the most extreme among the *philosophes* in his promotion of the new “secular messianism.” He advocated neither atheism (as, for example, Diderot did) nor the overthrow of the regime. The name of Voltaire is synonymous with deism, the rational belief in a God as the great watchmaker and architect of the universe, utterly unrelated to revelation and the dogmas of the Church and Christianity.

Finally, Voltaire was typical of the Enlightenment in France in that he not only showed an anti-religious bias, but also displayed a strong tendency towards libertinism and hedonism. On these two points, disciples of the Enlightenment in Germany (Immanuel Kant) and in America (Thomas Jefferson) parted ways with Voltaire and his fellow *philosophes*.

Much of Voltaire’s production expresses the pure enjoyment of the intellectual play with words. Nevertheless, his writings had a considerable effect on the developments that led to the French Revolution shortly after his death. The impact of his ideas was multiplied by the considerable prestige he had gained in old age, a time when he had come to be almost universally admired and revered as a sage and living legend—in ways the young Voltaire would perhaps have scorned.

VOLTAIRE’S PHILOSOPHY AND IDEAS

Voltaire was a man of ideas, not a lover of systems, be it for others or for himself. Both in content and in style, Voltaire’s philosophical attitudes were influenced by John Locke and England’s skeptical empiricism. He ridiculed both the religious optimism of Leibniz as well as the humanistic optimism of Rousseau. He greatly contributed to the lessening of Descartes’ influence in France and
generally to the elimination of metaphysical concerns. Voltaire’s philosophical ideas and ethical and social criticism tended not to be original, but he generally displayed a keen common sense. The originality of his contribution to philosophy was his genius at translating and spreading others’ ideas and forming a front of irresistible power. Voltaire believed in progress and in the virtues of civilization, contrary to Rousseau’s belief that civilization corrupts man. However, his faith in culture was measured and he did not expect the coming of any golden age.

**Voltaire and Religion**

Throughout his life, Voltaire fought for religious liberty. He discovered its virtues early on in his life, during his stay in England. In his *Philosophical Letters* (Letter 6, “On the Church in England”), Voltaire said, “If there were only one religion in England there would be danger of despotism; if there were two they would cut each other’s throats. But there are thirty, and they live in peace and happiness.” Later, he would fight with a vengeance to right the wrongs perpetrated against Protestants, whose beliefs he was far from sharing. This passion came together with an equally strong dislike of the institutions of the Catholic Church and its abuses. In spite of an occasional positive interaction and mutual respect in isolated situations, Voltaire found himself in a lifelong battle against the Church. He was also distrustful of religious enthusiasm and the emphasis on human sin (Blaise Pascal), both of which in his eyes represented the danger of fanaticism.

Voltaire’s position towards religion per se oscillated between prudent approval and violent opposition, complete with incisive verbal abuse. Voltaire is known to have recommended that religion be maintained for the people as a deterrent and an encouragement toward the good life. He is famous for saying “Si Dieu n'existait pas, il faudrait l'inventer” (If God did not exist, it would be necessary to invent him). There was, however, more than mere cynicism in his position. Voltaire’s viewpoint is best summarized in the article entitled “theist” of his *Philosophical Dictionary* (“theist” stands for "deist" in Voltaire’s terminology). The theist, Voltaire states, is deeply convinced of the existence of a supreme being “as good as He is powerful,” just without cruelty and kind in his rewards. He makes no claim to any knowledge about this God, his motives and his ways, and rebukes those who do. The theist’s religion is that of a universal brotherhood, that of helping the needy and defending the oppressed.

Voltaire's works, and especially his private letters, constantly contain the word *l'infâme* and the expression *écrasez l'infâme* (crush the infamy). This expression clearly refers to religious abuse and oppression, not to Christ or the Church. However, Voltaire’s opinion about revealed religion, Christianity in particular, was negative. For him, dogma and specific beliefs were an obstacle, rather than an aid. He considered the Jewish people to be a small desert nation without a culture that had unduly undermined the achievements of much greater civilizations. He was equally unkind to the content of the Gospels.

**Voltaire as a Businessman**

In spite of his aristocratic pretension, Voltaire was a son of the bourgeoisie and he embodied that class’s spirit of entrepreneurship. His stays in England, Holland, and later Geneva certainly contributed to love for free enterprise. He had always had a keen sense for business and became wealthy early on, in ways that were not always to be recommended. Towards the end of his life, in Ferney, he had become a large-scale industrialist. He had actually created a sizeable community around his own estates, thus accomplishing what future social utopists would often try in vain to
achieve. These accomplishments fit well with Voltaire’s agnosticism and muted pessimism in religious matters. His famous *Candide* concludes with the statement that one has to “cultivate one’s garden” instead of pursuing impossible metaphysical dreams. In Ferney, Voltaire had the opportunity to do just that, quite literally.

**Politics**

Voltaire perceived the French bourgeoisie to be too small and ineffective; the aristocracy to be parasitic and corrupt; the commoners as ignorant and superstitious, and the church as a static force only useful as a counterbalance since its "religious tax," or the tithe, helped to cement a powerbase against the monarchy. Voltaire distrusted democracy, which he saw as propagating the "idiocy of the masses". To Voltaire only an enlightened monarch, advised by philosophers like himself, could bring about change as it was in the king's rational interest to improve the power and wealth of France in the world. Voltaire is quoted as saying that he “would rather obey one lion, than two hundred rats of [his own] species.” Voltaire essentially believed monarchy to be the key to progress and change.

Almost all his more substantive works, whether in verse or prose, are preceded by prefaces of one sort or another, which are models of his own light pungent causerie; and in a vast variety of nondescript pamphlets and writings he shows himself a perfect journalist.

**Works**

Voltaire was a prolific writer and produced works in almost every literary form, authoring plays, poetry, novels, essays, historical, philosophical and scientific works, pamphlets, and over 20,000 letters. Voltaire made significant contributions to social studies and history with works like *The Century of Louis XIV, Charles XII* (1731), which rejected the proposition of a divine providence in history, and the “Essay sur les Moeurs.” His *Philosophical Letters* (1734), written after his return to France after some years in England, compared the French and English systems of government, to the discredit of his native France. His satirical and subversive *Philosophical Dictionary* (1764) argued that the religion should teach little dogma but much morality.

In his time, Voltaire became famous for what later generations would consider being the wrong reasons: his tragedies and epic poems. These productions, admired by Voltaire’s contemporaries, are now considered technically well done but conventional and devoid of creativity. They hint to one of Voltaire’s lesser traits of character, his vain desire for admiration, while the real Voltaire spontaneously appears in the less formal setting of his “contes” (tales) and letters. Voltaire's tales are unquestionably the most remarkable fruit of his genius. They were usually composed as pamphlets, with a purpose of polemic in religion, politics, and “idées reçues” (idea that is generally and uncritically accepted). In works such as *Candide, L'Homme aux quarante écus, Zadig* and others that puncture received forms of moral and metaphysical orthodoxy, the peculiar quality of Voltaire—ironic style without exaggeration—appears.

*Candide* is the most widely read of Voltaire's many works and his only work which has remained popular up to the present day. The novella begins with a young man, Candide, who is living a sheltered life and being indoctrinated with Leibnizian optimism by his tutor, Pangloss. The work describes Candide's slow, painful disillusionment as he witnesses and experiences great hardships in the world. *Candide* is known for its sarcastic tone and its erratic, fantastical, and fast-moving plot.
With a story similar to that of a more serious *bildungsroman* or picaresque novel, it parodies many adventure and romance clichés. Voltaire ridicules religion, theologians, governments, armies, philosophies, and philosophers, most conspicuously Leibniz and his optimism. As expected by Voltaire, *Candide* enjoyed both great success and great scandal. Immediately after its secretive publication, the book was widely banned because it contained religious blasphemy and political sedition hidden under a thin veil of naïveté. Today, *Candide* is recognized as Voltaire's *magnum opus* and included as part of the Western canon.

Voltaire’s vast correspondence is constantly being augmented by fresh discoveries, much of it remaining unpublished. In this collection of letters, Voltaire's personality is best shown. His immense energy and versatility, his adroit and unhesitating flattery when he chose to flatter, his ruthless sarcasm when he chose to be sarcastic, his rather unscrupulous business faculty, his determination to anything necessary to escape his enemies—all these things appear throughout the whole mass of letters. Voltaire’s lasting friendship with a few individuals also appears through his informal exchange with them, much of which is filled with spicy remarks.

**LEGACY**

Voltaire's legacy has been immense. Voltaire envisioned a secular, tolerant society and emphasized progress through scientific advances and social and political reform, and through transcending the confines of religious dogma and superstition. The influence of these Enlightenment ideals would survive the reaction of the Romantic era and, following the Industrial Revolution, emerge in the twentieth century in a renewed rationalist challenge to the truth claims of revealed religion.

Voltaire's emphasis on reason and justice, his icy wit, and his formidable gifts as a satirist and polemicist influenced such Enlightenment figures as Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Jefferson. His affirmation of civil rights and the principle of religious freedom would find expression in the U.S. Constitution and its guarantees of freedoms of speech, the press, and religion. In France, Voltaire's fiery condemnation of the corruption of the church bore fruit in the radicalism and violence of the French Revolution in 1789. Anti-clerical violence and appropriation of church lands would undermine the church and the role of religion in French life. Voltaire has cast a shadow over much of Europe to the present day in the marginalizing of Christianity and secularism of European society.

**Physiocrats**

The Physiocrats, or the "Economists" as they called themselves, were the first school of economic thought. They represented a reaction against the policies of Jean Baptiste Colbert [1619-1683]. Colbert was served as a minister in the Court of Louis XIV. Colbert advocated strict regulation of commerce, protective tariffs and isregarded as a archetypical “Mercantilist.” There were a number of writers who began to question the mercantilist policies of Colbert by the early 1700s (examples are Pierre Boisguillebert [1646-1714], Seigneur de Vauban [1633-1707] and later Richard Cantillon [1680-1734]), however it was François Quesnay [1694-1774] who provided the basic structure of the Physiocratic system in the late 1750's. The Physiocrats represented a an "alliance of persons, a community of ideas, andacknowledged authority and a combination in purpose, which banded then into asociety apart." [Higgs] They held in common the idea that all things are part of an interconnected system that is rational and comprehensible to the human mind.
The ideas of the Physiocrats lay the foundation for Adam Smith and the Classical Economists. It was the Classical Economists who provided the intellectual map and the justification for capitalism and market economies. Vaggi points out that the Greek word *phýsis* is nature and *krátos* is power. The core of the system described by the Physiocrats is one of the "power of nature," a system based on a natural order. A group of closely related writers (Vincent de Gournay [1712-1759] and Anne Robert Jacques Turgot [1727-1781]) held many ideas that were shared by the Physiocrats. (Vaggi, p 869) Together the two groups developed the concept of *laissez faire, laissez-passer*. They believed that a natural system, free from the intrusions of an improper man made law, would result in a harmony and improvement of the human condition.

A key idea of Physiocracy was that agriculture (land or extractive industry which included grasslands, pastures, forests, mines and fishing) was the productive sector of an economy. The economy was divided into landlords, farmers, and artisans. Quesnay's *Tableau économique* is a model of the flows of commodities among the three sectors. Land is seen as the source of the *net produit* (net product that may be regarded as a surplus). Trade and industry perform a function but were seen as sterile in that they produce no *net produit*. As a reaction against the extreme mercantilist policies of Colbert, the Physiocrats advocated *laissez faire* policies. The belief that if the *ordre positif* (positive order or rule of man) could be made consistent with *ordre naturel* (the order of nature not to be confused with the state of nature), the well being of society could be increased. Given the complex and high levels of taxation of Louis XIV, one of the proposals was a single tax on land.

Adam Smith characterized the system of the Physiocrats, the "system with all its imperfections, is perhaps the nearest approximation to the truth that has yet been published upon the subject of political economy, and is, upon account, well worth the consideration of every man who wishes to examine with attention the principles of that very important science."

The Men behind the American Revolution: Thomas Paine

Writing of propaganda in the 18th century was a serious business. Propagandists wrote articles and books designed to inflame public opinion to such a state that the public would take action that the propagandist advocated. During the American Revolution, there were propagandists who wrote pamphlets and articles to further the cause of Independence. The most prolific of these writers was Thomas Paine.

Thomas Paine (1737-1809) was a radical writer who emigrated from England to America in 1774. Just two years later, early in 1776, Paine published *Common Sense*, a hugely influential pamphlet that convinced many American colonists that the time had finally come to break away from British rule. No other figure played a greater role in moving the American people from a spirit of rebellion to one of revolution.

In *Common Sense*, Paine made a persuasive and passionate argument to the colonists that the cause of independence was just and urgent. The first prominent pamphleteer to advocate a complete break with England, Paine successfully convinced a great many Americans who had previously thought of themselves as loyal, if disgruntled, subjects of the king. In his pamphlet, Paine associated the corrupt monarchy with the despised taxation policy, persuading many readers to become proponents of the world's first republican government. Importantly, Paine was a master of transforming the complicated philosophical and scientific principles of the Enlightenment—individuality, reason, and liberty—into plain words that the masses could comprehend and rally.
around. Just as George Washington and his soldiers retreated across the Delaware River to the bitter winter encampment at Valley Forge, Paine wrote, "These are the times that try men's souls: The summer soldier and the sunshine patriot will, in this crisis shrink from the service of his country; but he that stands it NOW, deserves the love and thanks of man and woman." Washington had this piece read aloud to his cold and starving soldiers. Paine went on to publish fifteen other Crisis pamphlets, participate in the French Revolution, and write his controversial work, The Age of Reason, in which he attacked organized religion. As a result of his atheism, Paine returned to America in 1802 to scorn and ridicule, and died in obscurity in 1809.

Paine's writings clearly show the power of words to affect the course of history. The shooting had started at Lexington and Concord in April 1775, but for months, there was no move to break away from England. On January 10, 1776, Paine's pamphlet 'COMMON SENSE' appeared. In brilliant language, logical and passionate, yet so simple that all could understand, Paine argued in favor of declaring independence from Britain. The effect was so electrifying that by June, the Continental Congress resolved to break away; and on July 4, 1776, the DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE appeared.

Paine had served for a time in the Continental Army, sharing the hardships of the ill equipped, hard-pressed American troops. He saw the mounting discouragement, and on December 23, 1776, he started publishing 'The Crisis', a series of 16 pamphlets to help inspire the Continental Army. It began with the challenging words: "These are the times that try men's souls." Washington said that without Paine's bold encouragement the American cause might have been lost, and ordered it read to "every corporal's guard in the army."

UNIT-IV

ERA OF FRENCH REVOLUTION

THE FRENCH REVOLUTION

Introduction

Towards the end of the 18th century, Europe was shaken by an uprising staged by the French people against autocracy and aristocracy. The French Revolution began with the fall of the Bastille on July 14, 1789 and continued till Napoleon Bonaparte rose to power. This event is regarded as a landmark by most historians as tremendous changes took place in France and these changes had a significant effect on the other countries in Europe. The English revolutions of 1672 and 1688 were political and religious, while the American Revolution of 1776 was mainly political. However the French Revolution of 1789 was political, social, religious and economic for it swept away the existing political institutions and aimed at establishing a more egalitarian society, and responsible government than what was in existence earlier.
Causes of the French Revolution

Political Causes

The French rulers were not interested in the welfare of the people. This naturally created discontent among the people. France attained the height of glory under Louis XIV who ruled for twelve years. However, his highly expensive wars and lavish style of living weakened France, economically as well as politically. He gave good advice to his successor Louis XV saying "Do not imitate my fondness for building and for war, but work to lessen the misery of my people."

Louis XV considered state business to be a bore and engaged himself in pursuing worldly pleasures. His constant source of enjoyment was Madame de Pompadour and Madame du Barry. He appointed and dismissed ministers and even declared wars only to please these women. When his ministers attempted to discuss affairs of the state with him, he merely remarked, "After me, the deluge." He was indifferent to the fact that the treasury was empty after the wars. He adopted a policy of repression by strict press censorship, arbitrary imprisonment of those seeking reform, banning and burning literature criticizing the Government, thus endangering personal liberty in France.

Though his successor Louis XVI was intelligent and meant to do well, he lacked the will power to carry out any reforms. Further, he was badly influenced by flattering courtiers and his ill-advised Queen Marie Antoinette who lacked consideration for the people. When she was told that the people had no bread, she remarked casually, "Let them eat cake."

Social Causes

There were several invidious distinctions and unjust privileges in the French society that led to the Revolution. French society was divided into three social classes or Estates.

(A) The First Estate was made up of the higher clergy, such as the archbishops, bishops, and the abbots on the one hand and the lower clergymen on the other. The bishops and archbishops led a very luxurious life in their palaces. However the priests had to suffer along with the peasants. So they were antagonistic to each other. Like the nobles, the higher clergy was exempted from paying most of the taxes.

(B) The Second Estate was composed of about 80,000 families in France, who belonged to the nobility. The nobles owned the most of the land, held important positions in the French administration and in the army, and were largely free from the payment of taxes. They lived a life of lordly ease and luxury and enjoyed great privileges.

(C) The Third Estate comprised of the bulk of the French population. They were the peasants and farmers, craftsmen, businessmen, professional people, workers, laborers and the common men. Their life was full of misery and social degradation. Inspite of their education and wealth, the French middle class that is the bourgeoisie, were despised by the first two Estates, and were deeply offended by the social discrimination leveled at them. The peasants were over burdened with taxes, which reduced them to penury. They were humiliated by the nobles who destroyed their fields while hunting. This explains why the Third Estate led the Revolution.
Economic Causes

The French system of taxation was unjust owing to inequality. The clergymen and noblemen owned about three-fifths of the entire land. However they paid less than one-fifth of the total direct taxes in the country. On the other hand, a member of the Third Estate paid 152 francs as income tax, whereas he should have paid only 14 francs, if the distribution were equal. Further the nobles and clergy were totally exempted from direct taxes levied on personal property and land.

The empty national purse was the spark that set the French Revolution aflame. While the French peasants were starving and dying, the nobles were enjoying themselves. The French government mishandled the national economy. It had no regular budget. It wasted money without proper planning. The national debt kept on increasing. Nacker, the Controller of Finance in 1776, was succeeded by Claonne who borrowed 300 million dollars in 3 years. The result of his "philosophy of borrowing" was that the royal treasury became completely empty by the August of 1786.

Intellectual Awakening

One of the most important factors leading to the Revolution was the influence of the philosophy of the age. The three great intellectual giants of the age were Montesquieu, Voltaire and Rousseau, who revolutionized the thinking of the members of the Third Estate with their new ideas and revolutionary solutions.

(a) Charles Montesquieu (1689 - 1775), a lawyer and student of constitutional government summed up his ideas in his book *L’ Esprit Des Lois* (The Spirit of the Laws). Here he puts forward the theory of the separation of powers. According to this theory, the legislature, the executive and the judiciary should be separate and independent of each other. If not, there would be dictatorship and tyranny. Through his writings, Montesquieu exposed grand monarchy in France, in its true colors and deeply influenced the minds of the people.

(b) Francis Aronet Voltaire (1694 - 1778) was an internationally famous writer and critic, much sought after by Louis XV of France, Frederick the Great of Prussia and Catherine the Great of Russia. Through his poems, biographies, histories, essays and dramas he attacked traditions and beliefs as well as existing institutions like the church and the state. Macaulay rightly comments about Voltaire who launched the French people on a fresh course of political thought, "Of all the intellectual weapons ever wielded by man the mockery of Voltaire was the most terrible."

(c) The spirit behind the French Revolution was Jean Jacques Rousseau (1712 - 1778), one of the greatest philosophers of the age. His famous work *Social Contract* influenced the people greatly. He stated that originally there was a contract between the king and the people, to the effect that the king would promote and protect the interests and welfare of the people and in return, the people would offer sovereignty and loyalty to the king. This contract had been broken by the French king. Hence the people had to revolt and overthrow the autocratic government. They had to break free of the feudal bonds. The 'Social contract' lit the outrage of revolution.

(d) There were other intellectuals such as the Encyclopaedists who condemned slavery, inequality in taxation, unjust things, the incompetence of government and the wasteful wars. Diderot
was the editor of the 'Encyclopedia' which prepared the people for the Revolution intellectually.

(e) Thomas Paine an English writer penned *The Rights of Man* and escaped from England to France to avoid imprisonment.

**Religious Causes**

Religious intolerance persisted in France. For example, the Edict of Nantes had been revoked by Louis XIV and the Huguenots were persecuted. Thus the misery of the people increased, owing to religious persecution.

**Influence of the English and the American Revolutions**

The Bloodless or Glorious Revolution had a deep influence on the French philosophers. It inspired them to active political and economic reforms. The American Revolution had a greater influence on them. They felt that if the Americans could revolt and overthrow the government of England, they should also revolt and overthrow the corrupt and autocratic government of Louis XVI. The French had been led by Lafayette in the American Revolution and were so highly influenced by it that Arthur Young remarked, "The American Revolution has laid the foundation for another in France, if the government does not take care of itself."

**Course of the Revolution**

The Estates General, an assembly of the three estates was summoned by the king on May 5, 1789 at Versailles, to save France from bankruptcy. It was called after an interval of 150 years. In the past, each Estate sat separately. However this time the Third Estate demanded that all the three Estates should sit together as a "National Assembly", but the first two estates rejected this demand.

The Third Estate found the entrance of their meeting place blocked by the royal army on June 20, 1789 as a royal session was to be held there. Hence they rushed to a nearby place that was originally a tennis court and took the famous ‘Tennis Court Oath’ "Never to separate and to reassemble wherever circumstances shall require, until the constitution of the kingdom shall be established."

The Royal Session on June 23, 1789 was attended by all the three estates. The king passed an order that the three estates should sit separately and vote by order. However Count Mirabeau sent a message to the king that "We are here by the will of the people, and that we shall not leave except at the point of the bayonet." Finally, the king was forced to yield and on June 27, 1789 permitted the clergy and the nobility to sit with the Third Estate as a "National Assembly" and to vote "by head."

When the National Assembly began its work, the royal soldiers moved towards Paris and Versailles, causing the hunger stricken people of Paris to revolt against authority. During the revolt that lasted three days, *shops* were looted; the houses of the nobles and the clergy were burnt along with the feudal title deeds. July 14, 1789 saw the fall of the Bastille, a royal fortress and symbol of Bourbon autocracy. C. D. Hazen aptly sums up, "The seizure of the Bastille was everywhere regarded in France and abroad as the triumph of liberty."
An army of women marched from Paris to Versailles shouting "Bread! Bread! Bread!" This happened on October 5, 1789. The royal palace was invaded by the mob, which killed several soldiers and servants of the palace. The king was forced to move to Versailles with his family. After ten days, the National Assembly shifted from Versailles to Paris.

The work done by the National Assembly was significant.

i. Feudalism and serfdom was abolished in August 1789 by the National Assembly, which wiped out feudal obligations, dues, privileges, and titles.

ii. The church was nationalized by the National Assembly. The church property was confiscated and the number of clergy was reduced, so as to solve the problem of raising money. The clergy were declared to be Government officers, whom the government paid and whom the people elected. A civil constitution was drawn up for the clergy, in order to reorganize the church of France.

iii. The ‘Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen’ was chalked out. It became the preamble to the constitution of 1791 and is as important a document as the English Magna Carta (1215) and the American Bill of Rights (1776). It contained 17 Articles and included the following fundamental rights:

A. "Men are born and remain free and equal in rights. These (rights) are liberty, security and resistance to oppression."

B. "Law is the expression of the general will. Every citizen has a right to participate personally or through his representative, in its formation. It must be the same for all."

C. "No person shall be accused, arrested or imprisoned except in the cases and according to the forms prescribed by law."

D. "Private Property is an inviolable and sacred right."

E. "Sovereignty resides in the nation."

F. "All officials of the state are responsible."

Dr. J.E. Swain states that "The entire world acclaimed it as a victory for democracy."(For details see the following title ‘Declaration of the Rights of man and of the citizen’)

iv) The church property was confiscated to save the state from financial ruin, and a paper currency known as assignats, was issued on the backing of its property.

The Constitution of 1791 was drawn up by the National Assembly, which assumed the title of the Constituent Assembly. The Constitution of 1791 was the first written constitution of France. It established a constitutional or limited monarchy and was based on the principle of separation of powers. A unicameral legislature was set up, called the Legislative Assembly and it consisted of 745 members, indirectly elected for two years by all "active citizens".

The Constitution of 1791 provided for a hereditary king with the power to appoint ministers, but not to form the Legislative Assembly. The Ministers could not sit in the Legislature. The king had a "suspensive veto" to suspend an act of the Legislative Assembly for six years, but he could not
dismiss the Assembly. The judges were to be elected. There was to be a jury for criminal cases and a Supreme Court to be set up in Paris. Other courts were also set up.

France was divided into 83 departments for administrative convenience and efficiency. These were further subdivided into districts, cantons and communes. Elected officials would replace the royal officers in administrative work. Louis XVI decided to flee to Germany owing to his loss of power. However he was caught and brought back to Paris where he took an oath to support the Constitution. The National Assembly was dissolved on September 20, 1791 and election to the Legislative Assembly was held.

The Legislative Assembly, consisting of 745 members, met on October 1, 1791, and represented three political parties. The Constitutionalists were in favor of a constitutional form of government. The Girondists were moderates who wanted a republican form of government. The Jacobins were republicans of the extreme type. The king vetoed certain laws passed by the Legislative Assembly which suspended the king on August 10, 1792, and also the Constitution of 1791.

King Leopold II of Austria and the King of Prussia decided to invade France, in order to restore the Bourbon monarchy. France declared war on Austria and Prussia on April 20, 1792, and inflicted a crushing defeat on its enemies on September 20, 1792. On receiving the news of the French victory, the National Convention was called on September 21, 1792, to prepare a new constitution. It proclaimed the First French Republic on September 22, 1792.

King Louis XVI was found guilty of high treason by the National Convention and was guillotined on January 21; 1793. After the execution of King Louis XVI, the first coalition consisting of England, Holland, Spain, Sardinia, Austria and Prussia was formed against the First French Republic. However, it was completely smashed by the French armies under their military leader Carnot.

The National Convention entrusted all executive authority to the "Committee of Public Safety", consisting of 12 members led by Robespierre. It let loose a ‘reign of terror’ in France, from 1793 to 1794. During this period royalists and others as Marie Antoinette, Danton, St. Just and Madame Roland were guillotined. About 2,500 people were guillotined in Paris and about 10,000 people, in other parts of France. In the words of Madame Roland, "O liberty, what crimes are committed in their name!" The ‘reign of terror’ came to an end with the revolt of the Parisian mob against Robespierre who was guillotined on March 13, 1794.

After the ‘reign of terror,’ a committee of nine members was appointed by the National Convention to draft a new constitution. After ruling France from 1792 to 1795, the Convention was dissolved and the new constitution came to be called the Constitution of the Year Third (1795). It provided for a bicameral legislature, entrusted with legislative work. The executive authority was vested in the hands of a Directory of five, chosen by the legislature. The Directory appointed Napoleon Bonaparte, to deal with the invading armies. When the domestic affairs of France deteriorated and the government was almost paralyzed, the legislature was dissolved by a coup d’etat and Napoleon Bonaparte became the supreme master of France.

**Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen**

The Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen is a fundamental document of the French
Revolution, defining the individual and collective rights of all the estates of the realm as universal. Influenced by the doctrine of natural right, the rights of man are universal: valid at all times and in every place, pertaining to human nature itself. Although it establishes fundamental rights for French citizens and "all the members of the social Body", it addresses neither the status of women nor slavery; despite that, it is a precursor document to international human rights instruments.

**History**

The last article of Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen was adopted 26 August 1789 by the National Constituent Assembly, during the period of the French Revolution, as the first step toward writing a constitution for France. It was prepared and proposed by the Marquis de Lafayette. A second and lengthier declaration, known as the Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen of 1793 was later adopted.

**Philosophic and theoretical context**

The concepts in the Declaration come from the philosophical and political principles of the Age of Enlightenment, such as individualism, the social contract as theorized by the French philosopher Rousseau, and the separation of powers espoused by the Baron de Montesquieu. As can be seen in the texts, the French declaration is heavily influenced by the political philosophy of the Enlightenment, and by Enlightenment principles of human rights, some of which it shares with the U.S. Declaration of Independence which preceded it (4 July 1776). Thomas Jefferson, primary author of the U.S. Declaration of Independence, was at the time in France as a U.S. diplomat, and was in correspondence with members of the French National Constituent Assembly. James Madison's proposal for a U.S. Bill of Rights was adopted by the U.S. House of Representatives on 21 August 1789. The declaration is in the spirit of what has come to be called natural law, which does not base itself on religious doctrine or authority.

The declaration defines a single set of individual and collective rights for all men. Influenced by the doctrine of natural rights, these rights are held to be universal and valid in all times and places. For example, "Men are born and remain free and equal in rights. Social distinctions may be founded only upon the general good." They have certain natural rights to property, to liberty and to life. According to this theory the role of government is to recognize and secure these rights. Furthermore government should be carried on by elected representatives.

At the time of writing, the rights contained in the declaration were only awarded to men. Furthermore, the declaration was a statement of vision rather than reality. The declaration was not deeply rooted in either the practice of the West or even France at the time. The declaration emerged in the late 18th Century out of war and revolution. It encountered opposition as democracy and individual rights were frequently regarded as synonymous with anarchy and subversion. The declaration embodies ideals and aspirations towards which France pledged to struggle in the future.

**Substance**

The Declaration opens by affirming "the natural and imprescriptible rights of man" to "liberty, property, security and resistance to oppression". It called for the destruction of aristocratic privileges by proclaiming an end to exemptions from taxation, freedom and equal rights for all human beings (referred to as "Men"), and access to public office based on talent. The monarchy was restricted, and all citizens were to have the right to take part in the legislative process. Freedom
of speech and press were declared, and arbitrary arrests outlawed.

The Declaration also asserted the principles of popular sovereignty, in contrast to the divine right of kings that characterized the French monarchy, and social equality among citizens, "All the citizens, being equal in the eyes of the law, are equally admissible to all public dignities, places, and employments, according to their capacity and without distinction other than that of their virtues and of their talents," eliminating the special rights of the nobility and clergy.

**Articles:**

Men are born and remain free and equal in rights. Social distinctions may be founded only upon the general good. The aim of all political association is the preservation of the natural and imprescriptible rights of man. These rights are liberty, property, security, and resistance to oppression.

The principle of all sovereignty resides essentially in the nation. No body or individual may exercise any authority which does not proceed directly from the nation.

Liberty consists in the freedom to do everything which injures no one else; hence the exercise of the natural rights of each man has no limits except those which assure to the other members of the society the enjoyment of the same rights. These limits can only be determined by law.

Law can only prohibit such actions as are hurtful to society. Nothing may be prevented which is not forbidden by law, and no one may be forced to do anything not provided for by law.

Law is the expression of the general will. Every citizen has a right to participate personally, or through his representative, in its foundation. It must be the same for all, whether it protects or punishes. All citizens, being equal in the eyes of the law, are equally eligible to all dignities and to all public positions and occupations, according to their abilities, and without distinction except that of their virtues and talents.

No person shall be accused, arrested, or imprisoned except in the cases and according to the forms prescribed by law. Any one soliciting, transmitting, executing, or causing to be executed, any arbitrary order shall be punished. But any citizen summoned or arrested in virtue of the law shall submit without delay, as resistance constitutes an offense.

The law shall provide for such punishments only as are strictly and obviously necessary, and no one shall suffer punishment except it be legally inflicted in virtue of a law passed and promulgated before the commission of the offense.

As all persons are held innocent until they shall have been declared guilty, if arrest shall be deemed indispensable, all harshness not essential to the securing of the prisoner's person shall be severely repressed by law.

No one shall be disquieted on account of his opinions, including his religious views, provided their manifestation does not disturb the public order established by law.

The free communication of ideas and opinions is one of the most precious of the rights of man. Every citizen may, accordingly, speak, write, and print with freedom, but shall be responsible for such abuses of this freedom as shall be defined by law.

The security of the rights of man and of the citizen requires public military forces. These forces are, therefore, established for the good of all and not for the personal advantage of those to whom they shall be entrusted.
A common contribution is essential for the maintenance of the public forces and for the cost of administration. This should be equitably distributed among all the citizens in proportion to their means.

All the citizens have a right to decide, either personally or by their representatives, as to the necessity of the public contribution; to grant this freely; to know to what uses it is put; and to fix the proportion, the mode of assessment and of collection and the duration of the taxes.

Society has the right to require of every public agent an account of his administration.

A society in which the observance of the law is not assured, nor the separation of powers defined, has no constitution at all.

Since property is an inviolable and sacred right, no one shall be deprived thereof except where public necessity, legally determined, shall clearly demand it, and then only on condition that the owner shall have been previously and equitably indemnified.

**Omissions**

While it set forth fundamental rights, not only for French citizens but for "all Men without exception" (meaning "all human beings") it did not make any statement about the status of women, nor did it explicitly address slavery.

**Women's rights**

The Declaration recognized many rights as belonging to citizens (who could only be male). This was despite the fact that after the march on Versailles on 5th October 1789, Women presented the women’s petition to the National Assembly in which they proposed a decree giving women equality. In 1790 Nicolas De Condorcet and Etta Palm d'Aelders unsuccessfully called on the National Assembly to extend civil and political rights to women. Condorcet declared that “and he, who votes against the right of another, whatever the religion, color, or sex of that other, has henceforth abjured his own”. The French Revolution did not lead to a recognition of women’s rights and this prompted Olympe de Gouges to publish the Declaration of the Rights of Woman and the Female Citizen in September 1791.

The Declaration of the Rights of Woman and the Female Citizen is modelled on the Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen and is ironic in formulation and exposes the failure of the French Revolution, which had been devoted to equality. It states that: “This revolution will only take effect when all women become fully aware of their deplorable condition, and of the rights they have lost in society”.

The Declaration of the Rights of Woman and the Female Citizen follows the seventeen articles of the Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen point for point and has been described by Camille Naish as “almost a parody... of the original document”. The first article of the Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen proclaims that:

“Men are born and remain free and equal in rights. Social distinctions may be based only on common utility.”

The first article of Declaration of the Rights of Woman and the Female Citizen replied:
“Woman is born free and remains equal to man in rights. Social distinctions may only be based on common utility”.

De Gouges also draws attention to the fact that under French law women were fully punishable, yet denied equal rights, declaring “Women have the right to mount the scaffold, they must also have the right to mount the speaker’s rostrum”.

**Slavery**

The declaration did not revoke the institution of slavery, as lobbied for by Jacques-Pierre Brissot's Les Amis des Noirs and defended by the group of colonial planters called the Club Massiac because they met at the Hôtel Massiac. Despite the lack of explicit mention of slavery in the Declaration, slave uprisings in Saint-Domingue that would later be known as the beginning of the Haitian Revolution took inspiration from its words, as discussed in C. L. R. James' history of the Haitian Revolution, The Black Jacobins. Deplorable conditions for the thousands of slaves in Saint-Domingue, the most profitable slave colony in the world, also led to the uprisings which would be known as the first successful slave revolt in the New World. Slavery in the French colonies was abolished by the Convention dominated by the Jacobins in 1794. However, Napoleon reinstated it in 1802. The colony of Saint-Domingue declared its independence in 1804. For more information about the Haitian Revolution and its connection to the French Revolution, see Laurent Dubois's Avengers of the New World.

**Constitution of the French Fifth Republic**

According to the preamble of the Constitution of the French Fifth Republic (adopted on 4 October 1958, and the current constitution), the principles set forth in the Declaration have constitutional value. Many laws and regulations have been canceled because they did not comply with those principles as interpreted by the Conseil Constitutionnel ("Constitutional Council of France") or by the Conseil d'État ("Council of State").

Taxation legislation or practices that seem to make some unwarranted difference between citizens are struck down as unconstitutional.

Suggestions of positive discrimination on ethnic grounds are rejected because they infringe on the principle of equality, since they would establish categories of people that would, by birth, enjoy greater rights.

**Legacy**

The declaration has also influenced and inspired rights-based liberal democracy throughout the world. It was translated as soon as 1793–94 by Colombian Antonio Nariño, who published it despite the Inquisition and was sentenced to be imprisoned for ten years for doing so. In 2003, the document was listed on UNESCO's Memory of the World register.

**NAPOLEON BONAPARTE**

Napoleon Bonaparte (15 August 1769 – 5 May 1821) was a French military and political leader during the latter stages of the French Revolution. As Napoleon I, he was Emperor of the French
from 1804 to 1815. His legal reform, the Napoleonic code, has been a major influence on many civil law jurisdictions worldwide, but he is best remembered for his role in the wars led against France by a series of coalitions, the so-called Napoleonic Wars, during which he established hegemony over most of continental Europe and sought to spread the ideals of the French Revolution, while consolidating an imperial monarchy which restored aspects of the deposed ancien régime. Due to his longtime success in these wars, often against numerically superior enemies, he is generally regarded as one of the greatest military commanders of all time.

Origins and Education

Napoleon Bonaparte was born the second of eight children in his family's ancestral home Casa Buonaparte, located in the town of Ajaccio, Corsica. He was born on 15 August 1769; one year after Corsica was transferred to France by the Republic of Genoa. He was christened Napoleone di Buonaparte, probably acquiring his first name from an uncle (though an older brother, who did not survive infancy, was also named Napoleone). He was called by this name until his twenties, when he adopted the more French-sounding Napoléon Bonaparte.

The Corsican Buonapartes originated from minor Italian nobility of Lombard origin, who had come to Corsica from Liguria in the 16th century. His father Nobile Carlo Buonaparte, an attorney, was named Corsica's representative to the court of Louis XVI in 1777. The dominant influence of Napoleon's childhood was his mother, Letizia Ramolino, whose firm discipline restrained a rambunctious child. He had an elder brother, Joseph; and younger siblings Lucien, Elisa, Louis, Pauline, Caroline and Jérôme. There were also two other children, a boy and girl, who were born before Joseph but died in infancy. Napoleon was baptised as a Catholic just before his second birthday, on 21 July 1771 at Ajaccio Cathedral.

Napoleon's noble, moderately affluent background and family connections afforded him greater opportunities to study than were available to a typical Corsican of the time. In January 1779, Napoleon was enrolled at a religious school in Autun, mainland France, to learn French, and in May he was admitted to a military academy at Brienne-le-Château. He spoke with a marked Corsican accent and never learned to spell properly. Napoleon was teased by other students for his accent and applied himself to reading. An examiner observed that Napoleon "has always been distinguished for his application in mathematics. He is fairly well acquainted with history and geography...This boy would make an excellent sailor." On completion of his studies at Brienne in 1784, Napoleon was admitted to the elite École Militaire in Paris; this ended his naval ambition, which had led him to consider an application to the British Royal Navy. Instead, he trained to become an artillery officer and when his father's death reduced his income, was forced to complete the two-year course in one year. He was the first Corsican to graduate from the Ecole Militaire and was examined by the famed scientist Pierre-Simon Laplace, whom Napoleon later appointed to the Senate.

Early career

Upon graduating in September 1785, Bonaparte was commissioned a second lieutenant in La Fère artillery regiment. He served on garrison duty in Valence, Drôme and Auxonne until after the outbreak of the French Revolution in 1789, though he took nearly two years' leave in Corsica and Paris during this period. A fervent Corsican nationalist, Bonaparte wrote to the Corsican leader Pasquale Paoli in May 1789: "As the nation was perishing I was born. Thirty thousand Frenchmen
were vomited on to our shores, drowning the throne of liberty in waves of blood. Such was the odious sight which was the first to strike me."

He spent the early years of the Revolution in Corsica, fighting in a complex three-way struggle between royalists, revolutionaries, and Corsican nationalists. He supported the revolutionary Jacobin faction, gained the rank of lieutenant colonel and command over a battalion of volunteers. After he had exceeded his leave of absence and led a riot against a French army in Corsica, he was somehow able to convince military authorities in Paris to promote him to captain in July 1792. He returned to Corsica once again and came into conflict with Paoli, who had decided to split with France and sabotage a French assault on the Sardinian island of La Maddalena, where Bonaparte was one of the expedition leaders. Bonaparte and his family had to flee to the French mainland in June 1793 because of the split with Paoli.

Siege of Toulon

In July 1793, he published a pro-republican pamphlet, Le Souper de Beaucaire (Supper at Beaucaire), which gained him the admiration and support of Augustin Robespierre, younger brother of the Revolutionary leader Maximilien Robespierre. With the help of fellow Corsican Antoine Christophe Saliceti, Bonaparte was appointed artillery commander of the republican forces at the siege of Toulon. The city had risen against the republican government and was occupied by British troops. He adopted a plan to capture a hill that would allow republican guns to dominate the city's harbour and force the British ships to evacuate. The assault on the position, during which Bonaparte was wounded in the thigh, led to the capture of the city and his promotion to brigadier general at the age of 24. His actions brought him to the attention of the Committee of Public Safety, and he was put in charge of the artillery of France's Army of Italy. Whilst waiting for confirmation of this post, Napoleon spent time as inspector of coastal fortifications on the Mediterranean coast near Marseille. He devised plans for attacking the Kingdom of Sardinia-Piedmont as part of France's campaign against the First Coalition. The commander of the Army of Italy, Pierre Jadart Dumberbion had seen too many generals executed for failing or for having the wrong political views. Therefore, he deferred to the powerful representatives on mission, Augustin Robespierre and Saliceti, who in turn were ready to listen to the freshly-promoted artillery general. Carrying out Bonaparte's plan in the Battle of Saorgio in April 1794, the French army advanced northeast along the Italian Riviera then turned north to seize Ormea in the mountains. From Ormea, they thrust west to outflank the Austro-Sardinian positions around Saorge (Saorgio). As a result, the coastal towns of Oneglia and Loano as well as the strategic Col de Tende (Tenda Pass) fell into French hands. Later, Augustin Robespierre sent Bonaparte on a mission to the Republic of Genoa to understand that country's intentions towards France.

Vendémiaire

Following the fall of the Robespierres in the July 1794 Thermidorian Reaction, Bonaparte was put under house arrest at Nice for his association with the brothers. He was released within two weeks and due to his technical skills was asked to draw-up plans to attack Italian positions in the context of France's war with Austria. He also took part in an expedition to take back Corsica from the British, but the French were repulsed by the Royal Navy.

Bonaparate became engaged to Désirée Clary, whose sister, Julie Clary, married Bonaparte's elder brother Joseph; the Clarys were a wealthy merchant family from Marseilles. In April 1795, he was assigned to the Army of the West, which was engaged in the War in the Vendée—a civil war
and royalist counter-revolution in Vendée, a region in west central France, on the Atlantic Ocean. As an infantry command, it was a demotion from artillery general – for which the army already had a full quota – and he pleaded poor health to avoid the posting. He was moved to the Bureau of Topography of the Committee of Public Safety and sought, unsuccessfully, to be transferred to Constantinople in order to offer his services to the Sultan. During this period he wrote a romantic novella, Clisson et Eugénie, about a soldier and his lover, in a clear parallel to Bonaparte's own relationship with Désirée. On 15 September, Bonaparte was removed from the list of generals in regular service for his refusal to serve in the Vendée campaign. He now faced a difficult financial situation and reduced career prospects.

On 3 October, royalists in Paris declared a rebellion against the National Convention after they were excluded from a new government, the Directory. One of the leaders of the Thermidorian Reaction, Paul Barras, knew of Bonaparte's military exploits at Toulon and gave him command of the improvised forces in defence of the Convention in the Tuileries Palace. Bonaparte had witnessed the massacre of the King's Swiss Guard there three years earlier and realised artillery would be the key to its defence. He ordered a young cavalry officer, Joachim Murat, to seize large cannons and used them to repel the attackers on 5 October 1795—13 Vendémiaire An IV in the French Republican Calendar. One thousand four hundred royalists died, and the rest fled. He had cleared the streets with "a whiff of grapeshot", according to the 19th century historian Thomas Carlyle in The French Revolution: A History.

The defeat of the Royalist insurrection extinguished the threat to the Convention and earned Bonaparte sudden fame, wealth, and the patronage of the new Directory; Murat would become his brother-in-law and one of his generals. Bonaparte was promoted to Commander of the Interior and given command of the Army of Italy. Within weeks he was romantically attached to Barras's former mistress, Joséphine de Beauharnais, whom he married on 9 March 1796 after he had broken off his engagement to Désirée Clary.

**First Italian campaign**

Two days after the marriage, Bonaparte left Paris to take command of the Army of Italy and led it on a successful invasion of Italy. At the Battle of Lodi he defeated Austrian forces and drove them out of Lombardy. He was defeated at Caldiero by Austrian reinforcements, led by József Alvinczi, though Bonaparte regained the initiative at the crucial Battle of the Bridge of Arcole and proceeded to subdue the Papal States. Bonaparte argued against the wishes of Directory atheists to march on Rome and dethrone the Pope as he reasoned this would create a power vacuum which would be exploited by the Kingdom of Naples. Instead, in March 1797, Bonaparte led his army into Austria and forced it to negotiate peace. The Treaty of Leoben gave France control of most of northern Italy and the Low Countries, and a secret clause promised the Republic of Venice to Austria. Bonaparte marched on Venice and forced its surrender, ending 1,100 years of independence; he also authorised the French to loot treasures such as the Horses of Saint Mark.

His application of conventional military ideas to real-world situations effected his military triumphs, such as creative use of artillery as a mobile force to support his infantry. He referred to his tactics thus: "I have fought sixty battles and I have learned nothing which I did not know at the beginning. Look at Caesar; he fought the first like the last." He was adept at espionage and deception and could win battles by concealment of troop deployments and concentration of his forces on the 'hinge' of an enemy's weakened front. If he could not use his favourite envelopment
strategy, he would take up the central position and attack two co-operating forces at their hinge, swing round to fight one until it fled, then turn to face the other. In this Italian campaign, Bonaparte's army captured 150,000 prisoners, 540 cannons and 170 standards. The French army fought 67 actions and won 18 pitched battles through superior artillery technology and Bonaparte's tactics.

During the campaign, Bonaparte became increasingly influential in French politics; he founded two newspapers both for the troops in his army and also for circulation in France. The royalists attacked Bonaparte for looting Italy and warned he might become a dictator. Bonaparte sent General Pierre Augereau to Paris to lead a coup d'état and purge the royalists on 4 September—Coup of 18 Fructidor. This left Barras and his Republican allies in control again but dependent on Bonaparte who proceeded to peace negotiations with Austria. These negotiations resulted in the Treaty of Campo Formio, and Bonaparte returned to Paris in December as a hero. He met with Talleyrand, France's new Foreign Minister—who would later serve in the same capacity for Emperor Napoleon—and they began to prepare for an invasion of England.

**Egyptian expedition**

After two months of planning, Bonaparte decided France's naval power was not yet strong enough to confront the Royal Navy in the English Channel and proposed a military expedition to seize Egypt and thereby undermine Britain's access to its trade interests in India. Bonaparte wished to establish a French presence in the Middle East, with the ultimate dream of linking with a Muslim enemy of the British in India, Tipu Sultan. Napoleon assured the Directory that "as soon as he had conquered Egypt, he will establish relations with the Indian princes and, together with them, attack the English in their possessions." According to a February 1798 report by Talleyrand: "Having occupied and fortified Egypt, we shall send a force of 15,000 men from Suez to India, to join the forces of Tipu-Sahib and drive away the English." The Directory agreed in order to secure a trade route to India.

In May 1798, Bonaparte was elected a member of the French Academy of Sciences. His Egyptian expedition included a group of 167 scientists: mathematicians, naturalists, chemists and geodesists among them; their discoveries included the Rosetta Stone, and their work was published in the Description de l'Égypte in 1809. En route to Egypt, Bonaparte reached Malta on 9 June 1798, then controlled by the Knights Hospitaller. The two hundred Knights of French origin did not support the Grand Master, PrussianFerdinand von Hompesch zu Bolheim, who had succeeded a Frenchman and made it clear they would not fight against their compatriots. Hompesch surrendered after token resistance, and Bonaparte captured a very important naval base with the loss of only three men.

General Bonaparte and his expedition eluded pursuit by the Royal Navy and on 1 July landed at Alexandria. He fought the Battle of Shubra Khit against the Mamluks, Egypt's ruling military caste. This helped the French practice their defensive tactic for the Battle of the Pyramids fought on 21 July, about 24 km from the pyramids. General Bonaparte's forces of 25,000 roughly equalled those of the Mamluks' Egyptian cavalry, but he formed hollow squares with supplies kept safely inside. 29 French and approximately 2,000 Egyptians were killed. The victory boosted the morale of the French army.

On 1 August, the British fleet under Horatio Nelson captured or destroyed all but two French vessels in the Battle of the Nile, and Bonaparte's goal of a strengthened French position in the
Mediterranean was frustrated. His army had succeeded in a temporary increase of French power in Egypt, though it faced repeated uprisings. In early 1799, he moved an army into the Ottoman province of Damascus (Syria and Galilee). Bonaparte led these 13,000 French soldiers in the conquest of the coastal towns of Arish, Gaza, Jaffa, and Haifa. The attack on Jaffa was particularly brutal: Bonaparte, on discovering many of the defenders were former prisoners of war, ostensibly on parole, ordered the garrison and 1,400 prisoners to be executed by bayonet or drowning to save bullets. Men, women and children were robbed and murdered for three days.

With his army weakened by disease—mostly bubonic plague—and poor supplies, Bonaparte was unable to reduce the fortress of Acre and returned to Egypt in May. To speed up the retreat, he ordered plague-stricken men to be poisoned. (However, British eyewitness accounts later showed that most of the men were still alive and had not been poisoned.) His supporters have argued this was necessary given the continued harassment of stragglers by Ottoman forces, and indeed those left behind alive were tortured and beheaded by the Ottomans. Back in Egypt, on 25 July, Bonaparte defeated an Ottoman amphibious invasion at Abukir.

**Ruler of France**

While in Egypt, Bonaparte stayed informed of European affairs through irregular delivery of newspapers and dispatches. He learned France had suffered a series of defeats in the War of the Second Coalition. On 24 August 1799, he took advantage of the temporary departure of British ships from French coastal ports and set sail for France, despite the fact he had received no explicit orders from Paris. The army was left in the charge of Jean Baptiste Kléber. Unknown to Bonaparte, the Directory had sent him orders to return to ward off possible invasions of French soil, but poor lines of communication meant the messages had failed to reach him. By the time he reached Paris in October France's situation had been improved by a series of victories. The Republic was bankrupt, however, and the ineffective Directory was unpopular with the French population. The Directory discussed Bonaparte's "desertion" but was too weak to punish him.

Bonaparte was approached by one of the Directors, Emmanuel-Joseph Sieyès, for his support in a coup to overthrow the constitutional government. The leaders of the plot included his brother Lucien; the speaker of the Council of Five Hundred, Roger Ducos; another Director, Joseph Fouché; and Talleyrand. On 9 November—18 Brumaire by the French Republican Calendar—Bonaparte was charged with the safety of the legislative councils, who were persuaded to remove to the Château de Saint-Cloud, to the west of Paris, after a rumour of a Jacobin rebellion was spread by the plotters. By the following day, the deputies had realised they faced an attempted coup. Faced with their remonstrations, Bonaparte led troops to seize control and disperse them, which left a rump legislature to name Bonaparte, Sieyès, and Ducos as provisional Consuls to administer the government.

**French Consulate**

Though Sieyès expected to dominate the new regime, he was outmanoeuvred by Bonaparte, who drafted the Constitution of the Year VIII and secured his own election as First Consul, and he took up residence at the Tuileries. This made Bonaparte the most powerful person in France.

In 1800, Bonaparte and his troops crossed the Alps into Italy, where French forces had been almost completely driven out by the Austrians whilst he was in Egypt. The campaign began badly
for the French after Bonaparte made strategic errors; one force was left besieged at Genoa but managed to hold out and thereby occupy Austrian resources. This effort, and French general Louis Desaix's timely reinforcements, allowed Bonaparte narrowly to avoid defeat and to triumph over the Austrians in June at the significant Battle of Marengo. Bonaparte's brother Joseph led the peace negotiations in Lunéville and reported that Austria, emboldened by British support, would not recognise France's newly gained territory. As negotiations became increasingly fractious, Bonaparte gave orders to his general Moreau to strike Austria once more. Moreau led France to victory at Hohenlinden. As a result, the Treaty of Lunéville was signed in February 1801; the French gains of the Treaty of Campo Formio were reaffirmed and increased.

Temporary peace in Europe

Bonaparte set up a camp at Boulogne-sur-Mer to prepare for an invasion of Britain, but both countries had become tired of war and signed the Treaty of Amiens in October 1801 and March 1802; this included the withdrawal of British troops from most colonial territories it had recently occupied. The peace was uneasy and short-lived; Britain did not evacuate Malta as promised and protested against Bonaparte's annexation of Piedmont and his Act of Mediation, which established a new Swiss Confederation, though neither of these territories were covered by the treaty. The dispute culminated in a declaration of war by Britain in May 1803, and he reassembled the invasion camp at Boulogne.

Bonaparte faced a major setback and eventual defeat in the Haitian Revolution. By the Law of 20 May 1802 Bonaparte re-established slavery in France's colonial possessions, where it had been banned following the Revolution. Following a slave revolt, he sent an army to reconquer Saint-Domingue and establish a base. The force was, however, destroyed by yellow fever and fierce resistance led by Haitian generals Toussaint Louverture and Jean-Jacques Dessalines. Faced by imminent war against Britain and bankruptcy, he recognised French possessions on the mainland of North America would be indefensible and sold them to the United States—the Louisiana Purchase—for less than three cents per acre ($7.40 per km²).

French Empire

Napoleon faced royalist and Jacobin plots as France's ruler, including the Conspiration des poignards (Dagger plot) in October 1800 and the Plot of the Rue Saint-Nicaise (also known as the infernal machine) two months later. In January 1804, his police uncovered an assassination plot against him which involved Moreau and which was ostensibly sponsored by the Bourbon former rulers of France. On the advice of Talleyrand, Napoleon ordered the kidnapping of Louis Antoine, Duke of Enghien, in violation of neighbouring Baden's sovereignty. After a secret trial the Duke was executed, even though he had not been involved in the plot.

Napoleon used the plot to justify the re-creation of a hereditary monarchy in France, with himself as emperor, as a Bourbon restoration would be more difficult if the Bonapartist succession was entrenched in the constitution. Napoleon crowned himself Emperor Napoleon I on 2 December 1804 at Notre Dame de Paris and then crowned Joséphine Empress. The story that he seized the crown out of the hands of Pope Pius VII during the ceremony to avoid his subjugation to the authority of the pontiff is apocryphal; the coronation procedure had been agreed in advance.[note 8] At Milan Cathedral on 26 May 1805, Napoleon was crowned King of Italy with the Iron Crown of Lombardy. He created eighteen Marshals of the Empire from amongst his top generals, to secure
the allegiance of the army. Ludwig van Beethoven, a long-time admirer, was disappointed at this turn towards imperialism and scratched his dedication to Napoleon from his 3rd Symphony.

**War of the Third Coalition**

By 1805, Britain had convinced Austria and Russia to join a Third Coalition against France. Napoleon knew the French fleet could not defeat the Royal Navy in a head-to-head battle and planned to lure it away from the English Channel. The French Navy would escape from the British blockades of Toulon and Brest and threaten to attack the West Indies, thus drawing off the British defence of the Western Approaches, in the hope a Franco-Spanish fleet could take control of the channel long enough for French armies to cross from Boulogne and invade England. However, after defeat at the naval Battle of Cape Finisterre in July 1805 and Admiral Villeneuve's retreat to Cadiz, invasion was never again a realistic option for Napoleon.

Instead, he ordered the army stationed at Boulogne, his Grande Armée, to march to Germany secretly in a turning movement—the Ulm Campaign. This encircled the Austrian forces about to attack France and severed their lines of communication. On 20 October 1805, the French captured 30,000 prisoners at Ulm, though the next day Britain's victory at the Battle of Trafalgar meant the Royal Navy gained control of the seas. Six weeks later, on the first anniversary of his coronation, Napoleon defeated Austria and Russia at Austerlitz. This ended the Third Coalition, and he commissioned the Arc de Triomphe to commemorate the victory. Austria had to concede territory; the Peace of Pressburg led to the dissolution of the Holy Roman Empire and creation of the Confederation of the Rhine with Napoleon named as its Protector.

Napoleon would go on to say, "The battle of Austerlitz is the finest of all I have fought." Frank McLynn suggests Napoleon was so successful at Austerlitz he lost touch with reality, and what used to be French foreign policy became a "personal Napoleonic one". Vincent Cronin disagrees, stating Napoleon was not overly ambitious for himself, that "he embodied the ambitions of thirty million Frenchmen".

**Middle-Eastern alliances**

Even after the failed campaign in Egypt, Napoleon continued to entertain a grand scheme to establish a French presence in the Middle East. An alliance with Middle-Eastern powers would have the strategic advantage of pressuring Russia on its southern border. From 1803, Napoleon went to considerable lengths to try to convince the Ottoman Empire to fight against Russia in the Balkans and join his anti-Russian coalition. Napoleon sent General Horace Sebastiani as envoy extraordinary, promising to help the Ottoman Empire recover lost territories. In February 1806, following Napoleon's victory at Austerlitz and the ensuing dismemberment of the Habsburg Empire, the Ottoman Emperor Selim III finally recognised Napoleon as Emperor, formally opting for an alliance with France "our sincere and natural ally", and war with Russia and England. A Franco-Persian alliance was also formed, from 1807 to 1809, between Napoleon and the Persian Empire of Fat'h-Ali Shah Qajar, against Russia and Great Britain. The alliance ended when France allied with Russia and turned its focus to European campaigns.

**War of the Fourth Coalition**
The Fourth Coalition was assembled in 1806, and Napoleon defeated Prussia at the Battle of Jena-Auerstedt in October. He marched against advancing Russian armies through Poland and was involved in the bloody stalemate of the Battle of Eylau on 6 February 1807. After a decisive victory at Friedland, he signed the Treaties of Tilsit; one with Tsar Alexander I of Russia which divided the continent between the two powers; the other with Prussia which stripped that country of half its territory. Napoleon placed puppet rulers on the thrones of German states, including his brother Jérôme as king of the new Kingdom of Westphalia. In the French-controlled part of Poland, he established the Duchy of Warsaw with King Frederick Augustus I of Saxony as ruler.

With his Milan and Berlin Decrees, Napoleon attempted to enforce a Europe-wide commercial boycott of Britain called the Continental System. This act of economic warfare did not succeed, as it encouraged British merchants to smuggle into continental Europe, and Napoleon's exclusively land-based customs enforcers could not stop them.

**Peninsular War**

Portugal did not comply with the Continental System, so in 1807 Napoleon invaded with the support of Spain. Under the pretext of a reinforcement of the Franco-Spanish army occupying Portugal, Napoleon invaded Spain as well, replaced Charles IV with his brother Joseph and placed his brother-in-law Joachim Murat in Joseph's stead at Naples. This led to resistance from the Spanish army and civilians in the Dos de Mayo Uprising. Following a French retreat from much of the country, Napoleon took command and defeated the Spanish Army. He retook Madrid, then outmanoeuvred a British army sent to support the Spanish and drove it to the coast. Before the Spanish population had been fully subdued, Austria again threatened war, and Napoleon returned to France.

The costly and often brutal Peninsular War continued in Napoleon's absence; in the second Siege of Saragossa most of the city was destroyed and over 50,000 people perished. Although Napoleon left 300,000 of his finest troops to battle Spanish guerrillas as well as British and Portuguese forces commanded by Arthur Wellesley, 1st Duke of Wellington, French control over the peninsula again deteriorated. Following several allied victories, the war concluded after Napoleon's abdication in 1814. Napoleon later described the Peninsular War as central to his final defeat, writing in his memoirs "That unfortunate war destroyed me... All... my disasters are bound up in that fatal knot."

**War of the Fifth Coalition and remarriage**

In April 1809, Austria abruptly broke its alliance with France, and Napoleon was forced to assume command of forces on the Danube and German fronts. After early successes, the French faced difficulties in crossing the Danube and suffered a defeat in May at the Battle of Aspern-Essling near Vienna. The Austrians failed to capitalise on the situation and allowed Napoleon's forces to regroup. He defeated the Austrians again at Wagram, and the Treaty of Schönbrunn was signed between Austria and France.

Britain was the other member of the coalition. In addition to the Iberian Peninsula, the British planned to open another front in mainland Europe. However, Napoleon was able to rush reinforcements to Antwerp, owing to Britain's inadequately organised Walcheren Campaign. He concurrently annexed the Papal States because of the Church's refusal to support the Continental System; Pope Pius VII responded by excommunicating the emperor. The pope was then abducted
by Napoleon's officers, and though Napoleon had not ordered his abduction, he did not order Pius' release. The pope was moved throughout Napoleon's territories, sometimes while ill, and Napoleon sent delegations to pressure him on issues including agreement to a new concordat with France, which Pius refused. In 1810 Napoleon married Archduchess Marie Louise of Austria, following his divorce of Joséphine; this further strained his relations with the Church, and thirteen cardinals were imprisoned for non-attendance at the marriage ceremony. The pope remained confined for 5 years and did not return to Rome until May 1814. Napoleon consented to the ascent to the Swedish throne of Bernadotte, one of his marshals and a long-term rival of Napoleon's, in November 1810. Napoleon had indulged Bernadotte's indiscretions because he was married to Désirée Clary but came to regret sparing his life when Bernadotte later allied Sweden with France's enemies.

**Invasion of Russia**

The Congress of Erfurt sought to preserve the Russo-French alliance, and the leaders had a friendly personal relationship after their first meeting at Tilsit in 1807. By 1811, however, tensions had increased and Alexander was under pressure from the Russian nobility to break off the alliance. An early sign the relationship had deteriorated was the Russian's virtual abandonment of the Continental System, which led Napoleon to threaten Alexander with serious consequences if he formed an alliance with Britain. By 1812, advisers to Alexander suggested the possibility of an invasion of the French Empire and the recapture of Poland. On receipt of intelligence reports on Russia's war preparations, Napoleon expanded his Grande Armée to more than 450,000 men. He ignored repeated advice against an invasion of the Russian heartland and prepared for an offensive campaign; on 23 June 1812 the invasion commenced.

In an attempt to gain increased support from Polish nationalists and patriots, Napoleon termed the war the Second Polish War—the First Polish War had been the Bar Confederation uprising by Polish nobles against Russia in 1768. Polish patriots wanted the Russian part of Poland to be joined with the Duchy of Warsaw and an independent Poland created. This was rejected by Napoleon, who stated he had promised his ally Austria this would not happen. Napoleon refused to manumit the Russian serfs because of concerns this might provoke a reaction in his army's rear. The serfs later committed atrocities against French soldiers during France's retreat.

The Russians avoided Napoleon's objective of a decisive engagement and instead retreated deeper into Russia. A brief attempt at resistance was made at Smolensk in August; the Russians were defeated in a series of battles, and Napoleon resumed his advance. The Russians again avoided battle, although in a few cases this was only achieved because Napoleon uncharacteristically hesitated to attack when the opportunity arose. Owing to the Russian army's scorched earth tactics, the French found it increasingly difficult to forage food for themselves and their horses.

The Russians eventually offered battle outside Moscow on 7 September: the Battle of Borodino resulted in approximately 44,000 Russian and 35,000 French dead, wounded or captured, and may have been the bloodiest day of battle in history up to that point in time. Although the French had won, the Russian army had accepted, and withstood, the major battle Napoleon had hoped would be decisive. Napoleon's own account was: "The most terrible of all my battles was the one before Moscow. The French showed themselves to be worthy of victory, but the Russians showed themselves worthy of being invincible."
The Russian army withdrew and retreated past Moscow. Napoleon entered the city, assuming its fall would end the war and Alexander would negotiate peace. However, on orders of the city's governor Feodor Rostopchin, rather than capitulation, Moscow was burned. After a month, concerned about loss of control back in France, Napoleon and his army left. The French suffered greatly in the course of a ruinous retreat, including from the harshness of the Russian Winter. The Armée had begun as over 400,000 frontline troops, but in the end fewer than 40,000 crossed the Berezina River in November 1812. The Russians had lost 150,000 in battle and hundreds of thousands of civilians.

**War of the Sixth Coalition**

There was a lull in fighting over the winter of 1812–13 while both the Russians and the French rebuilt their forces; Napoleon was then able to field 350,000 troops. Heartened by France's loss in Russia, Prussia joined with Austria, Sweden, Russia, Great Britain, Spain, and Portugal in a new coalition. Napoleon assumed command in Germany and inflicted a series of defeats on the Coalition culminating in the Battle of Dresden in August 1813. Despite these successes, the numbers continued to mount against Napoleon, and the French army was pinned down by a force twice its size and lost at the Battle of Leipzig. This was by far the largest battle of the Napoleonic Wars and cost more than 90,000 casualties in total.

Napoleon withdrew back into France, his army reduced to 70,000 soldiers and 40,000 stragglers, against more than three times as many Allied troops. The French were surrounded: British armies pressed from the south, and other Coalition forces positioned to attack from the German states. Napoleon won a series of victories in the Six Days' Campaign, though these were not significant enough to turn the tide; Paris was captured by the Coalition in March 1814. When Napoleon proposed the army march on the capital, his marshals decided to mutiny. On 4 April, led by Ney, they confronted Napoleon. Napoleon asserted the army would follow him, and Ney replied the army would follow its generals. Napoleon had no choice but to abdicate. He did so in favour of his son; however, the Allies refused to accept this, and Napoleon was forced to abdicate unconditionally on 11 April.

**Exile in Elba**

In the Treaty of Fontainebleau, the victors exiled him to Elba, an island of 12,000 inhabitants in the Mediterranean, 20 km off the Tuscan coast. They gave him sovereignty over the island and allowed him to retain his title of emperor. Napoleon attempted suicide with a pill he had carried since a near-capture by Russians on the retreat from Moscow. Its potency had weakened with age, and he survived to be exiled while his wife and son took refuge in Austria. In the first few months on Elba he created a small navy and army, developed the iron mines, and issued decrees on modern agricultural methods.

**Hundred Days**

Separated from his wife and son, who had come under Austrian control, cut off from the allowance guaranteed to him by the Treaty of Fontainebleau, and aware of rumours he was about to be banished to a remote island in the Atlantic Ocean, Napoleon escaped from Elba on 26 February 1815. He landed at Golfe-Juan on the French mainland, two days later. The 5th Regiment was sent to intercept him and made contact just south of Grenoble on 7 March 1815. Napoleon approached the regiment alone, dismounted his horse and, when he was within gunshot range, shouted, "Here I
am. Kill your Emperor, if you wish." The soldiers responded with, "Vive L'Empereur!" and marched with Napoleon to Paris; Louis XVIII fled. On 13 March, the powers at the Congress of Vienna declared Napoleon an outlaw, and four days later Great Britain, Russia, Austria and Prussia bound themselves to each put 150,000 men into the field to end his rule. Napoleon arrived in Paris on 20 March and governed for a period now called the Hundred Days. By the start of June the armed forces available to him had reached 200,000, and he decided to go on the offensive to attempt to drive a wedge between the oncoming British and Prussian armies. The French Army of the North crossed the frontier into the United Kingdom of the Netherlands, in modern-day Belgium.

Napoleon's forces fought the allies, led by Wellington and Gebhard Leberecht von Blücher, at the Battle of Waterloo on 18 June 1815. Wellington's army withstood repeated attacks by the French and drove them from the field while the Prussians arrived in force and broke through Napoleon's right flank. Napoleon was defeated because he had to fight two armies with one, attacking an army in an excellent defensive position through wet and muddy terrain. His health that day may have affected his presence and vigour on the field, added to the fact that his subordinates may have let him down. Despite this, Napoleon came very close to clinching victory. Outnumbered, the French army left the battlefield in disorder, which allowed Coalition forces to enter France and restore Louis XVIII to the French throne. Off the port of Rochefort, Charente-Maritime, after consideration of an escape to the United States, Napoleon formally demanded political asylum from the British Captain Frederick Maitland on HMS Bellerophon on 15 July 1815.

**Exile on Saint Helena**

Napoleon was imprisoned and then exiled to the island of Saint Helena in the Atlantic Ocean, 1,870 km from the west coast of Africa. In his first two months there, he lived in a pavilion on the Briars estate, which belonged to a William Balcombe. Napoleon became friendly with his family, especially his younger daughter Lucia Elizabeth who later wrote Recollections of the Emperor Napoleon. This friendship ended in 1818 when British authorities became suspicious that Balcombe had acted as an intermediary between Napoleon and Paris and dismissed him from the island.

Napoleon moved to Longwood House in December 1815; it had fallen into disrepair, and the location was damp, windswept and unhealthy. The Times published articles insinuating the British government was trying to hasten his death, and he often complained of the living conditions in letters to the governor and his custodian, Hudson Lowe. With a small cadre of followers, Napoleon dictated his memoirs and criticised his captors—particularly Lowe. Lowe's treatment of Napoleon is regarded as poor by historians such as Frank McLynn. Lowe exacerbated a difficult situation through measures including a reduction in Napoleon's expenditure, a rule that no gifts could be delivered to him if they mentioned his imperial status, and a document his supporters had to sign that guaranteed they would stay with the prisoner indefinitely.

In 1818, The Times reported a false rumour of Napoleon's escape and said the news had been greeted by spontaneous illuminations in London. There was sympathy for him in the British Parliament: Lord Holland gave a speech which demanded the prisoner be treated with no unnecessary harshness. Napoleon kept himself informed of the events through The Times and hoped for release in the event that Holland became prime minister. He also enjoyed the support of Lord Cochrane, who was involved in Chile's and Brazil's struggle for independence and wanted to rescue Napoleon and help him set up a new empire in South America, a scheme frustrated by
Napoleon's death in 1821. There were other plots to rescue Napoleon from captivity including one from Texas, where exiled soldiers from the Grande Armée wanted a resurrection of the Napoleonic Empire in America. There was even a plan to rescue him with a primitive submarine. For Lord Byron, Napoleon was the epitome of the Romantic hero, the persecuted, lonely and flawed genius. The news that Napoleon had taken up gardening at Longwood also appealed to more domestic British sensibilities.

**Death**

In February 1821, his health began to fail rapidly, and on 3 May two British physicians, who had recently arrived, attended on him but could only recommend palliatives. He died two days later, after confession, Extreme Unction and Viaticum in the presence of Father Ange Vignali. His last words were, "France, armée, tête d'armée, Joséphine."("France, army, head of the army, Joséphine.") Napoleon's original death mask was created around 6 May, though it is not clear which doctor created it. In his will, he had asked to be buried on the banks of the Seine, but the British governor said he should be buried on St. Helena, in the Valley of the Willows. Hudson Lowe insisted the inscription should read 'Napoleon Bonaparte'; Montholon and Bertrand wanted the Imperial title 'Napoleon' as royalty were signed by their first names only. As a result the tomb was left nameless.

In 1840, Louis Philippe I obtained permission from the British to return Napoleon's remains to France. The remains were transported aboard the frigate Belle-Poule, which had been painted black for the occasion, and on 29 November she arrived in Cherbourg. The remains were transferred to the steamship Normandie, which transported them to Le Havre, up the Seine to Rouen and on to Paris. On 15 December, a state funeral was held. The hearse proceeded from the Arc de Triomphe down the Champs-Élysées, across the Place de la Concorde to the Esplanade des Invalides and then to the cupola in St Jérôme's Chapel, where it stayed until the tomb designed by Louis Visconti was completed. In 1861, Napoleon's remains were entombed in a porphyry sarcophagus in the crypt under the dome at Les Invalides.

**Cause of death**

Napoleon's physician, François Carlo Antommarchi, led the autopsy, which found the cause of death to be stomach cancer. Antommarchi did not, however, sign the official report. Napoleon's father had died of stomach cancer though this was seemingly unknown at the time of the autopsy. Antommarchi found evidence of a stomach ulcer, and it was the most convenient explanation for the British who wanted to avoid criticism over their care of the emperor.

In 1955, the diaries of Napoleon's valet, Louis Marchand, appeared in print. His description of Napoleon in the months before his death led Sten Forshufvud to put forward other causes for his death, including deliberate arsenic poisoning, in a 1961 paper in Nature. Arsenic was used as a poison during the era because it was undetectable when administered over a long period. Forshufvud, in a 1978 book with Ben Weider, noted the emperor's body was found to be remarkably well-preserved when moved in 1840. Arsenic is a strong preservative, and therefore this supported the poisoning hypothesis. Forshufvud and Weider observed that Napoleon had attempted to quench abnormal thirst by drinking high levels of orgeat syrup that contained cyanide compounds in the almonds used for flavouring. They maintained that the potassium tartrate used in his treatment prevented his stomach from expellation of these compounds and that the thirst was a
symptom of poisoning. Their hypothesis was that the calomel given to Napoleon became an overdose, which killed him and left behind extensive tissue damage. A 2007 article stated the type of arsenic found in Napoleon's hair shafts was mineral type, the most toxic, and according to toxicologist Patrick Kintz, this supported the conclusion his death was murder.

The wallpaper used in Longwood contained a high level of arsenic compound used for colouring by British manufacturers. The adhesive, which in the cooler British environment was innocuous, may have grown mould in the more humid climate and emitted the poisonous gas arsine. This theory has been ruled out as it does not explain the arsenic absorption patterns found in other analyses.

There have been modern studies which have supported the original autopsy finding. Researchers, in a 2008 study, analysed samples of Napoleon's hair from throughout his life, and from his family and other contemporaries. All samples had high levels of arsenic, approximately 100 times higher than the current average. According to these researchers, Napoleon's body was already heavily contaminated with arsenic as a boy, and the high arsenic concentration in his hair was not caused by intentional poisoning; people were constantly exposed to arsenic from glues and dyes throughout their lives. 2007 and 2008 studies dismissed evidence of arsenic poisoning, and confirmed evidence of peptic ulcer and gastric cancer as the cause of death.

Marriages and children

Napoleon married Joséphine de Beauharnais in 1796, when he was twenty-six; she was a thirty-two-year-old widow whose first husband had been executed during the Revolution. Until she met Bonaparte, she had been known as 'Rose', a name which he disliked. He called her 'Joséphine' instead, and she went by this name henceforth. Bonaparte often sent her love letters while on his campaigns. He formally adopted her son Eugène and cousin Stéphanie and arranged dynastic marriages for them. Joséphine had her daughter Hortense marry Napoleon's brother Louis.

Joséphine had lovers, including a Hussar lieutenant, Hippolyte Charles, during Napoleon's Italian campaign. Napoleon learnt the full extent of her affair with Charles while in Egypt, and a letter he wrote to his brother Joseph regarding the subject was intercepted by the British. The letter appeared in the London and Paris presses, much to Napoleon's embarrassment. Napoleon had his own affairs too: during the Egyptian campaign he took Pauline Bellisle Foures, the wife of a junior officer, as his mistress. She became known as Cleopatra after the Ancient Egyptian ruler.

While Napoleon's mistresses had children by him, Joséphine did not produce an heir, possibly because of either the stresses of her imprisonment during the Reign of Terror or an abortion she may have had in her twenties. Napoleon ultimately chose divorce so he could remarry in search of an heir. In March 1810, he married Marie Louise, Archduchess of Austria, and a great niece of Marie Antoinette by proxy; thus he had married into a German royal and imperial family. They remained married until his death, though she did not join him in exile on Elba and thereafter never saw her husband again. The couple had one child, Napoleon Francis Joseph Charles (1811–1832), known from birth as the King of Rome. He became Napoleon II in 1814 and reigned for only two weeks. He was awarded the title of the Duke of Reichstadt in 1818 and died of tuberculosis aged 21, with no children.

Napoleon acknowledged two illegitimate children: Charles Léon (1806–1881) by Eléonore Denuelle de La Plaigne, and Count Alexandre Joseph Colonna-Walewski (1810–1868) by Countess
Marie Walewska. He may have had further unacknowledged illegitimate offspring as well, such as Karl Eugen von Mühlfeld by Victoria Kraus; Hélène Napoleone Bonaparte (1816–1910) by Albine de Montholon; and Jules Barthélemy-Saint-Hilaire, whose mother remains unknown.

**Image**

Napoleon has become a worldwide cultural icon who symbolises military genius and political power. Martin van Creveld described him as "the most competent human being who ever lived". Since his death, many towns, streets, ships, and even cartoon characters have been named after him. He has been portrayed in hundreds of films and discussed in hundreds of thousands of books and articles.

**Legacy**

**Warfare**

In the field of military organisation, Napoleon borrowed from previous theorists such as Jacques Antoine Hippolyte, Comte de Guibert, and from the reforms of preceding French governments, and then developed much of what was already in place. He continued the policy, which emerged from the Revolution, of promotion based primarily on merit. Corps replaced divisions as the largest army units, mobile artillery was integrated into reserve batteries, the staff system became more fluid and cavalry returned as an important formation in French military doctrine. These methods are now referred to as essential features of Napoleonic warfare. Though he consolidated the practice of modern conscription introduced by the Directory, one of the restored monarchy's first acts was to end it.

Weapons and other kinds of military technology remained largely static through the revolutionary and Napoleonic eras, but 18th century operational mobility underwent significant change. Napoleon's biggest influence was in the conduct of warfare. Napoleon was regarded by the influential military theorist Carl von Clausewitz as a genius in the operational art of war, and historians rank him as a great military commander. Wellington, when asked who the greatest general of the day was, answered: "In this age, in past ages, in any age, Napoleon."

Napoleon suffered various military setbacks however: Aspern-Essling in 1809, Russia in 1812 and at Leipzig in 1813. He also had to abandon his forces in Egypt — the result of strategic defeat rather than any reverse in pitched battle. With the exception of two small scale battles in Italy, Napoleon was not defeated in a field battle without being heavily outnumbered.

Under Napoleon, a new emphasis towards the destruction, not just outmanoeuvring, of enemy armies emerged. Invasions of enemy territory occurred over broader fronts which made wars costlier and more decisive. The political impact of war increased significantly; defeat for a European power meant more than the loss of isolated enclaves. Near-Carthaginian peaces intertwined whole national efforts, intensifying the Revolutionary phenomenon of total war.

**Bonapartism**

In French political history, Bonapartism has two meanings. The term can refer to people who
restored the French Empire under the House of Bonaparte including Napoleon's Corsican family and his nephew Louis. Napoleon left a Bonapartist dynasty which ruled France again; Louis became Napoleon III, Emperor of the Second French Empire and was the first President of France. In a wider sense, Bonapartism refers to a broad centrist or center-right political movement that advocates the idea of a strong and centralised state, based on populism.

**Criticism**

Napoleon ended lawlessness and disorder in post-Revolutionary France. He was, however, considered a tyrant and usurper by his opponents. His critics charge that he was not significantly troubled when faced with the prospect of war and death for thousands, turned his search for undisputed rule into a series of conflicts throughout Europe and ignored treaties and conventions alike. His role in the Haitian Revolution and decision to reinstate slavery in France's overseas colonies are controversial and have an impact on his reputation. Napoleon institutionalised plunder of conquered territories: French museums contain art stolen by Napoleon's forces from across Europe. Artefacts were brought to the Musée du Louvre for a grand central museum; his example would later serve as inspiration for more notorious imitators. He was compared to Adolf Hitler most famously by the historian Pieter Geyl in 1947. David G. Chandler, historian of Napoleonic warfare, wrote that, "Nothing could be more degrading to the former and more flattering to the latter."

Critics argue Napoleon's true legacy must reflect the loss of status for France and needless deaths brought by his rule: historian Victor Davis Hanson writes, "After all, the military record is unquestioned—17 years of wars, perhaps six million Europeans dead, France bankrupt, her overseas colonies lost." McLynn notes that, "He can be viewed as the man who set back European economic life for a generation by the dislocating impact of his wars. However, Vincent Cronin replies that such criticism relies on the flawed premise that Napoleon was responsible for the wars which bear his name, when in fact France was the victim of a series of coalitions which aimed to destroy the ideals of the Revolution.

**His administration**

Napoleon was not only an excellent general, but also a great administrator and statesman. He centralized the whole of the administration of France. The local government was made subordinate to the central government. There was to be a Prefect as head of a department; a sub-prefect as head of an arrondissement and a mayor for each town. They were to be appointed by and responsible to Napoleon. Napoleon improved the financial position of his country by a careful collection of the taxes and a rigid economy. The Bank of France was established in 1800.

Bonaparte introduced many educational reforms. Primary, elementary and secondary schools were established in rural and urban areas. The government directly regulated schools for higher and technical education, civil services and military schools. The University of France was also established. Napoleon carried out several public works. He constructed new broad military roads, bridges, canals, waterways and seaports for commercial and naval purposes.

He was able to solve the difficult problem of religion in the state. He negotiated with Pope Pius VII. Finally, a Concordat (For details see the following title ‘concordat’) was concluded in 1802. It
governed relations between the Church and the State in France for 103 years. This guaranteed freedom of worship to all. He appointed several committees of legal experts to draft in simple, clear and concise language, five codes, namely: the civil code, the code of civil procedure, the code of Criminal procedure, the Penal code and the commercial code. Some of the outstanding features of the ‘Code Napoleon’ (For details see Napoleonic code) are personal liberty, social equality, religious toleration, emancipation of land, public trial, and the jury system. It presented to Europe, the fundamental rules governing civilized society.

Napoleon Bonaparte thus stands out as one of the greatest generals and conquerors, a peerless administrator, a lawgiver, and the greatest diplomat the world has ever known. Napoleon appealed to the masses as a great orator. He abolished feudalism wherever he went and replaced old, outmoded, confusing and conflicting laws, with the new Code Napoleon. Professors Grant and Temperley rightly conclude, "Napoleon was without question a man of extraordinary force of brain and character. He had great powers of work and of organization, and the gift of genius which defies analysis."

In 1801 Bonaparte became President of the French Academy of Sciences and appointed Jean Baptiste Joseph Delambre its Permanent Secretary. In May 1802, he instituted the Legion of Honour, a substitute for the old royalist decorations and orders of chivalry, to encourage civilian and military achievements; the order is still the highest decoration in France. His powers were increased by the Constitution of the Year X including: Article 1. The French people name and the Senate proclaim Napoleon-Bonaparte First Consul for Life. After this he was generally referred to as Napoleon rather than Bonaparte.

**Metric system**

The official introduction of the metric system in September 1799 was unpopular in large sections of French society, and Napoleon's rule greatly aided adoption of the new standard across not only France but the French sphere of influence. Napoleon ultimately took a retrograde step in 1812 when he passed legislation to introduce the mesures usuelles (traditional units of measurement) for retail trade – a system of measure that resembled the pre-revolutionary units but were based on the kilogram and the metre; for example the livre metrique (metric pound) was 500 g instead of 489.5 g – the value of the livre du roi (the king's pound). Other units of measure were rounded in a similar manner. This however laid the foundations for the definitive introduction of the metric system across Europe in the middle of the 19th century.

**Napoleonic Code**

Napoleon's set of civil laws, the Code Civil—now often known as the Napoleonic code—was prepared by committees of legal experts under the supervision of Jean Jacques Régis de Cambacérès, the Second Consul. Napoleon participated actively in the sessions of the Council of State that revised the drafts. The development of the code was a fundamental change in the nature of the civil law legal system with its stress on clearly written and accessible law. Other codes were commissioned by Napoleon to codify criminal and commerce law; a Code of Criminal Instruction was published, which enacted rules of due process.
The Napoleonic code was adopted throughout much of Europe, though only in the lands he conquered, and remained in force after Napoleon's defeat. Napoleon said: "My true glory is not to have won 40 battles...Waterloo will erase the memory of so many victories. ... But...what will live forever is my Civil Code." The Code still has importance today in a quarter of the world's jurisdictions including in Europe, the Americas and Africa. Dieter Langewiesche described the code as a "revolutionary project" which spurred the development of bourgeois society in Germany by the extension of the right to own property and acceleration towards the end of feudalism. Napoleon reorganised what had been the Holy Roman Empire, made up of more than a thousand entities, into a more streamlined forty-state Confederation of the Rhine; this provided the basis for the German Confederation and the unification of Germany in 1871. The movement toward national unification in Italy was similarly precipitated by Napoleonic rule. These changes contributed to the development of nationalism and the nation state.

**Concordat**

Seeking national reconciliation between revolutionaries and Catholics, the Concordat of 1801 was signed on 15 July 1801 between Napoleon and Pope Pius VII. It solidified the Roman Catholic Church as the majority church of France and brought back most of its civil status. During the French Revolution, the National Assembly had taken Church properties and issued the Civil Constitution of the Clergy, which made the Church a department of the State, removing it from the authority of the Pope. This caused hostility among the Vendeans towards the change in the relationship between the Catholic Church and the French government. Subsequent laws abolished the traditional Gregorian calendar and Christian holidays.

While the Concordat restored some ties to the papacy, it was largely in favor of the state; the balance of church-state relations had tilted firmly in Napoleon's favour. Now, Napoleon could win favor with the Catholics within France while also controlling Rome in a political sense. Napoleon once told his brother Lucien in April 1801, "Skillful conquerors have not got entangled with priests. They can both contain them and use them." As a part of the Concordat, he presented another set of laws called the Organic Articles.

**Jewish Emancipation**

Napoleon emancipated Jews (as well as Protestants in Catholic countries and Catholics in Protestant countries) from laws which restricted them to ghettos, and he expanded their rights to property, worship, and careers. Despite the anti-semitic reaction to Napoleon's policies from foreign governments and within France, he believed emancipation would benefit France by attracting Jews to the country given the restrictions they faced elsewhere. He stated, "I will never accept any proposals that will obligate the Jewish people to leave France, because to me the Jews are the same as any other citizen in our country. It takes weakness to chase them out of the country, but it takes strength to assimilate them." He was seen as so favourable to the Jews that the Russian Orthodox Church formally condemned him as "Antichrist and the Enemy of God".

**Consequences of the Revolution**

The French Revolution had many permanent results, which proved to be of great value. This
Revolution affected not only the people of France, but also changed the course of human history. There was a complete collapse of the ancient regime. The French Revolution abolished all elements of feudalism including serfdom. The privileges of the clergy and the nobility also came to an end. A new order was established based on the ‘Declaration of the Rights of Man’. The Declaration possesses a very important place in the history of man, along with other documents of worldwide importance, such as the English Magna Carta of the 13th century, and the American Declaration of Independence of the 18th century.

The main theme of the French Revolution was "Liberty, Equality and Fraternity". For the French, Liberty meant the rights to property, security of life, to resistance, to worship, to freedom of speech, expression and the press. Equality meant the absence of all elements of feudalism, including serfdom and the privileges of the clergy and the nobility.

The Revolution spread the ideas of nationalism and democracy throughout the length and breadth of the world. The French democratic slogan, "Liberty Equality, Fraternity," soon became the watchword of the suppressed and the oppressed peoples of the world. The philosophy of Locke, Rousseau, Montesquieu and Voltaire awakened the peoples of the world from their long slumber of ignorance and united them to fight for the cause of nationalism and democracy. The whole of Europe felt the impact of the Revolution of 1789. Indeed, European history merges into the history of one nation, one event, and one man: the nation is France, the event is the French revolution, and the man is Napoleon, "a child of the Revolution".

The Revolution of 1789 sealed the fate of monarchy, once for all. It paved the way for democracy. The makers of the Revolution established the idea of a limited monarch. When the Bourbons came back to the throne, after the rise of Napoleon Bonaparte, they were expected to play the role of limited or constitutional monarchs.

The National Assembly, followed by the National Convention, began several social and economic reforms. It abolished negro slavery and imprisonment for debt. Women were guaranteed protection in their property claims in common with men. New laws of inheritance were passed, by which all heirs were to inherit the property equally. Napoleon’s conquests had such a great impact that the revolutionary ideas of nationalism, patriotism and democracy spread throughout Europe.

The Metric system was another effect of the Revolution, which was later adopted by the whole of Europe and some Asian countries too. The French Revolution was a beacon of inspiration and hope to suffering humanity, even though it advised moderation in the attainment of freedom.

**Continental System**

The Continental System or Continental Blockade (known in French as Blocus continental) was the foreign policy of Napoleon I of France in his struggle against the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland during the Napoleonic Wars. It was a large-scale embargo against British trade, inaugurated on November 21, 1806. This embargo ended on April 11, 1814 after Napoleon's first abdication.

**Background**
The United Kingdom was an important force in encouraging and financing alliances against Napoleonic France. Napoleon didn't have the resources to attempt an invasion of the United Kingdom or to defeat the Royal Navy at sea. His one attempt to do so ended with defeat at the Battle of Trafalgar in 1805. Napoleon resorted instead to economic warfare. As a result of the Industrial Revolution, Great Britain was emerging as Europe's manufacturing and industrial centre, and Napoleon believed it would be easy to take advantage of embargo on trade with the European nations under his control, causing inflation and great debt.

**The Plan**

In November 1806, having recently conquered or allied with every major power on the European continent, Napoleon issued the Berlin Decree forbidding his allies and conquests from trading with the British. The UK responded with the Orders in Council of 1807 issued 11 November 1807. These forbade French trade with the UK, its allies or neutrals, and instructed the Royal Navy to blockade French and allied ports. Napoleon retaliated with the Milan Decree of 1807, which declared that all neutral shipping using British ports or paying British tariffs were to be regarded as British and seized.

Napoleon's plan to defeat Britain was to destroy its ability to trade. As an island nation, trade was the most vital lifeline. Napoleon believed that if he could isolate Britain economically, he would be able to invade the nation after the economic collapse. Napoleon decreed that all commerce ships wishing to do business in Europe must first stop at a French port in order to ensure that there could be no trade with Britain. He also ordered all European nations and French allies to stop trading with Britain, and he threatened Russia with an invasion if they did not comply as well.

**Failure of the System**

The main flaw in the Continental Plan was that Britain still had naval dominance, which meant that Napoleon could only enforce his law on land.

**Effect of the System**

Its effect on the UK and on British trade is uncertain, but thought to be much less harmful than on the continental European states; food imports in Britain dropped and the price of staple foods rose. The continental European states needed British goods and Napoleon had put in place internal tariffs, all favoring France and hurting the other nations. The embargo encouraged British merchants to seek out new markets aggressively and to engage in smuggling with continental Europe. Napoleon's exclusively land-based customs enforcers could not stop British smugglers, especially as these operated with the connivance of Napoleon's chosen rulers of Spain, Westphalia and other German states, who faced severe shortages of goods from the French colonies.

Britain, by Orders in Council (1807), prohibited its trade partners from trading with France. The British were able to counter the plan by threatening to sink any ship that did not come to a British port or chose to comply with France. This double threat created a difficult time for neutral nations like the United States of America. In response to this prohibition, compounded by the Chesapeake Incident, the U.S. Congress passed the Embargo Act of 1807 and eventually Macon's Bill No. 2. This embargo contributed to the general ill will between the two countries (Britain and the U.S.), and together with the issue of the impressment of foreign seamen, eventually led to armed conflict between the U.S. and the UK in the War of 1812. The embargo also had an effect on France itself. Ship building and its trades such as rope-making declined, as did many other industries that relied
on overseas markets, e.g. the linen industries. With few exports and a loss of profits, many industries were closed down.

Portugal openly refused to join the Continental System. In 1793, after the French declaration of war against Great Britain, Portugal signed with Great Britain a treaty of mutual help. After the Treaty of Tilsit of July 1807, Napoleon attempted to capture the Portuguese Fleet and the House of Braganza, and to occupy the Portuguese ports. He failed. King John VI of Portugal took his fleet and transferred the Portuguese Court to Brazil with a Royal Navy escort. The Portuguese population rose in revolt against the French invaders, the British Army under Arthur Wellesley, 1st Duke of Wellington intervened, and the Peninsular War began in 1808. Napoleon also forced the Spanish royal family to resign their throne in favor of Napoleon's brother, Joseph.

Sweden, Britain's ally in the Third Coalition, refused to comply with French demands and was invaded by Russia in February 1808. Also; Russia chafed under the embargo, and in 1812 reopened trade with the UK. Russia's withdrawal from the system was the main incentive for Napoleon to force a decision to invade, which was the turning point of the war.

**Important Points to Remember:**

**Causes of the French Revolution**

France reached its zenith of glory under King Louis IV. But he was involved in wasteful wars which drained the national treasury. Louis V was even worse as he indulged in wars only to please his mistresses. Further, he enforced strict censorship on any criticism of the monarchy in France. Louis VI was well-meaning but lacking in resolve. And he was influenced by the insensitive Queen Marie Antoinette.

There were three social classes in France: the First, Second and the Third Estate. Members of the first and second Estate enjoyed a luxurious lifestyle and were completely exempt from taxes. But members of the third Estate (the common men) had to bear the burden of taxation and did not even enjoy the privileges granted to the first and second Estates.

Whereas the peasants and workers were starving for lack of means, the nobility and the clergy lived lavishly.

Besides, the national treasury was emptied thanks to a lack of a regular budget or planning. The "philosophy of borrowing" first by Nacker and then by Claonne emptied the national treasury.

French thinkers brought in the international awakening in France. Through his work, Montesquieu introduced the idea of a government branched into a separate legislature, executive and judiciary. He demonstrated how a lack of this would bring about tyranny.

Voltaire, a famous writer, attacked conventional institutions like the church and the state in his work. Rousseau’s ‘social contract’ theory pointed out the offense of the French monarchs. Encyclopaedists also contributed in speaking against slavery, unjust laws and incompetence of the government.
Religious intolerance (revoking of the Edict of Nantes by Louis XIV) was an important factor. The glorious revolution in England encouraged French philosophers to think of economic and political reforms.

Though the Americans had overthrown a government of a mother country, the revolution inspired the French to revolt against a tyrannical rule.

**Course of the Revolution**

The third Estate demands to sit with the other Estates for the General assembly. Their request is refused. The members of the third Estate take the famous ‘Tennis Court Oath’ and resolve to remain united until a constitution is established.

Thanks to the influential message of Count Mirabeau, all the three Estates could sit together in a ‘National Assembly’ and vote ‘by head’.

There were riots in Paris followed by the ‘Fall of the Bastille’ i.e. the triumph of liberty. The Royal palace was invaded by the people and the royal family was moved to Versailles and the National Assembly was shifted from Versailles to Paris.

The National Assembly did noteworthy work: it abolished slavery, nationalized the church and came up with a Declaration of Rights of man and of a citizen.

A written Constitution was drawn up in 1791; it allowed for a limited monarchy and a separation of powers.

Louis XVI took an oath to support the Constitution and the National Assembly was dissolved and finally a Legislative Assembly was established in its place.

The Legislative Assembly suspended the king after he spoke against its matters. The National Convention declared the First French Republic in 1792. Louis XVI was guillotined by the National Convention.

A coalition of England, Holland, Spain, Sardinia, Austria and Prussia was formed against the First French Republic but the French army defeated it under the leadership of Carnot.

A ‘reign of terror’ was unleashed during which the Royalists were executed.

A new constitution called the Constitution of the Year third was established by the National Assembly.

A decline in the state of domestic affairs led to Napoleon Bonaparte gaining supreme control over the country.

**Napoleon Bonaparte**

Napoleon began his career as an artillery officer but rose to the post of a Brigadier general. He became the first consul after overthrowing the Directory and thus enjoyed dictatorial powers. He led a series of conquests and was badly defeated by the Russians. He centralized the whole of the administration of France.
Napoleon introduced a number of economic and educational reforms.

A significant religious reform he introduced was the Concordat which ensured freedom of religion to all. He brought in the Code of Napoleon.

**Consequences of the Revolution**

It announced the destruction of the ancient regime and a ‘Declaration of the Rights of man’ was introduced.

The fundamentals of "Liberty, Equality and Fraternity" were secured for the people.

From therein emerged the child of the Revolution Napoleon Bonaparte.

Various economic and social reforms were brought about.

Thanks to Napoleon, the ideals of patriotism, democracy and nationalism spread throughout Europe.

The French Revolution of 1830, also known as the July Revolution or Trois Glorieuses in French, saw the overthrow of King Charles X of France, the French Bourbon monarch, and the ascent of his cousin Louis-Philippe, the Duc d'Orléans, who himself, after 18 precarious years on the throne, would in turn be overthrown. It marked the shift from one constitutional monarchy, the Bourbon Restoration, to another, the July Monarchy; the transition of power from the House of Bourbon to its cadet branch, the House of Orléans; and the substitution of the principle of popular sovereignty for hereditary right. Supporters of the Bourbon would be called Legitimists, and supporters of Louis PhilippeOrleanists.

**BACKGROUND**

On 16 September 1824, Charles X ascended to the throne of France. He was the younger brother of Louis XVIII, who, upon the defeat of Napoléon Bonaparte, and by agreement of the Allied powers, had been installed as King of France. The fact that both Louis and Charles ruled by hereditary right rather than popular consent was the first of two triggers for *Les Trois Glorieuses*, the "Three Glorious Days" of the July Revolution.

Upon the abdication of Napoleon in 1814, continental Europe, and France in particular, was in a state of disarray. The Congress of Vienna met to redraw the continent's political map. Although there were many European countries attending the congress, there were four major powers that controlled the decision making: United Kingdom, represented by her foreign secretary Viscount Castlereagh; Austria, represented by the chief minister (and chairman of the congress) Klemens, Fürst von Metternich; Russia, represented by Emperor Alexander I; and Prussia, represented by King Frederick William III. Another very influential person at the Congress was Charles Maurice de Talleyrand, a French diplomat under Napoleon. Although France was considered an enemy state, Talleyrand was allowed to attend the Congress because he claimed that he had only cooperated with Napoleon under duress.
Talleyrand proposed that Europe be restored to its "legitimate" (i.e. pre-Napoleon) borders and governments; a plan that, with some changes, was accepted by members of the Congress. France returned to its 1789 borders and the House of Bourbon, deposed by the Revolution, was restored to the throne. In the eyes of the Congress, the political situation in France and Europe was now backing to normal. However, the new king, Louis XVIII, knew that ideas of nationalism and democracy still lingered in his country; hence the establishment and signing of the Charte constitutionnelle française, the French Constitution otherwise known as La Charte. A document both liberal and monarchical, La Charte was the second trigger of the July Revolution.

**Charles X's Reign**

On 16 September 1824, after a lingering illness of several months, the 69-year-old Louis XVIII died childless. Therefore his younger brother, Charles, aged 66, inherited the throne of France. On 27 September Charles X, as he was now known, made his state entry into Paris to popular acclaim. During the ceremony, while presenting the King the keys to the city, the comte de Chabrol, Prefect of the Seine, declared: "Proud to possess its new king, Paris can aspire to become the queen of cities by its magnificence, as its people aspire to be foremost in its fidelity, its devotion, and its love."

But eight months later, the mood of the capital had sharply worsened in its opinion of the new king. The causes of this dramatic shift in public opinion were many, but the main two were:

- The imposition of the death penalty for anyone profaning the Host of the Catholic Church.
- The provisions for financial indemnities for properties confiscated by the 1789 Revolution and the First Empire of Napoleon. These indemnities to be paid to any one, whether noble or non-noble, who had been declared "enemies of the Revolution",

Critics of the first accused the king and his new ministry of pandering to the Catholic Church, and by so doing violating guarantees of equality of religious belief as specified in La Charte.

The second matter that of financial indemnities, was far more opportunistic than the first. This was because since the restoration of the monarchy, there had been demands from all groups to settle matters of property ownership; to reduce, if not eliminate, the uncertainties in the real estate market both in Paris and in France. But liberal opponents, many of whom were frustrated Bonapartists, began a whispering campaign that Charles X was only proposing this in order to shame those who had not emigrated. Both measures, they claimed, were nothing more than clever subterfuge meant to bring about the destruction of La Charte. Up to this time, thanks to the popularity of the Chamber of Peers with the people of Paris, the king's relationship with the elite – both of the right and left – had remained solid. This, too, was about to change. On 12 April, propelled by both genuine conviction and the spirit of independence, the Chamber of Deputies roundly rejected the government's proposal to change the inheritance laws. The popular leftist newspaper *Le Constitutionnel* pronounced this refusal "a victory over the forces of counter-revolutionaries and reactionism."

The popularity of both the Chamber of Peers and the Chamber of Deputies skyrocketed, and the popularity of the king and his ministry dropped. This became unmistakable when on 16 April 1827, while reviewing the Garde Royale in the Champ de Mars, the king was greeted with icy silence,
and many of the spectators refusing even to remove their hats. Charles X "later told [his cousin] Orléans that, 'although most people present were not too hostile, some looked at times with terrible expressions'."Because of what it perceived to be growing, relentless, and increasingly vitriolic criticism of both the government and the Church, the government of Charles X introduced into the Chamber of Deputies a proposal for a law tightening censorship, especially in regard to the newspapers. The Chamber, for its part, objected so violently that the humiliated government had no choice but to withdraw its proposals.

On 18 March 1830, the liberal majority in the Chamber of Deputies made the Address of the 221 (motion of no confidence) against the king and Polignac's ministry. The following day, Charles dissolved parliament, and then alarmed Liberals by delaying elections for two months. During this time, the liberals championed the '221' as popular heroes, whilst the government struggled to gain support across the country as prefects were shuffled around the departments of France. The elections that followed return an overwhelming Liberal majority, thus defeating the government. This came after another event: on the grounds that it had behaved in an offensive manner towards the crown, on 30 April the king abruptly dissolved the National Guard of Paris, a voluntary group of citizens and an ever reliable conduit between the monarchy and the people. Cooler heads were appalled: "[I] would rather have my head cut off," wrote a noble from the Rhineland upon hearing the news, "than have counseled such an act: the only further measure needed to cause a revolution is censorship."

That came in July 1830 when, on Sunday, 25 July Charles X signed the July Ordinances, also known as "The Ordinances of Saint-Cloud". On Monday 26 July, they were published in the leading conservative newspaper in Paris, Le Moniteur. On Tuesday 27 July, the revolution began in earnest Les trois journées de juillet, and the end of the Bourbon monarchy.

**The Three Glorious Days:**

**Monday, 26 July 1830**

It was a hot, dry summer, pushing those who could afford it to leave Paris for the country. Most businessmen could not, and so were among the first to learn of the Saint-Cloud "ordonnances" from the Monday edition of Le Moniteur. They did not like what they read, perhaps most of all because they suddenly learned they were now no longer permitted to run as candidates for the House of Deputies, membership of which was the *sine qua non* of those who sought the ultimate in social prestige. In protest, members of the Bourse refused to lend money, and business owners shuttered their factories. Workers were unceremoniously turned out into the street to fend for themselves. Unemployment, which had been growing through early summer, spiked. "Large numbers of... workers therefore had nothing to do but protest."The few liberal politicians who still remained in Paris gathered in private to protest, exchange notes, point fingers, and avoid any real course of action. Liberal journalists, on the other hand, took action.

While conservative newspapers such as the Journal des débats, Le Moniteur, and Le Constitutionnel had already ceased publication in compliance with the new law, nearly 50 liberal and radical journalists from a dozen city newspapers met in the offices of the liberal Le National. There they signed a collective protest, and vowed their newspapers would continue to run. That evening, when police raided a news press and seized contraband newspapers, they were greeted by
a sweltering, unemployed mob angrily shouting, "À bas les Bourbons!" "Vive la Charte!!" Armand Carrel, a Republican journalist, wrote in the next day's edition of Le National:

"France... falls back into revolution by the act of the government itself... the legal regime is now interrupted, that of force has begun... in the situation in which we are now placed obedience has ceased to be a duty... It is for France to judge how far its own resistance ought to extend. "As if living in a dream world, the Paris Préfet de Police wrote on the evening, “...the most perfect tranquility continues to reign in all parts of the capital. No event worthy of attention is recorded in the reports that have come through to me."

**TUESDAY, 27 JULY 1830: DAY ONE**

The sun rose to a Paris awash in radical newspapers. By noon, the noise and traffic on the avenues, which in the early morning had seemed to hold the promise of a typical day, began to disappear. The city grew quiet as the milling crowds grew larger. At 4:30 pm commanders of the troops of the First Military division of Paris and the Garde Royale were ordered to concentrate their troops, and guns, on the Place du Carrousel facing the Tuileries, the Place Vendôme, and the Place de la Bastille. In order to maintain order and protect gun shops from looters, military patrols throughout the city were established, strengthened and expanded. Amazingly, no special measures were taken to protect either the arm depots or gunpowder factories.

For a time, it seemed the precautions seemed premature, but at 7:00 pm, with the coming of twilight, the fighting began. "Parisians, rather than soldiers, were the aggressor. Paving stones, roof tiles, and flowerpots from the upper windows... began to rain down on the soldiers in the streets". At first, soldiers fired warning shots into the air. But before the night was over, twenty-one civilians were killed. Quick-thinking rioters, knowing nothing helps along an uprising more than a martyr, paraded the corpse of one of their fallen throughout the streets shouting "Mort aux Ministres!" "À bas les aristocrates!" ("Death to the ministers! Down with the aristocrats").

One witness wrote:

"[I saw] a crowd of agitated people pass by and disappear, then a troop of cavalry succeed them... In every direction and at intervals... Indistinct noises, gunshots, and then for a time all is silent again so for a time one could believe that everything in the city was normal. But all the shops are shut; the Pont Neuf is almost completely dark, the stupefaction visible on every face reminds us all too much of the crisis we face...."

In the late 1820s, the city of Paris had established some 2,000 street lamps. These lanterns were hung on ropes looped-on-looped from one pole to another, the whole casting shadows like giant spiders' webs on streets and buildings. These lights were the reason the rioting lasted as late into the night as it did. But along came the sound of smashing glass as the street lamps fell in wanton or accidental destruction. By 10 pm nearly all of them were destroyed, and as the city slipped into darkness, the crowds began to disperse; by midnight the city was quiet.

**WEDNESDAY, 28 JULY 1830: DAY TWO**

Though Paris had been quiet during the night, it had not been asleep."It is hardly a quarter past eight," wrote an eye witness, "and already shouts and gun shots can be heard. Business is at a
complete standstill.... Crowds rushing through the streets... the sound of cannon and gunfire is becoming ever louder.... Cries of 'À bas le roi!', 'À la guillotine!!' can be heard...."

The original plan of Maréchal Auguste Marmont, Major-General of the city's Garde Royale, to have the Garde Royale singlehandedly guard the vital thoroughfares of the city, as well as protect important buildings such as the Palais Royal, Palais de Justice, and the Hôtel de Ville was both ill considered and wildly ambitious. Not only were there not enough troops but, worse, from bullets to bread to clean drinking water, there were nowhere near enough provisions for those troops... or rather for what troops remained. The Garde was composed of Parisians, a small but growing number of whom were deserting. Some merely slipping away, others leaving, not caring who saw them.

The 73-year-old Charles X, prudently remaining at Saint-Cloud, was kept abreast of the events in Paris, and assured by his ministers that the troubles would end as soon as the rioters ran out of ammunition. After all, his ministers assured him, had not Marmont himself sent a report to His Majesty just the previous night assuring him all was under control?

In Paris, a committee of the liberal opposition, composed of banker-and-kingmaker Jacques Laffitte, Casimir Perier, Generals Etienne Gérard and Georges Mouton, comte de Lobau, among others, had drawn up and signed a petition in which, not surprisingly, they asked for the ordonnances to be withdrawn; more surprising was their criticism "not of the King, but his ministers" – thereby disproving Charles X's conviction that his liberal opponents were enemies of his dynasty.

After signing the petition, committee members went directly to Marmont to beg for an end to the bloodshed, and to plead with him to become a mediator between Saint-Cloud and Paris. In the near-chaos of his headquarters, Marmont explained with tired patience that petitions and humble requests were all well and good, but that the first step lay with the people of Paris – they must lay down their arms and return to their homes. Then, and only then, could there be talk. Discouraged but not despairing, the party then sought out the king's chief minister, the haughty; eerily calm de Polignac – "Jeanne d'Arc en culottes" as he was whisperingly called at Saint-Cloud. From Polignac they received even less satisfaction. He refused to see them, perhaps because he knew that discussions would be a waste of time. Like Marmont, he knew that Charles X considered the ordonnances vital to the safety and dignity of the throne of France. Thus, the King would not withdraw the ordonnances.

At 4 pm, Charles X received Colonel Komierowski, one of Marmont's chief aides. The colonel was carrying a note from Marmont to his Majesty:"Sire, it is no longer a riot, it is a revolution. It is urgent for Your Majesty to take measures for pacification. The honour of the crown can still be saved. Tomorrow, perhaps, there will be no more time... I await with impatience Your Majesty's orders."The king asked Polignac for advice, and the advice was to resist. Meanwhile, in Paris, a group of serious men met and talked. The name of the duc d'Orléans was mentioned for the first time.

**THURSDAY, 29 JULY 1830: DAY THREE**

"They (the king and ministers) do not come to Paris," wrote the poet, novelist and playwright Alfred de Vigny, "people are dying for them ... Not one prince has appeared. The poor men of the
guard abandoned without orders, without bread for two days, hunted everywhere and fighting. "Perhaps for the same reason, royalists were nowhere to be found; perhaps another reason was that now the révoltés were well organized and very well armed. In what seemed like only a day and a night, over 4,000 barricades had been thrown up throughout the city; nearly every tree of any size in the city had been chopped down to erect or strengthen these barricades; entire streets had had their cobble stones torn out for the same reasons. The tricolor flag of the revolutionaries – the "people's flag" – flew over buildings, an increasing number of them important buildings. Nowhere was there the white and gold flag of the Bourbon.

Marmont lacked either the initiative or the presence of mind to call for additional troops from Saint-Denis, Vincennes, Lunéville or Saint-Omer; neither did he ask for help from reservists or those Parisians still loyal to Charles X. Liberals swarmed to his headquarters demanding the arrest of Polignac and the other ministers; conservatives and city leaders demanding he arrest the rioters and their puppet masters. Marmont listened to them all with growing indifference, and did nothing. Instead he waited for orders from the king, just as his king had commanded.

By 1:30 pm, the Tuileries had fallen. It now seemed like an overturned ant-hill of radicals, rioters, and opportunists. What could not be pillaged was smashed to bits, or sent hurling through closed windows to the ground below. "A man wearing a ball dress belonging to the duchesse de Berry, with feathers and flowers in his hair, screamed from a palace window: "Je reçois! Je reçois!" Others drank wine from the palace cellars." It should be noted that the amount of looting during these three days was surprisingly little; not only at the Louvre – whose paintings and objets d'art were protected by the crowd – but the Tuileries, the Palais de Justice, the Archbishop's Palace, and other places as well.

Earlier that day, the Louvre had fallen, and even more quickly. The Swiss Guards, seeing the mob swarming towards them, and manacled by the orders of Marmont not to fire unless fired upon first, ran away. They had no wish to share the fate of a similar contingent of Swiss Guards back in 1792, who had held their ground against another such mob and were torn to pieces for their valour. By mid-afternoon came the greatest prize, the Hôtel de Ville, had been captured. A few hours later, liberal politicians entered the battered complex and set about establishing a provisional government. Though there would be spots of fighting throughout the city for the next few days, the revolution, for all intents and purposes, was over.

**Results**

The revolution of July 1830 created a constitutional monarchy. Charles X abdicated rather than become a limited monarch and departed for Great Britain. In his place Louis Philippe of the House of Orléans was placed on the throne, and he agreed to rule as a constitutional monarch. This period became known as the July Monarchy.

The July Column, located on Place de la Bastille, commemorates the events of the Three Glorious Days. One month after the revolution, in the United Kingdom of the Netherlands, the Belgian Revolution would commence, leading to the establishment of an independent Kingdom of Belgium.

**Congress of Vienna**
The Congress of Vienna was a conference among the ambassadors of the great powers of the country of Europe. Klemens Wenzel von Metternich headed the congress and it was held from late September, 1814, to June 9, 1815. The actual purpose of this Conference was to redraw the continent's political map after the defeat of Napoleonic France in the previous spring. Although many say that the Congress of Vienna never occurred because the Congress never met as a whole, but as informal discussion sessions. There were several European countries that were in the Congress and the first of these countries was the United Kingdom represented by Viscount Castlereagh, then by the Duke of Wellington, and then by Earl of Clancarty. Austria was also a county represented at the Congress of Vienna and it was represented by Prince Klemens Von Metternich, and by Baron Wessenberg. Another country being represented at the Congress was Prussia. Prussia was represented by Prince Karl August von Hardenberg and also by scholar Wilhelm von Humboldt. Louis XVIII's France was well represented by Charles Maurice de Talleyrand -Périgord. Russia was represented by Alexander I but almost all of the official delegations were led by Count Nesselrode.

The representatives of the four victorious powers, all of these being the four major allies, wanted to exclude France out of the major participation in negotiations, but France's representative, Talleyrand, managed to insert himself into the inner councils within the first two of the negotiations. These four major allies, which were all brought together by the Treaty of Chaumont, didn't actually expect for the smaller countries that we're not part of the major allies to actually have a say in any of the reorganization of the continent. The major allies basically had the smaller countries ratify their decisions. Most of the major allies didn't like the idea of France helping that much either and in an event of increasing these opinions, Talleyrand, France's representative, took advantage of the smaller nations and made certain that some of the problems would be discussed by larger number of participants, other than just the four major allies. Although, Talleyrand did this the other major allies wanted to conduct their affairs without creating havoc and uncontrollable united protest from the lesser powers (that being the smaller countries). This led to the call of a preliminary conference on protocol, in which both Talleyrand and the Marquis of Labrador were invited on September 30, 1814.

"The intervention of Talleyrand and Labrador has hopelessly upset all our plans. Talleyrand protested against the procedure we have adopted and soundly [be] rated us for two hours. It was a scene I shall never forget." reported Congress Secretary Freidrich von Gentz. The Allies replied that the document concerning the protocol they hard arranged actually meant nothing "If it means so little, why did you sign it?" snapped Labrador who was Outraged, embarrassed, and appalled by the Congress' secretary remarks. Since Talleyrand said this and had the idea of the smaller countries would have at least some say-so in the matter, a committee of eight was constituted, which included the four major allies, France, and the others from the First Treaty of Paris of May 30, 1814, which were Portugal, Sweden, and later, Spain. However, tensions would begin to rise between the countries of Russia, Austria, and Prussia during the Congress of Vienna meetings. The Russian emperor originally promised to divide the Grand Duchy of Warsaw between Russia, Austria, and Prussia. Now his promise had disappeared and he was going to claim all of Poland for Russia, and not divide it among these nations. Although the Russian emperor wanted to take all of Poland for Russia, he did propose a new idea which included that Austria would receive large slices of Italy and Prussia annexing all of Saxony.

Although all of the other major powers were fearful of Russia's territorial ambitions, France, Austria, and Britain decided that they would create a defense, which would remain secret, alliance
on Jan. 3, 1815. The terms of this alliance stated that the countries signing this alliance would resist Russia's demands, and if necessary would use force to do so. Although, this still didn't get the countries what they wanted, France most likely profited the most from this argument within the major allies. "The coalition is dissolved, France is no longer isolated in Europe" wrote Talleyrand to his master his Paris. Eventually after long talks and many disagreements among the nations to decide about the territory, Prussia would receive two fifths of Saxony and other territorial compensation in Westphalia and the Rhineland. Also, Poland would be again divided among the nations of Russia, Austria, and Prussia. Although Russia wanted to get all of the Grand Duchy of Warsaw, they didn't get all of it, but they did get most of it. However, the Congress of Vienna brought a complete reorganization to the European continent. These changes and different ideas "reigned" and lasted for nearly a century. By acquiring the country of Poland, Russia would be penetrating deeper into the European continent. Also, Prussia would be restored as a major power and would receive large area of German territory. Austria would become the master of northern Italy by acquiring Lombardy and Venetia.

Although territory was a major issue during the meetings of the Congress of Vienna, there are more things that were decided on. Some of these decisions were about slave trading. The congress decided to end all of the slave trade, so slave trading had become condemned. Also, another thing that was mentioned and decided upon was traveling through the rivers. The Congress of Vienna decided that freedom of navigation was guaranteed for many rivers, which did include the Rhine River. More territorial decisions/ changes had also been made. Norway had been transferred from Denmark to Sweden. This change sparked the establishment of the very short lived kingdom of Norway on May 17, 1814 due to the nationalist movement. Also, the Pope had been restored to the Papal States. The Republic of Genoa had been given to the Kingdom of Piedmont - Sardinia, which had also been restored back to its mainland. The Bourbon Ferdinand IV was restored to throne after Napoleon's brother-in-law, Joachim Murat, who had originally been allowed to retain the Kingdom of Naples, but after his support of Napoleon in the hundred days.

By the 19th century, and more recent historians, the Congress of Vienna was heavily criticized due their ignoring of national and liberal impulses and also for imposing a stifling reaction on the continent. Also, by this time the actions and decisions made by the Congress of Vienna had became an integral part of what had become known as the Conservative Order, this being in which peace and stability were traded for liberties and civil rights associated with the American and French revolutions. Although, during the 19th century the Congress of Vienna had been heavily criticized, many historians now have come to admire the statesmen at the Congress of Vienna. Their work was to have said prevented another European general war for at least another one hundred years. In 1918 before the Paris peace conference opening, the British Foreign Office commissioned a history of the Congress of Vienna to serve as an example to its own delegates of how to achieve an equal peace among nations. As Prince Klemens Wenzel Neponuk Lothar Von Metternich said, "Any plan conceived in moderation must fail when the circumstances are set in extremes."
UNIT-V

AGE OF INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION

THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION

Introduction

The Industrial Revolution was a significant landmark in the history of mankind. No other event in modern history; has had such a tremendous effect on the life of the common man and it has opened up wider vistas of human progress.

1. Meaning

The term 'Industrial Revolution' was first used by the historian Arnold Toynbee, to describe the economic development in England, from 1760 to 1840. Charles Beard gives a good description of the Industrial Revolution, which he calls a great transformation brought about by discoveries and
inventions that changed the methods of production and distribution of the means of life and of the economic functions of society. During the 18th century, Britain and Europe witnessed this transformation caused by the mass production of consumer goods with the help of the newly invented machines. The Industrial Revolution thus refers to the transformation in the method of production, from man-made, to machine made goods. Being mechanical in nature, the Industrial Revolution was peaceful. However it proved to be destructive as well as constructive, and indeed very noisy.

2. Features of the Industrial Revolution

There were several outstanding features of the Industrial Revolution:

There was a change from the 'Domestic System' to the 'Factory System.' In the Domestic System, people used to work in their own homes, on hand-operated machinery that they owned. The capitalists distributed the raw material to the people and collected the finished product, by paying wages for it. However, in the Factory System, many workmen were assembled in one unit. They worked on power-driven machines, under supervision, thus establishing a wage tie between capital and labor.

1. Under the Domestic System, there was a very small output. Under the Factory System, large quantities of goods could be manufactured, owing to power driven machines and mass production.
2. Manufacturers used new basic materials such as iron and steel.
3. New energy sources like coal, electricity, petroleum and steam were made use of.
4. New machines were invented such as the Spinning Jenny, the Power Loom, the Cotton Gin, Davy’s Safety Lamp and the Steam Engine.
5. Science was increasingly applied to industry.
6. There was an agrarian revolution, which made a great improvement in the quality and quantity in agriculture.
7. Finally the Industrial Revolution introduced radical socio-economic, political, cultural and psychological changes in society.


1. The Industrial Revolution first started in England from where it rapidly spread to the U.S.A. and later to Europe. Several factors were responsible for the advent of the Industrial Revolution in Great Britain.
2. England had sufficient money to finance new industries. Overseas trade, commerce and industry were encouraged by England's naval supremacy.
3. There was political and social stability in England, so people could invest their savings in new enterprises.
4. England began to manufacture practical and inexpensive articles, which could be exported if they were produced on a large scale. Hence England invented new techniques and machines.
to produce such articles.

5. Many agriculturists, who became unemployed owing to the Agriculture Revolution, were available as laborers in mills, factories and workshops. These laborers were able to move freely from place to place for jobs in factories. Coal, a cheap fuel, was available in large quantities for running factories, mills and workshops.

6. Napoleon’s Continental System of preventing the import of English goods into Europe enabled England to blockade the continental ports. Thus England bought raw materials at low rates and supplied finished products at high prices to her colonies.

7. Many Spanish and French artisans who were persecuted owing to their religion, went and settled down in England, thus giving an impetus to English industries.

8. The English colonies were ruthlessly exploited for raw materials and as markets for finished products.

9. Scientific discoveries were encouraged by the Royal Society of London. The inventive genius of the English, as seen in scientists like Sir Humphry Davy, George Stephenson, Dr. Edmund Cartwright and James Watt, favored the Industrial Revolution.

10. New inventions and new methods of production went hand in hand, giving rise to many factories over a span of a hundred years in Britain's countryside.

4. Course of the Industrial Revolution

Textile Industry

The Industrial Revolution first started in the textile industry in England, in the techniques of 'spinning' as well as of 'weaving'.

1. Hargreaves’ Spinning Jenny, 1764: Spinning was an extremely slow process, with the spinner spinning only one thread at a time, with the help of the spinning wheel. In 1764, James Hargreaves invented a machine called the 'Spinning Jenny.' It enabled a spinner to spin as many as eight to ten threads at a time, on his new machine. This increased the production of yarn.

2. Arkwright’s Water-Frame, 1769: In 1769, Richard Arkwright invented a machine run by waterpower instead of manpower. Hence it came to be called the 'Water-Frame'. This second machine could produce stronger and finer yarn than the Spinning Jenny. It increased the production of threads to a very great degree, as it worked on water force.

3. Crompton’s Spinning Mule, 1778: Samuel Crompton removed the defects of the Spinning Jenny and Water Frame, with his machine known as 'Spinning Mule'. A spinner could now spin threads of stronger and better quality on this machine.

4. Cartwright’s Automatic Loom, 1785: In 1733, John Kay had invented a device called the 'Flying Shuttle', which speeded up the weaving of cloth. It helped the weaver to do the work of two or three people at a time. In 1785, Dr. Edmund Cartwright invented the Automatic or Power Loom. It could do the work of many people at a time, since it worked on waterpower.

5. Whitney’s Cotton Gin, 1793: Eli Whitney invented a machine called the 'Cotton Gin.’ It separated the seeds from the fibres of raw cotton. So cotton could be produced in large
quantities for spinning and weaving of cloth. Eventually, inventions were made involving new techniques and processes for bleaching, dyeing and printing fabrics.

Basic Industrial Materials

1. **Coal**: Wood was used in large quantities as a fuel in Great Britain, before the Industrial Revolution. However, as the supply of timber diminished, and since wood was not able to withstand the strain of new techniques and processes, coal and steel was brought into use by industrialists. Thus coal mining became an important industry.

2. **Davy’s Safety Lamp, 1816**: In 1816, Sir Humphry Davy invented a machine called Davy’s Safety Lamp. It could save the lives of the miners by giving them a warning, in case of any danger in the mines.

3. **Steel**: Large Quantities of iron and steel were required to make new machines. This led to the establishment of smelting plants and foundries in Great Britain. In 1856, Henry Bessemer discovered a process by which impurities could be removed from iron. This purified refined iron came to be known as ‘steel’, which helped in making more accurate tools, implements, weapons and machines.

Transport and Communication

1. **MacAdam’s Roads (1756-1836)**: John MacAdam found out a new process of road building. Heavy stones were placed at the bottom of the roadbed and smaller stones at the top, with a mud-binder between them, in order to produce a hard surface. Later, tar was used in place of mudbinder. These Macadamized roads became popular in Great Britain, and also in the U.S.A., Canada and France.

2. **Trevithick’s Locomotive (1801)**: Since roads were not sufficient to meet the needs of transportation, railroads became necessary. Therefore in 1801, Richard Trevithick invented the first steam locomotive.

3. **Stephenson’s Rocket (1814)**: George Stephenson is regarded as ‘the father of the railway locomotive’, because he made great improvements on Trevithick’s locomotive in his ‘Rocket’ in 1814. It moved at a speed of twenty nine miles an hour.

4. **Canals**: John Smeaton (1724-1792) built the Forth and Clyde canals, while Charles Telford constructed the Ellesmere canal and the Caledonian Canal.

5. **Fulton’s Clermont (1807)**: In 1807, Robert Fulton invented the steamboat called the ‘Clermont’. It completed the one hundred and fifty five-mile trip on the River Hudson from New York to Albany, in thirty-two hours, at a speed of about five miles an hour.

Motive Force

1. **Steam Power**: Initially manpower and river water was used as the motive force in order to run all kinds of machines. However, this proved to be inadequate, when the new machines were invented. Further water and wind-power proved to be limited resources. Hence, a new motive force was sought and discovered in the form of steam power.
2. Steam Engine (1705): Thomas Newcomen invented the first steam engine in 1705, in order to pump water out of the mines.

3. Watt’s Beelzebub (1769): In 1769, James Watt invented a better steam engine called the ‘Beelzebub.’ This engine was also used to shift spinning and weaving machines in the textile industries.

4. Electricity: In 1800, Gieseppe Count Alexandro Volta invented the Voltaic Cell and Michael Faraday invented the Dynamo. These inventions led to the production of electric power, which was widely used in industries.

**Agriculture**

1. Tull’s seed Drill: Jethro Tull (1674-1740) experimented with farming on a scientific basis. He invented a Seed Drill that would distribute the seeds evenly in rows, over a large piece of land.

2. Townsend’s Crop Rotation: The discovery of a new method of ‘Crop Rotation’, was made by Viscount Townsend (1674-1738). This enabled one to keep land always under cultivation, without letting it lie idle for a season. This helped to double the yield per acre.

3. Scientific Breeding of Animals: Robert Bakewell (1725-1795) introduced scientific breeding of farm animals. He found through experiments, that by selective breeding of farm animals, he could improve the quality of cattle, horses and sheep.

**5. Spread of the Industrial Revolution**

Though the Industrial Revolution started in Great Britain, it soon spread to Europe and the U.S.A. Thus machines for industry were imported from England, by Belgium, France and Germany. In these countries, bobbin lace machines, textile machines, as well as industries for making the machines, led to the spread of the Industrial Revolution on the Continent. England maintained her industrial lead. However, the French textile manufacturers produced cloth that was excellent in design and quality. So also Germany was renowned for fine metal products. A huge industrial empire was also established in the U.S.A. With further inventions of the automobile, aeroplane, radio, telephone and television in the 19th and 20th centuries, the Industrial Revolution spread throughout the world, where it still continues as an ongoing process in various countries.

**6. Consequences of the Industrial Revolution.**

The Industrial Revolution revolutionized art, architecture, literature and science, as also the social, economic, political and cultural life of the people.

**A. There were several Economic Effects.**

Under the Factory system there was large-scale production. This resulted in a low cost of production per unit. There was also uniformity and a high quality in production.

There was a growth of joint stock companies or corporations. Ownership passed from individuals or partnership to joint stock companies or corporations.
There was a **growth of industrial combination of independent firms**. This was known as the Trust Movement in Britain.

Commerce and **banking** became worldwide in its scope.

It led to the **development of capitalism**, since the capitalists owned the means of production like wealth, land and machinery. Hence the capitalists became the supreme masters of industry.

Two classes, the capitalist and the laboring classes were created by the Revolution. The capitalists were the masters of industries, the managers of mills and the proprietors of workshops, who amassed great wealth, owing to a high profit margin. The laboring class, was a mere tool in the factories. Thus, the gap between the rich and the poor went on widening.

England grew very wealthy on account of industrialization. It became a leading country, in the field of industry, trade, commerce and finance.

**B. The Industrial Revolution also had many Social effects.**

1. The Revolution had a harmful effect on family life. All the family members used to help the head of the family, in the family profession before the advent of the Revolution. With the Revolution, the father and at times, the entire family shifted to a nearby city for employment in factories and mills. This led to the growth of new cities in Great Britain, which broadened the people’s outlook.

2. The cities were over crowded, owing to migration from villages and also because of high birth rates. The housing shortage in the city forced people to live in dull and dingy rooms. It also led to the creation of slums, which caused various diseases and premature deaths.

3. Where the parents were too old, the children had to earn. The easy availability of women and children for working in mills, led to low wages and unemployment. The factory owners preferred to employ unskilled workers, since they were cheaper.

4. Home life was poisoned due to such pathetic conditions. The standards of morality decreased. Women and children imitated such vices as drinking, which were noticeable only among men.

Finally, the comforts and luxuries in people’s lives increased, owing to the inventions in the various fields. The new means of transport and communications and the new methods of production served to be a boon to mankind in an important way.

**C. The Industrial Revolution encouraged Colonialism and Imperialism.**

England, the U.S.A., Russia and many European countries built large colonial empires. They needed colonies for securing raw materials at low prices for their industries. They also used the colonies as markets for setting their finished products at high prices.

**D. However, many problems were created for labor.**

1. The life of the working classes grew miserable and burdensome. A factory or mill worker toiled for fourteen or sixteen hours a day. Many factories or mills had no sanitation
facilities. They did not even have safety guards on machines which led to frequent accidents. There were no provisions for the care of the injured and the sick.

2. In 1800, parliamentary laws in England forbid the formation of trade unions. In 1825, some liberals persuaded Parliament to legalize trade unions. After this, many trade unions were formed everywhere in Europe and in the U.S.A. Their main demands included an eight-hour workday, the right of trade unions to bargain collectively with the employer, sanitary and safer working conditions, enhanced wages and prohibition of child labor.

3. In 1867, the Reform Act was passed, permitting the workers of Great Britain to enjoy these political rights. In the U.S.A. as well as in most of the industrialized countries of Europe, workers were allowed to enjoy political rights.

The workers then agitated for social legislation that would improve their working and living conditions. In 1880, Germany, under Chancellor Bismarck, undertook social legislation providing for accident insurance, regulation of child labor, maximum hours of work, old age insurance and inspection and supervision of factories and mines by government. Other countries also imitated Germany’s attempt to aid labor.

E. Growth of Socialism and Communism

Social evils sprang up, owing to the factory system and communism. Some early socialists like Saint Simon, Charles Fourier, Louis Blanc and Robert Owen stood up to remove these evils. They were called the Utopians. The socialist movement was a peaceful one upto 1848. It aimed at eliminating the capitalist class and substituting some form of working class ownership and control of the means of production. In 1848, Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels issued the 'Communist Manifesto' which introduced scientific socialism or Communism. Later, in 1867, Marx and Engels published the first of three volumes, entitled *Das Kapital*, in which they explained the sum and substance of Marxian Socialism or Communism. The ideas of Marx influenced world thought. Thereafter Soviet Russia adopted Communism, while other European countries like Britain and France began to follow socialism.

**Laissez-faire**

*Laissez-faire* is short for "laissez-faire, laissez-passer," a French phrase meaning idiomatically "leave to do, leave to pass" or more accurately "let things alone, let them pass". First used by the eighteenth century Physiocrats as an injunction against government interference with trade, it is now used as a synonym for strict free market economics. Laissez-faire economic policy is in direct contrast to Statist economic policy. Adam Smith played a large role in popularizing laissez-faire economic theories in English-speaking countries, though he was critical of a number of aspects of what is currently thought of as laissez-faire. Laissez-faire (imperative) is distinct from *laisser faire* (infinitive), which refers to a careless attitude in the application of a policy, implying a lack of consideration, or thought.

**Theory**

The laissez-faire school of thought holds a pure capitalist or free market view, that capitalism is best left to its own devices; that it will dispense with inefficiencies in a more deliberate and quick manner than any legislating body could. The basic idea is that less government
interference in private economic decisions such as pricing, production, and distribution of goods and services makes for a better system.

**HISTORY**

*Laissez-faire* philosophy was dominant in the late 19th and early 20th century in the wealthier countries of Europe and North America. Many historians also see that period as the height of *laissez-faire*'s implementation in those countries. However, there are critics who suggest that what was described as "laissez-faire" policy was simply pro-business policy, as with large subsidies for businesses to produce the railroads in the United States or the common use of tariffs by Republican presidents there. In this context, *laissez-faire* rhetoric was used to justify denial of similar subsidies to the poor and working classes.

For many, *laissez-faire* theories fell into disrepute because of their failure to allow governments to deal with managing the economy during and after World War I, and their alleged failure to prevent the Great Depression. However, some libertarians, such as Milton Friedman argue that by the time of the Great Depression, significant government economic regulation had already taken place in most major economies, as workers and employees in all industries organized themselves into trade unions to demand better living standards, as well as various checks and balances to the perceived "tyranny of laissez-faire". Workers succeeded in obtaining minimum wage laws and a progressive income tax in some countries. International trade barriers were also in the policy pipeline (e.g., Smoot-Hawley Tariff in the USA). So, according to the above-mentioned libertarians, the economies that suffered from the Depression, although possibly closer to laissez-faire than any other economic models that were ever used, still did not embrace pure capitalism. Some critics of laissez-faire argue that the attainment of pure capitalism is impossible, for example since it is difficult to deal with market failures without an active role for government.

Modern industrialised nations today are not typically representative of laissez-faire principles, as they usually involve significant amounts of government intervention in the economy. This intervention includes minimum wages, significant redistribution through tax and welfare programs, government ownership of businesses and regulation of market competition. The major exception to this is Hong Kong, which officially has a laissez-faire economic policy since the 1960s and perhaps earlier. Moreover, many suggest that President Ronald Reagan of the United States and Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher of the United Kingdom followed a generally laissez-faire perspective.

**Chartism (The Chartist Movement)**

The Chartist Movement had at its core the so-called "People's Charter" of 1838. This document, created for the London Working Men's Association, was primarily the work of William Lovett. The charter was a public petition aimed at redressing omissions from the electoral Reform Act of 1832. It quickly became a rallying point for working class agitators for social reform, who saw in it a cure-all for all sorts of social ills. For these supporters the People's Charter was the first step towards a social and economic utopia. In demanding so much the supporters of the charter probably ensured its downfall, for the number of demands probably diluted support for any single demand.

**Demands of the People's Charter.** The People's Charter outlined 6 major demands for reform. These were:
- Institution of a secret ballot
- General elections be held annually
- Members of Parliament not be required to own property
- MPs be paid a salary
- Electoral districts of equal size
- Universal male suffrage

The National Convention. The first gathering of Chartist delegates gathered in London on February 4, 1839. Although 53 delegates came to London, they were aware of laws forbidding gatherings of more than 50 men, and so took care that no more than that number were present at any one time. At this gathering the nature of the divisions that were to trouble the Movement were apparent, as some delegates favoured violence if necessary, some favoured a general strike, and there was even talk of electing a "people's parliament. In other words, in common with many social movements, they could figure out what they were against, but had a harder time figuring out what to do about it.

The Convention did adopt the motto "peaceably if we may, forcibly if we must", which may have frightened of those more moderate middle-class members who might have been persuaded to support their cause. Agitation continued throughout the spring of 1839, and government troops were used to ensure order in some areas of the country, notably the north.

Outcome

Proponents of the charter gathered over 1.25 million signatures in support of their aims. They presented the charter and the signatures to Parliament when it gathered in July, 1839. Though supported by future Prime Minister Benjamin Disraeli, the charter was rejected by the House of Commons by a vote of 235 to 46. In the wake of this defeat in the Commons, the National Convention lost its importance and finally dissolved itself in September.

With the national leadership of the Movement no longer effective, local reformers took charge. The government had many leaders of the movement arrested or detained. There were outbreaks of violence in several regions, notably at Newport, where 24 protestors were killed. The suppression of the Chartists drew further attention to their cause, but the movement in general failed to cross class lines and gain the necessary support among members of the ruling aristocracy and landed gentry.

The Chartists attempted to submit their petition to Parliament twice more, in 1842, when they claimed to have gathered over 31 million signatures of support, and for a final time in 1848. After this final failure the movement died out.

Why did Chartism seem a threat to authority? The aims of the Chartists may seem mild and eminently sensible to modern readers. But to the government of Victorian England they represented a potential for upheaval and overthrow of social institutions and entrenched authority. The violent turmoil of the French Revolution was still fresh in the minds of many in positions of authority. Rather than being swayed by the sensibilities of the Chartist's demands, they reacted in fear at the possibility of violent overthrow of society - and their own positions.

Why did Chartism fail? Chartism failed for a number of reasons; most obviously, it failed to gather support in Parliament - not surprising when you consider the threat it posed to the self-
interest of those in power. Equally important, it failed to gather support from the middle-classes. The demands of Chartism were too radical for many of the middle-classes, who were comfortable enough with the status quo. The repeal of the Corn Laws helped improve the economic climate of Britain, and there was less interest in radical reform. As well, the mid-19th century spawned a variety of social-reform groups with special aims, and the Chartist movement lost many of its members to these other groups.

**Why was it a success?** Although the Chartist Movement failed to directly achieve its aims, a good case can be made that the movement itself was not a failure at all, but a powerful force that resulted in an increased awareness of social issues and created a framework for future working-class organisations. Many of the demands of the Chartists were eventually answered in the electoral reform bills of 1867 and 1864. It also seems likely that the agitation for reform that the Chartist Movement helped bring to the forefront of British society was responsible for the repeal of the Corn Laws and other social reforms.

---

**UNIT-VI**

**FORCES OF LIBERALISM AND NATIONALISM**

**French Revolution of 1848 or February Revolution**

The 1848 Revolution in France was one of a wave of revolutions in 1848 in Europe. In France, the February revolution ended the Orleans monarchy (1830–1848) and led to the creation of the French Second Republic. The February Revolution was really the belated second phase of the Revolution of 1830. The Revolution of 1830, also called the July Revolution, was the event that had brought Louis-Philippe of Orleans to the throne of France as a constitutional monarchy. So these two phases of the same uprising bracketed the Orleanist "Bourgeois Monarchy" at the beginning as well as at the end of its eighteen year reign in France. Clearly, the July Revolution and the resultant Orleanist compromise were not successful in resolving the underlying problems with French society. The problems that had faced the government in 1848 were the same problems that had faced the government in 1830, except that in 1848 those problems had grown much worse.

Following the overthrow of the Louis-Philippe in February, the elected government of the Second Republic ruled France. As time passed, this government steered a course that became more
conservative. On 23 June 1848, the people of Paris rose in insurrection. This uprising became known as June days. The June days were a bloody but unsuccessful rebellion by the Paris workers against a conservative turn in the Republic's course. On 2 December 1848, Louis Napoleon was elected President of the Second Republic, largely on peasant support. Exactly three years later he suspended the elected assembly, establishing the Second French Empire, which lasted until 1871.

The February revolution established the principle of the "right to work" (droit au travail), and its newly-established government created "National Workshops" for the unemployed. At the same time a sort of industrial parliament was established at the Luxembourg Palace, under the presidency of Louis Blanc, with the object of preparing a scheme for the organization of labour. These tensions between liberal Orleanist and Radical Republicans and Socialists led to the June Days Uprising.

**BACKGROUND**

Per the Charter of 1814, Louis XVIII ruled France as the head of a constitutional monarchy. Upon Louis XVIII's death, his brother, the Count of Artois, ascended to the throne in 1824, as Charles X. Supported by the ultra-royalists, Charles X was an extremely unpopular reactionary monarch whose aspirations were far more grand than those of his deceased brother. He had no desire to rule as a constitutional monarch, taking various steps to strengthen his own authority as monarch and weaken that of the lower house.

In 1830, Charles, presumably instigated by one of his chief advisors Jules, Prince de Polignac, issued the Four Ordinances of St. Cloud. These ordinances abolished freedom of the press, reduced the electorate by 75%, and dissolved the lower house. This action provoked an immediate reaction from the citizenry, who revolted against the monarchy during the Three Glorious Days of 26–29 July 1830. Charles was forced to abdicate the throne and to flee Paris for England. As a result, Louis Philippe, of the Orleanist branch, rose to power, replacing the old Charter by the Charter of 1830, and his rule became known as the July Monarchy.

Nicknamed the "Bourgeois Monarch", Louis Philippe sat at the head of a moderately liberal state controlled mainly by educated elites. Supported by the Orleanists, he was opposed on his right by the Legitimists (former ultra-royalists) and on his left by the Republicans and Socialists. Louis Philippe was an expert businessman and, by means of his businesses, he had become one of the richest men in France. Still Louis Philippe saw himself as the successful embodiment of a "small businessman (petite bourgeoisie). Consequently, he and his government did not look with favor on the big business (bourgeoisie), especially, the industrial section of the French bourgeoisie. Louis Philippe did, however, support the bankers, large and small. Indeed, at the beginning of his reign in 1830, Jaques Laffitte, a banker and liberal politician who supported Louis Philippe's rise to the throne, said "From now on, the bankers will rule." Accordingly, during the reign of Louis Philippe, the privileged "financial aristocracy," i.e. bankers, stock exchange magnates, railroad barons, owners of coal mines, iron ore mines and forests and all landowners associated with them tended to support Louis Philippe, while the "industrial section of the bourgeoisie which may have owned the land their factories sat on but nothing much more, were disfavored by Louis Philippe and actually tended to side with the middle class and laboring class in opposition to Louis Philippe in the Chamber of Deputies. Naturally, landownership was favored, and this elitism resulted in the disenfranchisement of much of the middle and working classes. By 1848 only about one per cent of the population held the franchise. Even though France had a free press and trial by jury, only landholders were permitted to vote, which alienated the petty bourgeoisie and even the industrial
bourgeoisie from the government. Louis Philippe was viewed as generally indifferent to the needs of society, especially to those members of the middle class who were excluded from the political arena. Early in 1848, some Orleanist liberals, such as Adolphe Thiers, had turned against him, disappointed by Louis Philippe's opposition to parliamentarism. A Reform Movement developed in France which urged the government to expand the electoral franchise, just as England had done in 1832. The more radical democrats of the Reform Movement coalesced around the newspaper, La Réforme. However, the more moderate republicans and the liberal opposition rallied around the Le National newspaper. Starting in July 1847 the Reformists of all shades began to hold "banquets" at which toasts were drunk to "République française" (the French Republic), "Liberté" (Liberty), "Egalité" (Equality) and "Fraternité," (Brotherhood) etc. However, Louis Philippe turned a deaf ear to the Reform Movement and discontent among wide sections of the French people continued to grow.

Alexis de Tocqueville had observed, "We are sleeping together in a volcano . . . A wind of revolution blows, the storm is on the horizon." Lacking the property qualifications to vote, the lower classes were about to erupt in revolt.

**Economic and International Influences**

The French middle class watched changes in Britain with interest. When Britain's Reform Act of 1832 extended enfranchisement to anybody paying £10 or more per year (previously the vote was restricted to landholders), France's free press took interest. Meanwhile, economically, the working class may perhaps have been slightly better off than Britain's working class; still unemployment in France threw skilled workers down to the level of the proletariat. The only nominally social law of the July Monarchy was passed in 1841. This law prohibiting the use of child labor of those children under 8 years of age and prohibited the employment of children less than 13 years old for night time work. This law, however, was routinely flouted. The year 1846 saw a financial crisis and bad harvests, and the following year saw an economic depression. A poor railroad system hindered aid efforts, and the Peasant rebellions that resulted were forcefully crushed. Perhaps a third of Paris was on the dole. "Dangerous" writers proliferated such as Louis Blanc ("The right to work") and Pierre-Joseph Proudhon ("Property is theft").

**The Events of February**

Because political gatherings and demonstrations were outlawed in France, activists of the largely middle class opposition to the government began to hold a series of fund-raising banquets. This campaign of banquets (Campagne des banquets), was intended to circumvent the governmental restriction on political meetings and provide a legal outlet for popular criticism of the regime. The campaign began in July 1847. Frederick Engels was in Paris dating from October 1847 and had a chance to observe and attend some of these banquets. He had a chance to write a series of articles on these banquets. Like "The Reform Movement in France" which was published in the La Réforme on 20 November 1847, "Split in the Camp—the Réforme and the National—March of Democracy published in the The Northern Star on 4 December 1847, "Reform Banquet at Lille—Speech of LeDru-Rollin" published in The Northern Star on 16 December 1847, "Reform Movement in France—Banquet of Dijon" published in The Northern Star on 18 December 1847, "The Réforme and the National" published in the Deutsche-Brüsseler-Zeitung on 30 December 1847, and "Louis Blanc's Speech at the Dijon Banquet" published in the Deutsche-Brüsseler-Zeitung on 30 December 1847. The banquet campaign last until all political banquets was outlawed
by the French government under Louis Philippe in February 1848. As a result, the people revolted, helping to unite the efforts of the popular Republicans and the liberal Orleanists, who turned their back on Louis-Philippe.

Anger over the outlawing of the political banquets, brought crowds of Parisians flooding out into the streets at noon on 22 February 1848. The crowds directed their anger against the Citizen King Louis Philippe and his chief minister for foreign and domestic policy--François Pierre Guillaume Gizot. Shouting "Down with Guizot" and "Long Live the Reform" the crowds marched past Guizot's residence. The crowds erected barricades in the streets of Paris, and fighting broke out between the citizens and the Parisian municipal guards.

At 2 pm the next day, on 23 February, Prime Minister Guizot resigned. Upon hearing the news of Guizot's resignation, a large crowd gathered outside the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. An officer ordered the crowd not to pass, but people in the front of the crowd were being pushed by the rear. The officer ordered his men to fix bayonets, probably wishing to avoid shooting. However, in what is widely regarded as an accident, a soldier discharged his musket, which resulted in the rest of the soldiers firing into the crowd. Fifty two people were killed.Paris was soon a barricaded city. Omnibuses were turned into barricades, and thousands of trees were felled. Fires were set, and angry citizens began converging on the royal palace.King Louis Philippe abdicated and fled to England.

THE SECOND REPUBLIC

On 26 February 1848, the liberal opposition came together to organize a provisional government, called the Second Republic. The poet Alphonse de Lamartine was appointed president of the provisional government. Lamartine served as a virtual dictator of France for the next three months. Elections for a Constituent Assembly were scheduled for 23 April 1848. The Constituent Assembly was to establish a new republican government for France. In preparation for these elections, two major goals of the provisional government were universal suffrage and unemployment relief. Universal male suffrage was enacted on 2 March 1848, giving France nine million new voters. As in all other European nations, women did not have the right to vote. However, during this time a proliferation of political clubs emerged, including women's organizations. Relief for the unemployed was achieved, by the provisional government by enactment of the National Workshops, which guaranteed French citizens' "right to work". The "right" of a citizen to work and indeed the National Workshops themselves had been the idea of Jean Joseph Louis Blanc. The National Workshops proved to be an overnight success. By May 1848 the National Workshops were employing 100,000 workers and paying out daily wages of 70,000 livres. In 1848, 479 newspapers were founded. However, there was also a 54% decline in the number of businesses in Paris, as most of the wealthy had left Paris. There was a corresponding decline in the luxury trade and credit was unobtainable.

THE RISE OF CONSERVATISM WITHIN THE SECOND REPUBLIC

Naturally, the provisional government was disorganized as it attempted to deal with France's economic problems. The conservative elements of French society were wasting no time in organizing against the provisional government. After roughly a month, conservatives began to openly oppose the new government, using the rallying cry "order", which the new republic lacked.
Additionally, there was a major split between the citizens of Paris and those citizens of the more rural areas of France. The provisional government set out to establish a stronger economy and provide social services. As noted above, to deal with the unemployment problem, the provisional government established National Workshops. The unemployed were given jobs building roads and planting trees. The population of Paris ballooned as job seekers from all over France came to Paris to work in the newly formed National Workshops. To pay for these the new National Workshops and the other social programs, the provisional government placed new taxes on land. These taxes alienated the "landed classes"—especially the small farmers and the peasantry of the rural areas of France—from the provisional government. Hardworking rural farmers were resistant to paying for the unemployed city people and their new "Right to Work" National Workshops. The taxes were widely ignored in the rural areas and, thus, the government became very financially strapped for cash. Popular uncertainty about the liberal foundations of the provisional government became apparent in the 23 April 1848 elections. Despite the agitation from the left, voters elected a constituent assembly which was primarily moderate and conservative. In May, Jacques-Charles Dupont de l'Eure, chairman of the provisional government, made way for the Executive Commission, a body of state acting as Head of State with five co-presidents.

The results of the 23 April 1848 election were a disappointment to the radicals in Paris. The only bright spot for the radicals was the election of their hero of the working classes—François-Vincent Raspail. The radicals felt the elections were a sign of the slowing down of the revolutionary movement. To keep the revolutionary movement alive in France, radicals in Paris pressured the government to head an international "crusade" for democracy. Independence of other European states, such as Poland, was urged by the Paris radicals. In 1848, Poland as a national state did not exist. The nation of Poland had been gradually "partitioned" or divided between foreign powers of Prussia, Russia, and Austria in 1773, 1793. Finally in 1795, the entire Polish nation was swallowed up by the three powers. However, it was an opportune time to raise the issue of Polish independence as Poles were also undergoing their own period of revolt in 1848 starting with the uprising in Poznań on 20 March 1848.

However, the government of the National Constituent Assembly continued to resist the radicals. The radicals began to protest against the National Constituent Assembly government. On 15 May 1848, Parisian workmen feeling their democratic and social republic was slipping away invaded the Assembly en mass and proclaimed a new Provisional Government. This attempted revolution on the part of the working classes was quickly suppressed by the National Guard. The leaders of this revolt—Louis Auguste Blanqui, Armand Barbès, François Vincent Raspail and others—were arrested. The trial of these leaders was held in Bourges, France, from March 7 through April 3, 1849.

The conservative classes of society were becoming increasing fearful of the power of the working classes in Paris. They felt a strong need for organization and organized themselves around the need for "order"—the so-called "Party of Order." For the Party of Order the term "order" meant a roll back of society to days of Louis Philippe. The Party of Order was now the dominant member of the government. As the main force of reaction against revolution, the Party of Order forced the closure of the hated Right to Work National Workshops on 21 June 1848. On 23 June 1848, the working class of Paris rose in protest over the closure of the National Workshops. On that day 170,000 citizens of Paris came out into the streets to erect barricades. To meet this challenge, the government appointed General Louis Eugène Cavaignac to lead the military forces suppressing the uprising of the working classes. General Cavaignac had been serving in the Army in Algeria.
Cavaignac had returned from Algeria and in the elections of 23 April 1848, he was elected to the National Constituent Assembly. Cavaignac arrived in Paris only on 17 May 1848 to take his seat in the National Assembly.

Between 23 June and 26 June 1848, this battle between the working class and Cavaignac came to be known as the "June Days Uprising." Cavaignac's forces started out on 23 June 1848 with an army composed of from 20,000 to 30,000 soldiers of the Paris garrison of the French Army. Cavaignac began a systematic assault against the revolutionary Parisian citizenry, targeting the blockaded areas of the city. However, he was not able to break the stiff opposition put up by the armed workers on the barricades on 23 June 1848. Accordingly, Cavaignac's forces were reinforced with other 20,000–25,000 soldiers from the mobile guard, some additional 60,000 to 80,000 from the National Guard. Even with this force of 120,000 to 125,000 soldiers, Cavaignac still required two days to complete the suppression of the working class uprising.

In February 1848, the workers and petite bourgeoisie had fought together, but now, in June 1848, the lines were drawn differently. The working classes had been abandoned by the bourgeois politicians who founded the provisional government. This would prove fatal to the Second Republic, which, without the support of the working classes, could not continue. Although the governmental regime of the Second Republic continued to survive until December 1852, the generous, idealistic Republic to which the February Days had given birth ended with the suppression of the "June Days."

The "Party of Order" moved quickly to consolidate the forces of reaction in the government and on 28 June 1848, the government appointed Louis Eugène Cavaignac as the head of the French state. On 10 December 1848 a presidential election was held between four candidates. Cavaignac was the candidate of the Party of Order. Alexandre Auguste Ledru-Rollin was also a candidate in that presidential election. Ledru-Rollin was the editor of the La Réforme newspaper and as such was the leader of the radical democrats among the petty bourgeoisie. François-Vincent Raspail was the candidate of the revolutionary working classes. Louis-Napoléon Bonaparte was the fourth presidential candidate. Napoleon III won the presidential election of 10 December 1848 with 5,587,759 votes as opposed to 1,474,687 votes for Cavaignac and 370,000 votes for Ledru-Rollin. Raspail ended up a distant fourth in the balloting.

**Class Struggles within the Revolution**

To the French elite, the June Days uprising was something of a red scare. Karl Marx saw the "June Days" uprising as strong evidence of class conflict. Marx saw the revolution as being directed by the desires of the middle-class. While the bourgeoisie agitated for "proper participation", the workers themselves had other concerns. Many of the participants in the 1848 Revolution were of the so-called petite bourgeoisie (the owners of small properties, merchants, shopkeepers, etc.). Indeed the "petite" or petty bourgeoisie outnumbered the working classes (unskilled laborers working in mines, factories and stores, paid for their ability to perform manual labor and other work rather than their expertise) by about two to one in 1848. However, the financial position of the petty bourgeoisie was extremely tenuous. Because of the economic recession of 1846–47, the petty bourgeoisie had developed a great burden of debt as they attempted to stay in business. By 1848, in Paris alone 21,000,000 francs of this debt was "overdue." In the provinces another 11,000,000 francs of commercial paper (business loans) were overdue. During the February Revolution a united front had been presented by all classes of society who were in opposition to Louis Philippe.
Both the industrial bourgeoisie and the petty bourgeoisie had joined with the working classes in the February Revolution in order to obtain "proper participation" in the government for all sections and classes in society. However, as the working classes became more dissatisfied with the small share of this participation they actually received, they revolted and sought to have their demands heard in the streets. All the "propertied classes of the February Revolution," i.e. the finance bourgeoisie, the industrial bourgeoisie and the petty bourgeoisie, became fearful of the workers revolt. Thus, the industrial bourgeoisie and the petty bourgeoisie turned on their former allies in the February Revolution and moved to repress the working class uprising during the June Days. No class worked harder to suppress the workers revolt than did the petty bourgeoisie. However, since February, because slow sales and economic dislocations of the Revolution, the financial condition of the small merchants and shop keepers of the petty bourgeoisie had deteriorated even further. As of June 1848, over 7,000 shop keepers and merchants in Paris had not paid their rent since February. During the June Days, the creditors holding all the commercial paper for those loans and the landlords to whom the back rent was owed (i.e. the finance bourgeoisie), forestalled most attempts to enforce judgement to collect on those debts and back rent owed by the petty bourgeoisie. Once the worker revolt was put down, however, the creditors and landlords began to assert their claims for back rent and overdue debts in court. Bankruptcies and foreclosures rose dramatically following June 1848. It was as if the petty bourgeoisie returned home after their heroic fight against the working class on behalf of the propertied classes only to find that their allies in that fight (i.e. the finance bourgeoisie) had turned against them and turned them out of their businesses and homes. The petty bourgeoisie gathered in a large demonstration at the National Assembly to force the government to inquire into the problem of foreclosures and requiring an extension of debt for all those businessmen who could prove that their insolvency was caused by the Revolution itself. Although a plan containing this proposal was introduced in the National Assembly, the plan was rejected in the end. Thus, the petty bourgeoisie was betrayed and left to its own resources. The result was the pauperization of the petty bourgeoisie. Eventually, individual shop keepers and merchants left their own failed businesses and sought wage labor and thus became part of the laboring class themselves.

Accordingly, the provisional government, which had been created to address the concerns of the all classes of French society, did not have enough of a foothold in the working classes to be successful in this effort. Therefore, in the end, the provisional government tended to address only the concerns of the liberal bourgeoisie and forgot the concerns of the working class and the concerns of the petty bourgeoisie. Support for the provisional government was especially weak in the countryside, where a vast amount of France's population was agricultural and traditionally less revolutionary. Though the peasantry countryside did have their own concerns, such as food shortages as a result of bad harvests, the concerns of the bourgeoisie were still too far-off from those of the lower classes. Also, the memory of the French Revolution was still fresh in the minds of the French.

The Thermidorian reaction and the ascent of Napoleon III to the throne are evidence that the people preferred the safety of an able dictatorship to the uncertainty of revolution. Louis Napoleon portrayed himself as "rising above politics. Each class saw Louis Napoleon as a re-enactment of the "great days" of Napoleon Bonaparte. The various classes of France each had different visions of what a return to the days of Napoleon Bonaparte would mean and they supported Louis Napoleon for different reasons. This phenomenon was precisely what Karl Marx meant when he said "History repeats itself: the first time as a tragedy, the second time as a farce." The various classes and political groupings in France each had different reasons for supporting Louis Napoleon in the election of December 10, 1848. Louis Napoleon, himself encouraged this by "being all things to all
people." Both the Legitimists (Bourbons) and the Orleanists (Citizen King Louis-Philippe) monarchists saw Louis Napoleon as the beginnings of a royalist restoration in France. The army voted for Napoleon (against the Mobile Guard which supported Cavaignac in same election) because they saw Napoleon as a supporter of an active foreign policy—war in stead of peace. The big industrial bourgeoisie supported Louis Napoleon as a means of breaking with the proletariat and the other revolutionary forces. They felt that Louis Napoleon would suppress all further revolutionary activity. Even sections of the proletariat supported Louis Napoleon (over the petty bourgeoisie socialist Alexandre Ledru-Rollin who was also in the electoral race) because they saw Louis Napoleon as a means of getting rid of the hated Cavaignac and the hated bourgeois republicanism of the National Assembly which had betrayed the proletarian interests in the recent June Days. The petty bourgeoisie saw Louis Napoleon as the rule of the debtor over the creditor, as their savior against the large finance capitalists, who had denied them any kind of relief from their crushing debts despite the loyal support the petty bourgeoisie had provided the propertied interests in the June Days suppression of the revolution.

Then there was the peasantry, which overwhelmingly supported Louis Napoleon. The support of the peasantry for Louis Napoleon was so strong that the election of Louis Napoleon has been seen as a coup d' état or an insurrection of the peasantry. Thus, one might argue, without the support of these large lower classes, the revolution of 1848 would not carry through, despite the hopes of the liberal bourgeoisie.

**THE END OF THE REVOLUTION IN FRANCE**

Following the repression of the June Days, the French Revolution of 1848 was basically over. Politics in France continued to tilt to the right, as the era of revolution in France came to an end. However the Party of Order and the Cavaignac dictatorship were still fearful of another popular uprising in the streets. Accordingly, on 2 September 1848, the government continued the state of siege that had been in place since the June Days. Also on 2 September 1848, the National Constituent Assembly vowed not to dissolve itself until they had written a new constitution and enacted all the organic laws necessary to implement that new constitution. Although the National Constituent Assembly had attempted to write a constitution before the June Days, only a "first draft" of that constitution had been written before the repression in June 1848. This first draft, however, still contained the phrase "Right to Work" and contained several provisions dealing with the demands of the working classes. In the eyes of the Party of Order, these provisions were now entirely unacceptable, especially in the new conservative political environment after the June Days. Accordingly, on 4 September 1848, the National Constituent Assembly, now controlled by the Party of Order, set about writing a new constitution. The new constitution was finished on 23 October 1848 and presidential elections were scheduled for 10 December 1848. As noted above Louis Napoleon won the presidential election by a wide margin over the current dictator Louis Cavaignac and the petty bourgeoisie socialist Alexandre Ledru-Rollin. Louis Napoleon's family name of Napoleon rallied support to his cause. Elected with Louis Napoleon was a National Assembly which was filled with monarchists—of either the Legitimist (Bourbon) variety or the Orleanist (Louis-Philippe) variety. As noted above the Bourbons tended to support the landed aristocracy while the Orleanist tended to support the banking and finance bourgeoisie. One of those elected to the National Assembly was Adophe Thiers who was the leader of the Orleanist party. As such, Thiers became the chief spokesman of the finance bourgeoisie, however as time went by he was tending to speak for the whole bourgeoisie, including the rising industrial bourgeoisie. After sweeping the elections, Louis Napoleon tried to return France to the old order. Although, Napoleon
purged republicans and returning the "vile multitude" (including Adolphe Thiers) to its former place, Napoleon III was unable to totally turn the clock back. Indeed the presidency of Louis Napoleon, followed by the Second Empire, would be a time of great industrialization and great economic expansion of railroads and banking. By the time of the December 2, 1851 coup, Louis Napoleon had dissolved the National Assembly without having the constitutional right to do so, and became the sole ruler of France. Cells of resistance surfaced, but were put down, and the Second Republic was officially over. He re-established universal suffrage, feared by the Republicans at the time who correctly expected the country-side to vote against the Republic, Louis Napoleon took the title Emperor Napoleon III, and the Second Empire began.

PARIS COMMUNE

The term "Paris Commune" originally referred to the Paris Commune (French Revolution), the government of Paris during the French Revolution. However, the term more commonly refers to the socialist government that briefly ruled Paris from March 18 (more formally from March 26) to May 28, 1871. In a formal sense the Paris Commune of 1871 was simply the local authority (council of a town or district - French "commune") which exercised power in Paris for two months in the spring of 1871. But the conditions in which it was formed, its controversial decrees and tortured end make it one of the more important political episodes of the time.

BACKGROUND

The Commune was made possible through a civil uprising of all revolutionist trends within Paris after the Franco-Prussian War ended with French defeat. The war with Prussia, started by Napoleon III ("Louis Bonaparte") in July 1870, turned out disastrously for the French and by September Paris itself was under siege. The gap between rich and poor in the capital had widened in recent years and now food shortages and the continuous Prussian bombardment were adding to an already widespread discontent. Working people were becoming more open to radical ideas. A specific demand was that Paris should be self-governing, with its own elected Commune, something enjoyed by most French towns, but denied Paris by a government wary of the capital's unruly populace. An associated but more vague wish was for a fairer, if not necessarily socialist, way of managing the economy, summed up in the popular cry for "La Sociale!"

In January, 1871, when the siege had lasted for four months, Louis-Adolphe Thiers, soon to be Chief Executive (later President) of the Third Republic, sought an armistice. The Prussians included the occupation of Paris in the peace terms. Despite the hardships of the siege many Parisians were bitterly resentful and were particularly angry that the Prussians should be allowed a brief ceremonial occupation of their city. By that time many tens of thousands of Parisians were armed members of a citizens' militia known as the "National Guard", which had been greatly expanded to help defend the city. Battalions in the poorer districts elected their own officers and possessed many of the cannon which had been founded in Paris and paid for by public subscription. The city and its National Guard had withstood the Prussian troops for six months. The population of Paris was defiant in the face of occupation — they limited the Prussian presence to a small area of the city and policed the boundary.

Steps were being taken to form a "Central Committee" of the Guard, and Louis-Adolphe Thiers, president of the French government, the new Third Republic, realised that in the present unstable situation this body could come to form an alternative centre of political power. In addition, he was
concerned that the workers would arm themselves with the National Guard weapons and provoke the Prussians. The events at this juncture are confused, but what is clear is that before the Prussians entered Paris, National Guards, helped by ordinary working people, managed to take the cannon (which they regarded as their own property) away from the Prussians' path and store them in "safe" districts. One of the chief "cannon parks" was on the heights of Montmartre.

**THE RISE AND NATURE OF THE COMMUNE**

The Prussians entered Paris briefly and left again without incident. But Paris continued to be encircled while the issue of war indemnities dragged on. As the Central Committee of the National Guard was adopting an increasingly radical stance and steadily gaining in authority, the government could not indefinitely allow it to have four hundred cannon at its disposal. And so, as a first step; on March 18 Thiers ordered regular troops to seize the cannon stored on the Buttes Montmartre. Instead of following instructions, however, the soldiers, whose morale was in any case not high, fraternised with National Guards and local residents. When their general, Claude Martin Lecomte, ordered them to fire on an unarmed crowd they dragged him from his horse. He was later shot, together with General Thomas, a hated former commander of the Guard who was picked up by a mob in the Outer Boulevards.

Other army units joined in the rebellion which spread so rapidly that President Thiers ordered an immediate evacuation of Paris by as many of the regular forces as would obey; by the police; and by administrators and specialists of every kind. He himself fled, ahead of them, to Versailles. The Central Committee of the National Guard was now the only effective government in Paris: it almost immediately abdicated its authority and arranged elections for a Commune, to be held on March 26. The 92 members of the Commune (or, more correctly, of the "Communal Council") included skilled workers, several "professionals" (such as doctors and journalists), and a large number of political activists, ranging from reformist republicans, through various types of socialists, to the Jacobins who tended to look back nostalgically to the Revolution of 1789. The charismatic socialist, Louis Auguste Blanqui, was elected President of the Council, but this was in his absence, for he had been arrested on March 17 and was held in a secret prison throughout the life of the Commune. The Paris Commune was proclaimed on March 28, although local districts often retained the organizations from the siege.

Despite internal differences, the Council made a good start in maintaining the public services essential for a city of two million; it was also able to reach a consensus on certain policies whose content tended towards a progressive social democracy rather than a social revolution. Lack of time (the Commune was able to meet on less than 60 days in all) meant that only a few decrees were actually implemented. These included: the remission of rents for the entire period of the siege (during which they had been raised considerably by many landlords); the abolition of night work in the hundreds of Paris bakeries; the abolition of the guillotine; the granting of pensions to the unmarried companions of National Guards killed on active service, as well as to the children if any; the free return, by the state pawnshops, of all workmen's tools of their trade, pledged during the siege as they were concerned that skilled workers had been forced to pawn their tools during the war; they postponed debt obligations, and abolished interest on the debts; and, in an important departure from strictly "reformist" principles, the right of employees to take over and run an enterprise if it were deserted by its owner.
They ended conscription and replaced the standing army with a National Guard of all citizens who could bear arms. Projected legislation separated the church from the state, made all church property state property, and excluded religion from schools. The churches were only allowed to continue their religious activity if they kept their doors open to public political meetings during the evenings. This made the churches the chief participatory political centres of the Commune. Other projected legislation dealt with educational reforms which would make further education and technical training freely available to all. The commune adopted the previously discarded French Republican Calendar during its brief existence and used the red flag rather than the tricolore.

The load of work was eased by several factors, although the Council members (who were not "representatives" but delegates, subject to immediate recall by their electors) were expected to carry out many executive functions as well as their legislative ones. The numerous *ad hoc* organisations set up during the siege in the localities ("quartiers") to meet social needs (canteens, first aid stations) continued to thrive and cooperated with the Commune. At the same time, these local assemblies pursued their own goals, usually under the direction of local workers. Despite the formal reformism of the Commune council, the composition of the Commune as a whole was much more revolutionist. Revolutionary trends present included anarchist and socialists, Blanquists, and more libertarian republicans. The Paris Commune has been celebrated by anarchist and Marxist socialists continuously until the present day, partly due to the variety of tendencies, the high degree of workers' control and the remarkable cooperation among different revolutionists.

In the IIIe arrondissement, for instance, school materials were provided free, three schools were laicised and an orphanage was established. In the XXe arrondissement, school children were provided with free clothing and food. There were many similar examples. But a vital ingredient in the Commune's relative success at this stage was the initiative shown by ordinary workers in the public domain, who managed to take on the responsibilities of the administrators and specialists removed by Thiers. Friedrich Engels, Marx's closest associate, would later maintain that the absence of a standing army, the self-policing of the "quartiers", and other features meant that the Commune was no longer a "state" in the old, repressive sense of the term: it was a transitional form, moving towards the abolition of the state as such. Its future development, however, was to remain a theoretical question. After only a week it came under attack by elements of the new army (which included former prisoners of war released by the Prussians) being created at a furious pace in Versailles.

**THE ASSAULT**

The Commune was assaulted from April 2 by the government forces of the Versailles Army, and the city was constantly bombarded. The government advantage was such that from mid-April on they refused to negotiate. The outer suburb of Courbevoie was captured, and a delayed attempt by the Commune's own forces to march on Versailles failed ignominiously. Defence and survival became overriding considerations. The working-class women of Paris now played a steadily more important role. They served with the National Guard and even formed a battalion of their own which later fought heroically to defend the Place Blanche, a key to Montmartre. (But we should note that even under the Commune women did not have the vote, and there were no female members of the Council.)

Strong support came also from the large foreign community of political refugees and exiles in Paris: one of them, the Polish ex-officer and fighter for the independence of his country from
Russia, Jaroslaw Dombrowski, was to be the Commune's best general. The Council was fully committed to internationalism, and it was in the name of brotherhood that the Vendôme Column, celebrating the victories of Napoleon I, and considered by the Commune to be a monument to chauvinism, was pulled down. Abroad, there were rallies and messages of goodwill sent by trade union and socialist organisations, including some in Germany. But any hopes of getting serious help from other French cities were soon dashed. Thiers and his ministers in Versailles managed to prevent almost all information from leaking out of Paris; and in provincial and rural France there had always been a sceptical attitude towards the activities of the metropolis. Movements at Narbonne, Limoges and Marseilles were rapidly crushed.

As the situation deteriorated further, a section of the Council won a vote (opposed by bookbinder Eugène Varlin, a correspondent of Karl Marx, and by other moderates) for the creation of a "Committee of Public Safety", modelled on the Jacobin organ with the same title, formed in 1792. Its powers were extensive and ruthless. But the time when a strong central authority could have helped was now almost past. On May 21 a gate in the western part of the fortified city wall of Paris was forced (or, more probably, betrayed) and Versaillese troops began the reconquest of the city, first occupying the prosperous western districts where they were made welcome by those residents who had not left Paris after the armistice. The strong local loyalties which had been a positive feature of the Commune now became something of a disadvantage: instead of an overall planned defence, each "quartier" fought desperately for survival and was overcome in its turn. The webs of narrow streets which made entire districts nearly impregnable in earlier Parisian revolutions had been largely replaced by wide boulevards. The Versaillese enjoyed a centralised command and had modern artillery.

During the assault, the government troops were culpable in the slaughter of unarmed citizens: prisoners were shot out of hand and multiple executions were commonplace. In a futile gesture of defiance on May 27, a mob seized and brutally murdered 50 hostages, several of them priests, who had been held by the Commune. In all, government losses were around nine hundred. These deaths were to be avenged many times over. The toughest resistance came in the more working-class districts of the east, where fighting continued for a further eight days of vicious street fighting (La Semaine sanglante, the bloody week). By the May 27 only a few pockets of resistance remained, notably the poorer eastern districts of Belleville and Menilmontant.

At four o'clock in the afternoon of the next day the last barricade, in the rue Ramponeau in Belleville, fell, and Marshall MacMahon issued a proclamation: "To the inhabitants of Paris. The French army has come to save you. Paris is freed! At 4 o'clock our soldiers took the last insurgent position. Today the fight is over. Order, work and security will be reborn."

Reprisals now began in earnest. Having supported the Commune in any way was declared a crime, of which thousands could be, and were, accused. Some of the Communards were shot against what is now known as the Communards' Wall in the Père Lachaise cemetery while thousands of others were marched to Versailles for trials. Few Communards escaped, mainly through the Prussian lines to the north. For many days endless columns of men, women and children made a painful way under military escort to temporary prison quarters in Versailles. Later they were tried; a few were executed; many were condemned to hard labour; many more were deported for long terms or for life to virtually uninhabited French islands in the Pacific. The number of killed during La Semaine Sanglante can never be established for certain but the best estimates are 30,000 dead, many more wounded, and perhaps as many as 50,000 later executed or
imprisoned; 7,000 were exiled to New Caledonia. For the imprisoned there was a general amnesty in 1889. Paris remained under martial law for five years.

**THE COMMUNE IN RETROSPECT**

The better-off citizens of Paris, and many of the earlier historians of the Commune, saw it as a classic example of mob rule, terrifying and yet at the same time inexplicable. Most later historians, even those on the right, have recognised the value of some of the Commune's reforms and have deplored the savagery of its repression. However, they have found it difficult to explain the unprecedented hatred which the Commune aroused in the middle and upper classes.

On the left, there have been many who criticise the Commune for showing too great moderation, especially given the grave situation it was in. Karl Marx found it aggravating that the Communards "lost precious moments" organizing democratic elections rather than instantly finishing off Versailles once and for all. France's national bank located in Paris and storing billions of francs, was left untouched and unguarded by the Communards. Timidly they asked to borrow money from the bank (which of course they got without any hesitation). The Communards chose not to seize the bank's assets because they were afraid that the world would condemn them if they did. Thus large amounts of money were moved from Paris to Versailles, money that financed the army that crushed the Commune.

Communists, left-wing socialists, anarchists and others have seen the Commune as a model for, or a prefiguration of, a liberated society, with a political system based on participatory democracy from the grass roots up. Marx and Engels, Bakunin, and later Lenin and Trotsky tried to draw major theoretical lessons (in particular as regards the "withering away of the state") from the limited experience of the Commune. A more pragmatic lesson was drawn by the diarist Edmond de Goncourt, who wrote, three days after *La Semaine sanglante*, "...the bleeding has been done thoroughly, and a bleeding likes that, by killing the rebellious part of a population, postpones the next revolution... The old society has twenty years of peace before it..."

The Paris Commune has been subject to the awe of many communist leaders. Mao would refer to it often. Lenin, along with Marx, judged the Commune a living example of the dictatorship of the proletariat. At his funeral he had his body wrapped in the remains of a red flag preserved from the Commune. The Soviet spaceflight Voskhod 1 carried part of a communard banner from the Paris Commune for propaganda purposes. Also, the Bolshevists renamed the dreadnought battleship *Sevastopol* to *Parizhskaya Kommuna* in honor of the Commune.

**EVOLUTION OF PARLIAMENTARY DEMOCRACY IN GREAT BRITAIN**

**Introduction**

Great Britain was a veritable champion of liberalism. It was also the first country to destroy autocracy. However, democracy was built up, by reforms in the 19th century.

**1. Origin of Democracy in England.**

**The 'Witan' (Great Council)**
In the 9th century, England was ruled by Anglo-Saxon tribes. They ruled in consultation with the people. King Alfred formed a Consultative Council, known as the 'Witan' (the Council of the wise men), which was composed of several learned men. This Council played a definite role in the administration of the country. It laid the seeds of democracy in England. The Anglo-Saxon kings made laws, gave grants of land, administered justice and decided matters such as war and peace, with the counsel and the consent of the ‘Witan’.

During the period of the Normans, the ‘Witan’ was known as the ‘Great Council.’ A ‘Town-moot’ looked after the administration of the village; a ‘Hundred-moot’ was in charge of administering about a hundred villages. The ‘county-moot’ was a bigger council than the ‘Hundred-moot.’ Between 829 and 1066 AD, there was a tendency towards feudalism in England, until it had been conquered by the Normans.

**Monarchical Form of Government in England**

The Normans (1066-1154) conquered England in the eleventh century. They established a monarchical form of government. They wiped out feudal elements by setting up a strong central government. However, an important role continued to be played by the ‘Witan’ (now known as the ‘Great Council’) in the administration of the country. Its consent was declared in every legislation and sometimes, with regard to taxation. At times, it functioned as the Supreme Court of Justice for civil as well as criminal cases.

**2. Magna Carta - The Great Charter (1215)**

**Autocratic Rule of King John**

The rule of King John, during the Norman period, was noted for its bad government. The barons were grossly insulted by the king. King John harassed the common man too, in several ways. He imposed heavy taxes without the counsel and consent of the Great Council. He also imposed Octroi duties on goods and restricted their movement, without the council’s consent. The rights of the clergy and the nobles were also interfered with. The nobles, the barons and the bishops, therefore united under the leadership of Bishop Stephen Langton as protest against his tyranny. They prepared a Charter of Rights. This had the support of the common men who were disgruntled. Finding himself all alone, King John accepted the articles offered by the barons. On June 15, 1215 he affixed his seal on the 'Great Charter', which is referred to as the 'Magna Carta.'

**The Magna Carta: The Great Charter (1215)**

The Magna Carta was of special importance because; the people came together and successfully forced the king to publicly accept their demands. This kind of incident occurred for the first time in the constitutional history of England. The foundation of democracy in England was laid by the Charter, which put restrictions on the absolute and autocratic power of the king. The Magna Carta consisted of sixty-three articles. The following are some of the important ones:

1. The King will not impose any tax without the counsel and consent of the Great Council.
2. No one will be imprisoned, on mere suspicion, without trial.
3. To no man will we sell, to no man will we deny or delay, right or justice.
4. Private disputes will be determined in the King’s court at some fixed place.
5. Freedom of election shall be guaranteed to the clergy.
6. The traditional rights of the nobles and clergy will be protected.

Finally, the barons and nobles were empowered by the king to choose twenty-five of their number, to see that the articles of the Magna Carta were observed.

### 3. Establishment and Development of Parliament

**Simon-De-Montford, the "Father of Parliament"**

After King John’s death, government was carried on by the Great Council, since his son and successor Henry III was nine years old at the time. On coming of age, the young king dissolved the Great Council and levied arbitrary taxes on the people. Owing to Henry III’s misconduct, the nation was forced to renew its resistance, under the dynamic leadership of Simon de Montford, Earl of Leicester. A meeting of the nobles, the clergy and the representatives of the countries and towns (boroughs), was called by Simon de Montford in January 1265, in order to decide the methods of government administration and of levying taxes. This meeting became famous as the Parliament of Simon-de-Montford. This earned him the title of "Father of Parliament."

**Model Parliament (1295) under Edward**

In 1295, King Edward attempted to curb the nobles and the clergy, by securing the support of the third estate, consisting of the common people. To do so, he summoned the first complete English Parliament including representatives from all sections of society. This meeting came to be referred to as the "Model Parliament." On November 5, 1295, King Edward confirmed the articles of the Charter, which stated, among other issues that the king would not be able to levy taxes, without common consent. Thus Parliament’s consent became essential for levying any new tax. There was a gradual progress of this representative institution, which has led the British Parliament to be regarded as the "Mother of Parliaments."

**Medieval Parliament in England**

Parliament in the medieval period was basically a Parliament of Estates. Each of the three estates, namely the Estate of the Clergy, the Estate of the Lords Temporal and the Estate of the Commons was represented in the Parliament. The duration of the medieval Parliament was only for one session, lasting for a little more than a month. The Parliament was usually called once a year and this custom was converted into law by the statutes of 1330 and 1361.

Gradually Parliament was divided into two chambers - the House of Lords and the House of Commons. During the rule of King Henry IV, in 1407, financial bills began to be discussed only in the House of Commons. This led to the Lower House being regarded as the real representative body of the people. The bills were then sent to the House of Lords. After both Houses had agreed among themselves, they had to make their report through the Speaker of the House of Commons.

**Dispute between the king and the Parliament**
During the Tudor period, the dispute regarding where the final authority rested, continued to rage between the king and the Parliament. Nevertheless, the Tudor monarchs generally worked in agreement with the Parliament. The struggle between the king and the Parliament during the Stuart period increased tremendously. James I (1603-25) was a strong champion of the doctrine of the Divine Right of kings. He made laws as he pleased and people were forced to obey them.

The reign of Charles I (1625-49) saw the peak of the struggle between the king and the Parliament. His attempts to rule and tax the people, without the consent of the Parliament, led to failure in 1628. He was forced to call a parliament, which laid certain conditions on him in the famous document known as "The Petition of Rights." It included the following terms:

i. Loans and taxes, without consent of Parliament, were illegal.

ii. No one should be imprisoned without a fair trial.

iii. Martial law should not be imposed during peacetime.

iv. People should be forced to meet the expense of the army.

The Petition of Rights was an important step in the evolution of parliamentary democracy in England. Though the 'Petition of Rights' was accepted by Charles I, he dissolved the Parliament and ruled from 1629 to 1640 without a parliament. He was finally forced to call a parliament in 1640, which continued to work for 20 years. It thus came to known as the "Long Parliament."

The Long Parliament had great achievements to its credit. The king’s tyrannical and unjust courts were disbanded. The self-seeking advisors to the king, Strafford and Laud, were tried and sentenced to death. The tenure of Parliament was fixed at three years. When the king refused to summon the Parliament, it did so on its own, which enraged the king. He then organized his own army. In turn, an army was organized by the parliament, under the leadership of Oliver Cromwell. The king was defeated and the parliament found him guilty of tyranny, treason and treachery. He was then sentenced to death and beheaded in 1649. Thus the institution of monarchy in England was put to an end by the Long Parliament.

After this, England became a Commonwealth or a Republic that is a country ruled by the elected members of the Parliament, in the absence of a king. All powers were concentrated in the hands of Oliver Cromwell who was called the "Great Protector." A new written constitution was drafted, with all military, judicial and administrative powers, being concentrated in the hands of Cromwell. He was succeeded by his son Richard who was forced to resign, after the army revolted against him. England then invited Charles II (1660-85) the son of Charles I (1625-49) from France to rule England in 1660.

4. The Glorious Revolution of 1688

During his reign of twenty-three years, Charles II ruled with the consent of Parliament, as far as possible. However, he was succeeded by his younger brother, James II in 1685, who ruled as an absolute autocrat. In 1688, Parliament proclaimed its own sovereignty, by choosing a king of its own liking. William of Orange, who was the Protestant ruler of Holland and the son-in-law of
James II, was sent for. He had been invited to rule. This invitation was accepted by William and his wife Mary. They came to England with an army.

As he would not be able to fight against the Parliament and William of Orange, James II escaped to France. Since this revolutionary change occurred in 1688 without any bloodshed, it is known as "the Glorious Revolution." A Convention Parliament was summoned by William. It passed a Declaration of Rights and offered the crown to William and Mary, on condition that they agreed to respect the English laws. This offer was accepted by William and Mary, bringing an end to the long struggle between Parliament and the king, establishing the supremacy of Parliament and constitutional laws in England.

The Parliament became supreme after the Glorious Revolution and passed a Bill of Rights (1689), which obtained the consent of King William and Queen Mary in 1689. The following were its main provisions:

1. The pretended power of suspension or execution of laws by regal authority, without consent of Parliament, is illegal.

2. The pretended power of dispersion with, or execution of laws by regal authority, as it had been as assumed and exercised recently, is illegal.

3. Levy of money for, or to the use of the crown, by pretence or prerogative, without grant of Parliament for longer time, or in any other manner than the same is, or shall be granted, is illegal.

4. It is the right of the subjects to petition the King.

5. The raising or keeping a standing army within the kingdom, in time of peace, without the consent of Parliament is against the law.

6. The election of members of Parliament ought to be free.

7. The freedom of speech and debates or proceedings in parliament ought not to be impeached or questioned in any court or place, out of Parliament.

8. Excessive bail ought not to be required nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted.

9. Jurors should be duly empaneled and returned.

10. Finally, for redress of all grievances, and for amendment, for strengthening and preserving laws, Parliament ought to be summoned as frequently as possible.

The crown was then bestowed upon William and Mary jointly. In case of default of their offspring, succession would be followed by Princess Anne and her offspring. Further, in default of her issue, the rule reigns would shift upon the issue of William by any wife other than Mary.

**Significance of the Bill of Rights**

The Bill of Rights is one of the most important of the English statutes. It holds the same rank as the Great Charter of John, the confirmation of the Charters by Edward I and the Petition of Rights under Charles I. It is however regarded as more important because it changed the succession to the throne. Simultaneously, a number of sovereigns were brought in, possessing only a parliamentary
title. Thus the crown, which was so powerful in the 17th century, lost its relative significance in the 18th century. Thereafter, the leading members of Parliament, and not the king, began to conduct the government of England. Parliament, which had formerly acted as a check upon the supreme power, now became the supreme power itself.

The Act of Settlement was also passed in 1701. It stated:

a. that whosoever should, hereafter, come to occupy the throne of England, was required to join in communion with the Church of England, as by law established.

b. that all the business of government formerly transacted in the Privy Council should still be transacted there.

c. that no person, who had an office, or place of profit, under the King, or received a pension from the Crown, should be capable of serving as a member of the House of Commons and
d. that judge’s commission should be for life, or for good behavior and that their salaries should be ascertained and established. However they could be removed after a joint address of both Houses of Parliament.

e. 9.5 Rise of a Responsible Council Of Ministers.

f. Another important development was that of the responsible Council of Ministers, then referred to as the Cabinet. There was a gradual development of the cabinet. This has been called "the very pivot of government", by Professor F.C. Montague.

The king had to choose as Ministers those who commanded the confidence of the House of Commons that is those who held the opinions of the majority in the House. Thus began the practice of selecting ministers from the party, which enjoyed the majority support in the House of Commons. According to the Act of Settlement (1701), the House of Hanover came to power, after the Stuarts. Since King George I did not know English, he was the first king who stayed away from these meetings, giving rise to the custom that the cabinet meets together, apart from the sovereign.

g. In the absence of the king, another President had to be chosen. The minister who was most respected by the party was naturally selected as the leader. Thus, the Prime Minister was the leader of the party, commanding majority support of the House of Commons. In this sense, Sir Robert Walpole was the first Prime Minister and during his long term of office (1721-1742), he worked as the mouthpiece of the ministry in Parliament, as well as in the royal closet, according to Professor F.C. Montague.

h. After his defeat in the House of Commons in 1742, Sir Robert Walpole resigned as the Prime Minister thus establishing the practice that the Prime Minister and his cabinet were responsible to the House of Commons in Parliament.

6. Reform Act Of 1832

Though the Parliament became supreme after the Glorious Revolution of 1688, it could not be regarded as the real representative of the people until the 19th century, since the right to vote was restricted only to the rich and to property holders. Hence wealthy industrialists and rich landlords
dominated the Parliament. Owing to the growth of industries and factories there was a growth of labor force. This led to an agitation of the industrial workers; they demanded their representatives in Parliament. For this reason, the Reforms Bill of 1832 was passed by the Parliament.

Provisions of the Reform Act of 1832

By the Reform Act of 1832, fifty-six boroughs with less than 2,000 inhabitants were disfranchised. The one hundred and forty-three seats secured under the Reform Act of 1832 were distributed in the following manner:

a. Twenty-two new boroughs, either large towns or districts of London were given two members each.

b. Twenty-one of less importance, received one member each.

c. The counties secured sixty-five additional members.

d. Of the remaining seats, eight were given to Scotland and five to Ireland.

The franchise was also extended. Thus the right to vote was extended to copyholders and leaseholders in counties as well as tenants-at-will, paying a rent of $50 or upwards. All householders in boroughs, paying a rent of $10 and upwards, were given the franchise.

Separate Reform Acts were passed for Scotland and Ireland

The Reform Act of 1832 had significant effects:

The parliamentary influence exercised by ministers, as well as the parliamentary power of the landed interest, was greatly reduced. This was achieved by extinction of rotten boroughs, by extension of franchise to many new towns and boroughs and also by establishing household franchise in all boroughs.

Several differences began to arise between the House of Commons, which was dominated by the middle class, and the House of Lords, which was dominated by the landed interest. In these differences, based on public policy, the House of the Lords had to yield to the House of Commons. However the new electors under the Reforms Act of 1832, did not comprise of a considerable part of the laboring class. They were generally prosperous persons.

7. Representation of the People Act, 1867

By 1832, the industrial revolution was at its zenith. Owing to the introduction of free trade between 1840 and 1860, great impetus was given to trade and manufacturers. However the gains of agriculture were lessened. The artisan class began to agitate for political power. In 1838; a "People’s Charter" was drawn up. It was signed by thousands of people all over the country who demanded that the Charter should be accepted by the government. This popular movement which is known as the Chartist Movement, put forward the following demands.

a. Universal suffrage, or giving the right to vote to all adult males in the country.

b. Vote by secret ballot.
c. Equal electoral districts.
d. Annual Parliaments.
e. Removal of the property qualification for membership of the Parliament and payment to members of Parliament.

As a result of the growing strength of the ‘Chartist Movement’, the Representation of the People Act, was passed in 1867. It was introduced by Benjamin Disraeli.

The main provision of the Representation of the People Act, 1867 were as follows:

1. By this Act, a number of small boroughs were wholly or partially disfranchised.
2. Eleven new boroughs were created, and a few large cities and towns received one more member.
3. Twenty-five additional members were given to the English counties, and one was given to the University of London.
4. The franchise was extended in counties, to occupiers rated at $12 a year.
5. The franchise was extended in boroughs to all householders whatsoever and to lodgers paying $10 a year.
6. In 1868 separate Acts were passed to introduce household franchise into Scotch and Irish boroughs.

Lord Derby regarded the Reform Act of 1867 as ’a leap in the dark.’

The Secret Ballot Act introduced by Gladstone in 1872 ended the practices of bribery as well as of intimidating influential candidates.

8. Representation of the People Act, 1884

There were several causes that led to the Act of 1884. Since household suffrage was granted in the boroughs, it would have to be also given to the counties. Thus the way was paved for the equal representation of equal numbers. Among the main provisions of the Representation of the People Act, 1884 was the extension of the household franchise and ledger franchise to the counties. In this way, the whole body of agricultural laborers in England and Scotland, and of small farmers in Ireland, secured the franchise.

9. Parliamentary Act, 1911

There were many events that culminated in the passing of the Parliament Act of 1911.

The conflict between the Houses of Parliament was renewed after the Liberals returned to power in December 1905. The Unionists suffered a crushing defeat on the tariff question, and the General Election took place in December 1905. In the first session of the new parliament in 1906 the
Government’s Education Bill and the Plural Voting Bill were defeated by the Unionists. It was possible to enforce the supremacy of the House of Commons in the following two ways:

1. An alternation could be made in the composition of the House of Lords.
2. The powers of the House of Lords could be reduced.

In 1907, the government realized that an alternation in the character of the House of Lords would be undesirable unless its veto over legislation was removed. In 1909, the Budget of 1909 was rejected by the Upper Chamber, and hence the electorate began to appeal for a mandate to reduce the power of the Upper Chamber.

In the General Election of 1910, the Liberals lost over a hundred seats, while the Unionists remained a minority. The Government then introduced its proposals for constitutional reforms in the form of the Parliament Act of 1911.

**Provisions of the Parliament Act of 1911**

If a money bill was passed by the House of Commons and sent to the House of Lords, at least one month before the close of the session, the Lords could amend or reject it. However the Bill would secure the royal assent. A Bill certified by the speaker of the House of Commons, as dealing with some alteration of taxation, was defined as a 'Money Bill.'

A Public Bill, other than a Money Bill or a Bill for extension of the duration of Parliament, beyond five years would receive royal assent, if it was passed by the House of Commons in three successive sessions, whether in the same parliament or not and was sent to the House of Lords, at least one month before the end of the session, even though it was rejected by the Lords in each of those three sessions.

The duration of Parliament was reduced from seven to five years. All non-official members of the House of Commons would receive a salary of $400 a year. Thus the financial and legislative supremacy of the House of Commons was registered by the Parliament Act of 1911.

**10. Representation of the People Acts 1918 & 1928**

**The Female Suffrage Movement**

It was widely believed that women were not made to govern. In 1867, John Stuart Mill had spoken in favor of voting rights for women. This created a favorable atmosphere for the 'Female Suffrage Movement.' Under the leadership of influential women such as Mrs. Fawcett, Mrs. Pethick-Lawrence and the Pankhurs, several women suffrage societies sprang up, and began to work towards women’s claim to franchise. During the World War I (1914-18), women had played a vital role and had substituted for men in some service. Thus their demands were granted as a reward of appreciation, after the World War I.

In 1918, the 'Representation of the People Act' was passed by Parliament in 1918, granting franchise to all men over twenty-one and to all women of thirty years and above.
The works of electoral reform was completed by the Representation of the People Act of 1928, which granted the right to vote, to all women over twenty-one years. Thus the rule of the people was established step by step.

**LATIN AMERICAN REVOLUTIONS**

Independence movements in Latin America came after a long history of direct colonial control by the French, British, Portuguese, and Spanish across Central and South America and in the Andes. Though many indigenous groups had been fighting the colonists for over three hundred years, all of Latin America was under some form of direct colonial control. Anti-colonial movements in Latin America were not uniform, and were achieved in various ways from different segments of colonial society. Each anti-colonial movement in Latin America encompassed different ideological and intellectual ideas. Of all the anti-colonial revolts that occurred in Latin America, two contrastingly important revolts stand out: The Haitian Revolution and Simon Bolivar’s revolts in Venezuela. Both revolts were very different in how they were fought, and had different results than one another. The revolutions in Latin America were influenced greatly by the enlightenment period. Many of the important books of the enlightenment period were brought to the Americas and read by many, though they were at times hard to get. Major enlightenment philosophers such as Jean Jacques Rousseau, John Locke, Thomas Hobbes, and The Baron de Montesquieu played an important role in shaping beliefs and values among the educated classes in Latin America. In colonial universities, enlightenment figures such as Rene Descartes and Isaac Newton were taught and played an important role in shaping intellectual thought, while more controversial authors such as Rousseau and Voltaire were read in secret. The Enlightenment also led to many changes in the administration of the imperial system.

The Death of the Spanish king Charles II, the last of the Hapsburgs in Spain, led to the imposition of Philip of Anjou as the new the bourbon king of Spain. The new Bourbon king made many radical changes to the Spanish colonial system. One of the major changes was to end Seville’s monopoly over the colonies and allowed more ports in Spain to directly trade with the colonies. Politically, the bourbon king created new viceroyalties that established the modern borders of most of South America. The bourbon reforms also led to the expulsion of the Jesuits in 1767, having accused them of running a state within a state and causing revolts. He also increased the taxes on consumable goods, and created new taxes for the colonies while at the same time cutting back salaries for local officials. These reforms led to a lot of tensions between the colonies and Spain.

Venezuela was one of the few colonies that benefited from the bourbon reforms. Their main exports were agricultural goods that relied heavily on slave labour. In 1795 slaves and free labourers from the colony led a revolt against their landowners that resulted in the seizure of many sugar plantations in the Coro region. In 1797 a conspiracy to overthrow the colonists in Caracas was uncovered and was repressed by royalist authorities. Soon after the French invasion of Spain in 1808, a group of wealthy creoles attempted to create a junta to overthrow the colonial administration of Venezuela. Spanish Authorities repressed many of the juntas and imprisoned their leaders, but did not succeed in stopping them. In 1810 a junta comprising primarily of wealthy Creole revolutionary nationalists and autonomists, overthrew the captain general of the Audencia of Caracas and established a three person rotational executive republican government somewhat similar to the system in the United States in Venezuela and New Granada. Two important leaders emerged out of this government: Francisco de Miranda, a long time agitator and activist, and Simon Bolivar, the son of one of the wealthiest families in the colony.
When the Junta took power they established free trade policies and lowered taxes that would benefit the elite. They also abolished the slave trade, but not slavery. The government required certain property qualifications in order to be able to participate in the political system, making it essentially impossible for the black population to get any political representation. The established government was very unstable and was constantly threatened by uprisings and military challenges by royalists. In March of 1812 a massive earthquake struck Caracas the Venezuelan Capital. Royalist religious leaders managed to convince the masses that the earthquake was a sign of God’s judgement over the new regime. This belief was so strong among the people that Miranda was forced to negotiate with Spain due to the instability. Miranda negotiated to give power back to the royalists in Venezuela and was later arrested and sent to a Spanish prison where he died. Bolivar fled to the then still independent state of New Granada where he gained support to return to Venezuela and fight the Spaniards again.

In May 1813, Bolivar started a campaign against the Spaniards in Venezuela. Despite his efforts, the royalists in southern Venezuela ultimately defeated his armies and he was forced to flee the country again, this time to Jamaica. Having crushed another uprising, Ferdinand VII sent the Spanish military to pacify Venezuela and New Granada. To fund this enormous military endeavour, Ferdinand sold the estates of wealthy Republican leaders and supporters. This measure made the republicans very angry and only managed to increase tensions. Meanwhile Bolivar sought support from outside sources. The Haitian president Alexandre Pition, offered to help Bolivar if he promised to abolish slavery, which Bolivar promised to do. He was also able to get support from some of the most important royalist troops, the free blacks and the casta cowboys who had defeated him in his 1813 campaign. He also managed to enlist approximately three thousand troops from Great Britain, Ireland, and Germany.

In 1819, with the help of his newly recruited troops, Bolivar successfully re-conquered New Granada in under a month. The acquisition of New Granada allowed Bolivar to build up an even stronger. This lead to a successful assault on Caracas two years later, that resulted in Bolivar gaining control of Venezuela and New Granada. This time rather than establishing a republican system of government like they had in 1810, Bolivar created a centralized form of government with some system of political representation, but with a primarily strong executive. Bolivar and Lieutenant Jose de Sucre then lead a movement to liberate Ecuador in a difficult. Having kicked out the Spaniards, Bolivar was faced with a political crisis in Ecuador. Many Ecuadorians wanted complete independence from the Spaniards and from Bolivar or wanted to be united with Peru. Ultimately Ecuador became its own independent state as a result.

Chilean forces under San Martin were already engaged in a war with Peru however the Peruvian creoles did not trust the Royalists or the invading forces, making it difficult to get rid of the royalists. San Martin also did not have a sufficient sized army to confront the royalists due to under funding and bad leadership. Ultimately San Martin attempted to negotiate a settlement with the royalists that would produce a kind independent state but would still be within the Spanish empire. The Creole elite reluctantly declared independence in 1821 under these provisions. San Martin attempted to make some reforms, but the Peruvian Creole elite did not enforce them. Eventually, San Martin met with Bolivar to enlist his help, following this meeting he withdrew his troops from Peru and in 1823 Bolivar led a large-scale assault on Peru. The revolt was successful and Simon Bolivar became the Dictator of Peru, and created a state of Bolivia in northern Peru. These victories marked the end of Spanish Rule in South America. Bolivar was essentially a man of action, a soldier more than a statesman, who was driven into action by a few strong ideas? Bolivar became
known across South America and El Liberator for having liberated so many countries from Spanish rule.

Spain was not the only country to lose colonies during the early eighteenth century. One of the first Revolutions in the Americas occurred in Haiti, a French colony with a large slave population. The Haitian revolution stemmed from changes in the Atlantic world throughout the eighteenth century, particularly with the French revolution. Haiti was a French Colony, and the outbreak of the French Revolution in 1789 led to a simultaneous anti-colonial revolt in Haiti. There was three main social groups that populated Haiti. The largest group were slaves. There were many divisions among slaves based on gender, skill, occupation and their relationship with their master and as a result very little solidarity existed among them. Above slaves were a small class of freed slaves and non-whites, many of who were also slave owners. On the top of the social hierarchy were whites whose elites represented the slave owners, and big landowners. Less wealthy whites worked as artisans, small merchants, or plantation overseers and there was a clear distinction between the Grands Blancs, and Petits Blancs.

In the late 18th century the moral and religious justifications of slavery increasingly started coming into question. A movement to eliminate slavery in French colonies emerged in 1789 with the outbreak of the French Revolution, and was passed by one of the provisional governments during the Revolution, but was then overturned in the turmoil of the revolution. The Haitian revolution began as a revolt between the Grands Blancs and Petits Blancs in 1790. Both groups organized slave militias to fight each other. After two years of fighting for their slave owners, the slaves started to fight for their own cause. The conflict quickly evolved into a large-scale revolt against the white slave owners, who were ultimately defeated in 1793. Pierre-Dominique Toussaint Louverture, an ex-slave and slave-owner, was made leader of Haiti. Despite having gained control of the colony it did not lead to the end of slavery or fighting in the country.

In 1797 commissioner Liger Folicit Sonthonax of the French Jacobin party, expelled all invading forces (including the French) and gave it a remarkably modern and democratic constitution. Sonthonax also helped suppress a free-black revolt in southern Haiti, and also helped capture Santo Domingo, a small Spanish colony. When Napoleon became Emperor of France, he sent his brother in law General Charles Victor Emmanuel Leclerc and over forty four thousand troops to the colony in an attempt to re-colonize the area and re-instate slavery. Ultimately Napoleon’s campaign was disastrous, and on January 1 1804, Haiti received its independence from France. Haitian independence was incredibly important to Latin America; it was the first country to be under black rule, and represents the only successful slave revolt in Latin American history. The Haitian Revolution was very threatening to white slave owners in other colonies who feared that a similar uprising could be successful. The victory of the slaves also played a role in eliminating slavery in the Americas and Andes. In 1818 France abolished their slave trade system, and by 1848 had eliminated slavery in their colonies. Britain, Holland, and Spain also abolished their slave systems during the 19th century. By the end of the 19th century Slavery was abolished in the Americas.

The Haitian Revolution and Bolivar’s revolts were very different in nature and as a result had very different outcomes. Simon Bolivar was a well-educated and wealthy Creole that did not engage in a revolution to bring equality to South American society, but rather to liberate it from foreign control. The Haitian revolution originated with the same goal; however the subordinated masses were able to take over the territory. Along class lines it could be argued that Bolivar’s
revolutions benefited the upper classes primarily and to maintained existing hierarchies, while the Haitian revolution was a revolution to create equality amongst all citizens. This was illustrated when Toussaint sent to a white, mulatto, and free black deputy to France to represent the nation.

Bolivar was well educated and had read many of the important philosophers of his time such as Rousseau and Machiavelli. Though he had initially attempted to create a more liberal republic, he later moved towards creating a strong centralized government with certain republican features, while keeping a certain oligarchic structure. The Haitian revolution did not have a clear ideological or political philosophy to which it adhered. Rather it simply sought black rule and an end to slavery in the colony, which ironically lead to a very centralized government. Bolivar was very imperialist in his endeavors and sought to control as much of the continent as possible. Through the years he was dictator and leader of many different countries and had a lot of political power. He felt as if it was his personal duty to liberate South America from the Spanish as he said in his oath taken in Rome? ‘I swear before you, I swear by God of my fathers, I swear on their graves, I swear by my Country that I will not rest body or soul until I have broken the chains binding us to the will of Spanish might’? The Haitian revolution was not expansionary because of geographic, economic and practical reasons. It would have been very difficult for Haitians to lead popular slave revolts in other colonies, however it did have an effect on other nations, and particularly with Simon Bolivar himself, by providing economic support for his movement as long as he promised to eliminate slavery in Latin America.

The Haitian and Bolivar revolutions represent the end of the colonial era, and the start of a new era of independence in Latin America. This period saw the end of slavery in the colonies, and major changes in the political structures and the organization of peoples. For Spain and France it meant the downfall of their power and position in the world community, and for the millions of people living in South America it meant the beginning of real political autonomy. Bolivar helped liberate millions of people across South America, and the Haitian revolution strengthened the movement to abolish slavery around the world, and helped bring freedom to thousands of slaves. The success of the revolutions allowed Latin American colonies to prosper on their own and manage their own governments in order to benefit themselves rather than a colonial power.

Some Important Leaders of the Latin American Revolution

1. Simon Bolivar: Liberator of Latin America

Simon Bolivar was one of the most powerful figures in world political history, leading the independence movement for six nations (an area the size of modern Europe), with a personal story that is the stuff of dramatic fiction. Yet today outside of Latin America, where he is still practically worshipped, his name is almost unknown. Born to wealthy Creoles in Caracas, Venezuela, on July 24, 1783, his father died when he was three and his mother six years later. Simon was reared by an uncle with a tutor who exposed him to the writers of the Enlightenment, such as Voltaire and Rousseau, who were inspirations for the French Revolution. The tutor, Simon Rodriguez, fled the country when he was suspected of conspiring to overthrow Spain's colonial rule in 1796. At 16, Bolivar was sent to Spain to complete his education and on the way, his ship stopped in Vera Cruz. During an audience with the viceroy, he audaciously praised the French Revolution and American independence, both of which made Spanish officials nervous.
In 1802, he married the daughter of a nobleman in Spain and returned to Caracas, only to have her die a year later from yellow fever. As a way of keeping his mind off of his grief, Bolivar decided to return to Europe to immerse himself in the intellectual and political world he had found so stimulating. While in Paris, he met Alexander von Humboldt, the great naturalist who had just returned after five years in South America. As von Humboldt spoke of the enormous natural resources and wonders of the continent, Bolivar remarked, "In truth, what a brilliant fate--that of the New World, if only its people were freed of their yoke." Von Humboldt responded, "I believe that your country is ready for its independence. But I can not see the man who is to achieve it." It was a fateful comment Bolivar was to vividly recall the rest of his life. He also witnessed the coronation of Napoleon as emperor on December 2, 1804. Bolivar was appalled at what he felt was a betrayal of the principles of the Revolution, yet he took note of the ability of one man to change the course of history.

Bolivar had met up with his old tutor, Rodriguez, and the two traveled to Rome, where they again crossed paths with von Humboldt. On August 15, 1805, Bolivar found himself with Rodriguez on Monte Sacro (Aventine Hill), a place associated in Roman history with freedom from oppression. The 22-year-old fell to his knees and, grasping his teacher's hands, vowed to free his country. After returning to Paris, Bolivar sailed for America, stopping often along the east coast before arriving home in 1807. The following year, France invaded Spain. By 1810, the city council of Caracas had grown bold enough to depose the Spanish viceroy and sent Bolivar to London to seek protection from the British government against any attempt by France to seize Venezuela. No help was forthcoming, but Bolivar recruited Francisco de Miranda, who had spearheaded a prior revolt, to return to head the new independence movement. While in London, Bolivar also had his most famous portrait painted. On close examination, a medallion hanging from his neck reads, "There is no fatherland without freedom." When he left on September 21, he was never to return to Europe.

As is typical of revolutions before history is rewritten to present all the natives as patriots, what followed in South America was as much civil war as an effort to throw off the colonial yoke. The see-saw power struggle between revolutionary and loyalist factions and with the royal forces was to last 14 years (followed by several years of occasional conflict between factions in the liberated territories). In March 1811, a national congress met in Caracas. Though not a delegate, Bolivar gave his first public speech to the group, saying, "Let us lay the cornerstone of American freedom without fear. To hesitate is to perish." The First Republic was declared July 5, Venezuela becoming the first colony anywhere in the Spanish empire to attempt to break free. Like many in the aristocracy, Bolivar had slaves, and in the spirit and excitement of the independence movement he was the first to set them free. He was later to call for the abolition of slavery across the entire Western Hemisphere. Although he had no formal military training and no battlefield experience, Bolivar was made Lieutenant Colonel serving under Miranda. He participated in his first engagement on July 19, an assault on the Spanish stronghold of Valencia in which he distinguished himself, but the rebel forces were repelled. A siege forced capitulation on August 19th after heavy losses on both sides. It was a harbinger of things to come.

Miranda and Bolivar had been having an increasing number of serious disagreements, from how to treat counterrevolutionary conspirators (Bolivar was for execution) to whether those born in Spain should be allowed to stay (Bolivar wanted them expelled). Meanwhile, on the political front the republicans were suffering from lack of governing experience. Within a few months, the captured royal treasury was spent and a Spanish blockade led to a worsening economic situation. On March 26, 1812, two years to the day after the Caracas city council had deposed the viceroy, a severe
earthquake hit the region, killing 10,000. Areas where loyalists to Spain resided were little affected and religious hysteria followed, blaming the independence movement for defying God's chosen monarch. The Spanish commander-in-chief, Juan Domingo de Monteverde, took advantage of the situation, marching out into the country, even finding rebel units eager to switch sides. However, Miranda, who had 5,000 men vs. Monteverde's 3,000, could have struck a decisive blow if he had gone on the offensive instead of being overly cautious. In the few times they clashed, Miranda held back his men from pursuit which could have annihilated the Spanish.

Bolivar was put in charge of the most important republican port, Puerto Cabello, where a large number of prisoners were kept at the main fort, as well as a large stockpile of arms and artillery (which played little role by either side in South America's fight for freedom). The combination proved fatal: a traitor freed the prisoners who armed themselves and began bombarding Bolivar's position. He and his men barely escaped with their lives. Bolivar felt disgraced by the loss and furious that Miranda had not responded to calls for help. Shortly thereafter, he and other officers turned Miranda over to the Spaniards. As the Spanish completed their reconquest of the country, Bolivar escaped to Cartagena in New Granada (now Colombia), where rebels held power (though locked in civil war with a rival faction in Bogota).

There in 1812, he wrote the first of his many eloquent political manifestos, saying, "Not the Spanish, but our own disunity led us back into slavery. A strong government could have changed everything." He began championing a political system in which the nobility played a strong role, led by a president for life. He condemned the leniency against crime in general and against the state in particular that he felt had contributed to the fall of the First Republic. He began arguing that Venezuela should be liberated as the first step in creating an entire continent of independent states. The government of New Granada authorized a revolutionary force to liberate the Spanish-held bastions in their territory and in Venezuela, headed by Pierre Labatut. Against orders, Bolivar took 200 of the men and boldly attacked a Spanish garrison, capturing supplies and boats. One small victory followed another and the rebel ranks swelled. As a result of his actions, Bolivar was named commander-in-chief of the entire New Granadian army. He had to improvise tactics as he went along, finding European tactics he read about in books useless in a land of enormous mountain ranges, deep gorges, rushing rivers, vast plains, no roads, minimal ability to communicate over any distance, and sparse population.

Taking 650 men, he reentered Venezuela in May 1813. Facing 4,000 Spanish soldiers, Bolivar's expedition seemed foolhardy. Using speed and surprise, he would defeat units of the Spanish army and the population rose up to swell the ranks of the republicans. He also recruited from the enemy by offering amnesty for deserters, threatening to kill captured Spaniards. Though only occasionally carried out, he believed that only through such a drastic measure could the republicans win and avoid the slaughter and plunder of civilians that was inevitable if they lost.

After five swift victories, Bolivar had built up an army of 2,500, which came across 1,200 of the enemy, who retreated swiftly towards Valencia. He placed two men on each of 200 horses and had them ride around the Spanish through the night. The Spanish found their way blocked in the early morning of July 31 and in the Battle of Taguanes the revolutionaries crushed the royalists. It was Bolivar's first large-scale victory (by the small-scale standards of South American war). The republican army reentered Caracas on August 7, where Bolivar, now 30, was given dictatorial powers, although half of Venezuela remained under control of the crown, which had 10 times the number of troops, who were, of course, much better equipped and trained. Gradually, the population grew war-weary and sentiment turned against the independence movement, which was also
hindered by being poorly equipped (the infantry typically had antiquated muskets which required six motions to load; often running out of ammunition, they resorted to bayonet attacks, when they had bayonets).

The Spanish leaders also began recruiting the fierce *llaneros*, nomadic cattle-raising horsemen of the Amazon grasslands. They appointed Jose Tomas Boves, a former rebel embittered by having been imprisoned by his comrades, to head them. Known as the Legion of Hell, it consisted of as many as 10,000 riders using spears, knives, and bolos, easily superior to better-armed republicans, who were almost entirely infantry. They began waging an even more savage war, so the rebels responded in kind, even killing civilians who would not take up arms against the royalists. Prisoners were executed on the spot. There was no grand war strategy, no static fronts, just one pitched battle after another between a few hundred or few thousand. On November 10, Bolivar inflicted what seemed to be a defeat on the *llaneros* and Spanish soldiers at Barquisemeto, but in the midst of the pursuit by the republicans, someone in their camped issued a call to retreat, throwing the army into confusion and the roles were reversed, the Spanish turning to pursue. It was Bolivar's first personal battlefield loss in one-and-a-half years. The first regiment to retreat was stripped of its medals, rank, and banners. Then on December 5, at dawn, Bolivar's 3,000 attacked 5,000 Spanish forces under General Monteverde, who were on in the hills near Araure. The patriot's advance unit was immediately wiped out, but while Monteverde was reinforcing his flanks where he expected the next assault, rebels armed mostly with knives and sticks overran the center. After fierce hand-to-hand combat, Bolivar himself led the charge which scattered the Spanish. He gave chase until 2 a.m. the next morning, directing his men to kill even those who surrendered.

Over the next few months, the patriots found themselves fighting on so many fronts that they sometimes faced 7-to-1 odds. Bolivar's forces were nearly annihilated several times. By February 1814, Bolivar had recruited some replacements and had dug in at San Mateo. The Spanish, who had 10 times the cavalry, made repeated attacks on his positions and nearly succeeded in overrunning them. At one point, they almost captured the supply and munitions depot, until the defenders blew themselves up to prevent its capture. The Spanish finally gave up after several months. On May 28, Bolivar's 5,000 faced 1,000 entrenched royalists in hills above the Plains of Carabobo. Although his men were poorly armed, he knew that *llaneros* were on the way to reinforce the enemy, so he decided to risk everything again. The assault was so relentless that the Spanish fled. But with his men nearly naked and the rainy season turning the region into a swamp, Bolivar found it increasingly difficult to follow up, final victory always slipping from his hands. On June 15, he gathered 3,000 soldiers at La Puerta against Boves' equal number, and this time the revolutionaries were trounced, Bolivar barely escaping from the field. As Boves marched onto Caracas with his numbers increasing by the day, 20,000 fled the city.

At Aragua, Boves caught up with remnants of the patriot army and 4,000 men, mostly Bolivar's, died in one of the bloodiest battles of the South American war for independence. Bolivar shipped 24 chests of church silver and gems to a safe point to buy arms from British colonies and in September sailed to Cartagena. The royalists gained control of Venezuela by the end of the year, reinforced in May 1815 by 11,000 veterans of the Napoleonic wars, the biggest expedition the Spanish had ever sent to the Americas. Ever the optimist, Bolivar wrote his fellow citizens, "I have been chosen by fate to break your chains…Fight and you shall win. For God grants victory to perseverance." He exhorted his men that misfortune was the "school of heroes."

The government of New Granada gave him an army to go after its own Spanish garrisons and rebellious cities. He sent out a public letter, pleading with the factions to unite against Spain because
"our country is America." But he was only partially successful in stopping the civil war and when a large Spanish army arrived from Venezuela in May, Bolivar sailed for Jamaica with most of his officers. There, the prolific Bolivar wrote his most famous document, *Letter from Jamaica*, in which he declared, "A people that love freedom will in the end be free." He foresaw a great federation of Hispanic American republics which would deserve the same respect as European nations. A man of great charm who could size up the people he met instantly, the indefatigable Bolivar set out to persuade the world to back his vision yet again. He was said to speak so eloquently on the spur of the moment that his speeches could be printed without editing. He answered every letter written to him, sometimes dictating to three secretaries at once. Bolivar's pleas fell on deaf ears as far as governments went, with the exception of Haiti, whose president agreed to provide money and equipment. In March 1816, the first expedition sailed with 250 men in seven ships, an absurd force to engage the 10,000-strong royal army. They came across four Spanish vessels and were able to board two. They landed the next day at San Juan Griego and were warmly welcomed by the people. Another 300 joined what was called the Liberating Army. But shortly thereafter they were driven back and returned to Haiti for reprovisioning.

When Bolivar landed in Venezuela again in December 1816, he was 33 and would remain there for the rest of his life. He had 500 men with him; a nearby fort had 1,500 of the enemy, never mind the 16,000 government soldiers in Caracas. Bolivar began circulating proclamations, making up stories about supposed victories in various areas of the country, building an image of himself everywhere and invincible. In actuality, he operated mostly on the plains around the Orinoco River in the interior; headquartered in remote Agostura. And Bolivar was actually spending much of his time quelling efforts by subordinates to usurp his command. Bolivar showed excellent political skills in maneuvering around the many internal roadblocks, but finally felt compelled to execute the leading conspirator, Manuel Piar, who was, unfortunately, was also the republicans' best tactician. One man became indispensable to Bolivar's new strategy: Antonio Jose Paez, seven years his younger (who had an enormous bodyguard called the First Negro who had a knife so large no one else could wield it). Paez had mastered the supreme difficulties of guerrilla cavalry warfare in the tropics. Some of the *llaneros* were so impressed by him that they changed sides. His lightning attacks achieved the first victories against the powerful army which had landed in 1815.46.

By May, the 2,000 republicans had achieved some significant victories. One incident illustrated how much they thrived on boldness. With 15 of his officers on a reconnaissance, Bolivar spotted a large number of Spanish soldiers lying in wait to ambush him as he rounded a corner. He shouted for his men to form up and prepare for an assault on the enemy position—as if his own army were right behind. The Spaniards retreated. In January 1818, Bolivar's 3,000 soldiers marched 350 miles through a swampy region to join Paez's 1,000 cavalry. Armed mostly with lances and bows and arrows, they surprised one Spanish garrison after another. The commander of all Spanish forces in Venezuela and New Granada, Pablo Morillo, barely escaped. But inevitably, Spanish numbers and arms turned the tide prevail. Bolivar retreated to El Semen with 2,000 men and while he was passing baggage over a ravine on March 25, royal forces attacked. The rebels were exhausted and Morillo killed half of them, capturing their materiel and papers, though Bolivar escaped. The Spanish were sure that he was finished this time. But Bolivar was discouraged by the lack of popular support, but he still had Paez's 2,100 horsemen. He immediately began rebuilding the infantry by recruiting from convalescent hospitals and among teenage boys. Gradually, though, he realized that the only way to achieve a level of professionalism to match the enemy was to form a foreign legion. He began raising money and his agents found great interest among the 30,000 recently discharged soldiers of the British army. The weather and the inability of
the rebel army to meet payroll was discouraging to the mercenaries, but they adapted to conditions and became committed to the cause. Of the nearly 6000 who joined, 220 drowned on the way over, some deserted, and most were died from disease or in battle: only a few hundred survived the war. In February 1819, a republican congress was convened to draw up a constitution for the Third Republic. Meantime, guerrilla warfare was being successfully waged by Paez's cavalry. In one encounter, they lured the Spanish into a trap. The Venezuelans lost six, the Spanish 400. The Spanish withdrew from the region after losing half their 7,000 troops. Bolivar began to conceive one of the most audacious military campaigns in history. He had been operating on the eastern part of the Plains of Casanare. On the western plains up against the Andes, Francisco de Paula Santander was conducting a guerrilla campaign the Spanish found impossible to suppress. During the rainy season when the plains were a virtual swamp, the royalist troops withdrew and in April, Santander sent a message to Bolivar that the area was free of the enemy.

Bolivar knew that the Andes were considered impassable during winter (in the southern hemisphere) and that the Spanish guarded the frontier of New Granada on the other side very lightly. He called a war council of his generals, all of them under 40, in a hut without furniture; they sat on the bleached skulls of oxen to discuss his idea on May 23. Hannibal had spent years preparing for his epic trek through the Alps, as had San Martin of Argentina when he made his own climb over the Andes, both with seasoned soldiers. But within a week of making plans, Venezuela's 2,500 ragtag rebels set out to for the foot of the mountains. First, though, they had to cross 10 swollen rivers, as well as move through flooded plains with water often waist-deep, with the torrential rain constant. Half the cattle brought along for food drowned. Bolivar continually moved up and down his lines to exhort his men forward. On June 25, they began the ascent into the mountains. The army consisted mostly of men from the plains and Britain and Ireland, none of them prepared for what they were about to face. The higher they went, the colder it became. By the time they were at 18,000 feet, the horses and cattle had died in the frozen wasteland. The half-naked men who had no wood for fire most of the time, took to flogging each other to keep circulation going. Nearly 1,000 men died along the way.

Those who made it to the other side of the range were half-starved and had dropped their weapons along the way, but found a population eager to resupply them. After Bolivar's men had a few skirmishes with Spanish government outposts, word reach the regional commander, who prepared to meet the rebels in a well-defended position with 3,000 soldiers on July 24 at Pantano de Vargas. After the revolutionaries' cavalry managed to charge in the steep terrain and the foreign legion seemed to cinch a victory with a bayonet assault, the Spanish pushed them back. It was a stalemate, but the commander sent a report to the viceroy: "The annihilation of the republicans appeared inevitable. But despair gave them courage. Our infantry could not resist them." The Spanish retreated and the patriots pursued. At Boyaca, on August 7, the rebels prevented the royalists from crossing a bridge that would have allowed them to reach the garrison at Bogota. In a two-hour clash, they captured half of the 3,000 Spanish troops, the rest having been killed or fled the battlefield. It was the turning point for the independence movement in South America. The Spanish began to evacuate New Granada and word spread like wildfire that the empire was coming to an end. Desertions from the royal army increased and formerly neutral citizens began actively supporting Bolivar. In December, the underground legislature of Venezuela assembled and declared its country and New Granada united as the Republic of Colombia (which included what is now Ecuador). Bolivar was made president and military dictator.

Political events in Spain provided impetus for negotiations with the republicans throughout 1820, but skirmishes continued. Bolivar and Morillo, the Spanish commander, met in November and
signed an armistice. In the following months, the patriots built up their army and made plans for a campaign in the event a final agreement should not be worked out. The conflict resumed in April 1821. On June 24, the Spanish general La Torre brought 5,000 troops to Carabobo to block both passes that could allow the rebels to move towards Caracas. He made some decisive mistakes in position: a weak right flank, no sharpshooters at the edges, and cavalry too far to the rear to be brought up in a timely manner. Bolivar, with a total of 6,500 men, sent Paez with cavalry and infantry, including the British battalion, around to the enemy's right rear, but while cutting through the heavy bushes, that they were spotted. The Spanish reinforced their right and concentrated fire on Paez's troops, repelling the initial attack, which required the patriots to climb across steep ravines. But when the overconfident Spanish broke out and chased them, the royalists ran smack into the British veterans of the Napoleonic wars who cut them to pieces with disciplined heavy fire at close range. Running out of ammunition, the British charged with bayonets and the Spanish right collapsed. The main forces of both sides had not yet engaged, but when Bolivar saw the outcome on the right, he ordered a full attack. One-third of the Spanish troops was captured and as many was killed or wounded.

The region between Cali (Colombia) and Guayaquil (Ecuador) remained a Spanish stronghold after the victory at Carabobo. Bolivar had sent General Antonio Jose Sucre south to aid the local revolutionaries and he had achieved some success. In March 1822, Bolivar set out with 3,000 soldiers, but one third of them perished from exposure or harassment from loyalist guerrillas. On April 7, he came up against 1,800 Spanish troops in a seemingly impregnable position in thick woods at Bombana. Bolivar ordered an attack on the right at night under a full moon, losing a third of his 2,000 men under withering fire. But over the next six weeks while the Spanish were concentrating on resisting Bolivar, his right-hand, Antonio Jose Sucre, had gone around them, defeated royalist troops positioned near Quito, the capital of Ecuador, and taken it. From that base, he was able to mop of Spanish forces and Bolivar went on to Guayaquil. Forces under the generalship of Jose de San Martin, a 20-year veteran of service to the crown, and Bernardo O'Higgins, son of an Irishman who had become viceroy of Peru, had ended colonialism in Chile and Argentina. Between their armies and Bolivar's troops lay Peru, with 19,000 Spanish troops, the last of the empire. San Martin was well-provisioned and well-armed when he marched over the Andes with 4,500 veterans to take Lima in June 1821. However, had not been able to push further inland.

On July 26, 1822, San Martin and Bolivar met in Guayaquil to see how they could work together. There is no record of the meeting, but they didn't seem to get along well personally and had different visions for the continent. San Martin was so discouraged by Bolivar's impassioned insistence that his views would prevail that he retired immediately to France. Peru was left in Bolivar's hands. In June 1824, Bolivar assembled an army of 9,000 in Peru to move 600 miles over the Andes to the high plateau. Inadequately clothed, suffering from sun-blindness, lack of oxygen, and the hazards of the dizzying precipices, they climbed to 12,000 feet. One English general, a long-time veteran in Europe, described it as the most difficult military operation he had ever undertaken. At the top, Bolivar reviewed his troops and told them, "Soldiers, you are about to finish the greatest undertaking Heaven has confided to men—of saving an entire world from salvery!" On August 6, Bolivar reached the heights above the Plains of Junin. Below, he spotted part of the Spanish army moving across the plains. Bolivar sent 900 of his horsemen to attack the 2,000 royal cavalry at their rear. The engagement lasted 45 minutes; no shot was fired during the clash of lances and swords. The patriots lost 120 men, the Spanish, who retreated in wild disorder, 400. It was to be the last battle Bolivar would personally lead against the king's men.
Bolivar stepped down to attend to political matters and put nearly 5,780 soldiers under the command of Sucre. The Peruvian viceroy, La Serna, took 9,300 troops and began to pursue Sucre's forces. A cat and mouse game ensued through country crossed by steep ravines and deep rivers. Bolivar wrote Sucre that, "The axiom of Marshal of Saxony is being fulfilled. Feet spared Peru; feet saved Peru; and feet will again cause Peru to be lost. Fixed ideas always avenge themselves." The Spanish finally trapped Sucre's army in the valley of Ayacucho on December 9. The republicans had only one 4-pounder gun, opposed to the crown force's 24 artillery pieces. As the Spanish marched down on the republicans, Sucre rode along his lines, shouting, "Upon your efforts depend the fate of South America." Knowing that some of La Serna's subordinates perpetuated massacres of surrendered troops, the rebels knew it was a fight to the finish. One of Sucre's lieutenants killed his horse, explaining to his soldiers, "I have now no means of escape, so we must fight it out together." The Spanish were startled by the fierceness of the republican resistance and when the latter charged with bayonets, the Spanish lost 2,000 men and 15 guns. La Serna was taken prisoner and the commanding general surrendered. Sucre's report to Bolivar announced, "The war is ended, and the liberation of Peru completed." Mop-up operations occupied 1825 and in the same year the people of upper Peru deciding to form a separate nation, which they named Bolivia in Bolivar's honor. He wrote its constitution and accepted the position of lifetime president.

The fight for the independence of Venezuela, Columbia, Ecuador, Peru, Bolivia, and Panama (a department of Colombia) had involved 696 battles, with an average of 1,400 soldiers per engagement, counting both sides together. Bolivar received a letter from the then-old Marquis de Lafayette on behalf of the family of George Washington, along with a gold medallion coined after the capitulation at Yorktown. It read, "The second Washington of the New World." Bolivar was deeply moved. Simon Bolivar began vigorously rebuilding and administering the devastated new states. He was at the height of his power when he convened a congress of Latin American republics in Panama in 1826. He envisioned a league of the fledgling Central and South American nations, but he was far ahead of his time. Soon thereafter, fighting between the states, personality conflicts, and resentment of his authoritarian ways caused his influence to wane. After an assassination attempt and with failing health, Bolivar resigned all his positions and died shortly thereafter on December 10, 1830. But to Latin Americans, Bolivar remains immortal, one of the greatest military leaders in the history of the entire world.

2. Francisco de Miranda

Francisco de Miranda (1750-1816) was a Latin American patriot who advocated independence of the Spanish colonies, and although he did not see the fulfillment of his dreams, he was willing to pay the price these efforts demanded. Francisco de Miranda was born in Caracas on March 28, 1750, the son of a Spaniard from the Canary Islands. Early in life he entered the Spanish army and went to Madrid supplied with ample funds and letters of introduction. He bought a captaincy and began to keep the diary which in time became the nucleus of an immense archive. His military career was not fortunate. Accused of neglect of duty, he was eventually cleared and was sent to Cuba, where he again fell out with the authorities. In 1783 he left the Spanish service and fled to the United States.

Henceforth, Miranda was in open rebellion against the Spanish crown. Spurred by the example of the 13 colonies that had achieved independence from England, he aspired to set up an independent empire in Hispanic America. Among his friends in the United States were such men as Washington, Hamilton, and Thomas Paine. Constantly hounded by Spanish agents, he visited
England, Prussia, Austria, Italy, Turkey, and Russia. Catherine the Great took a liking to him and allowed him to wear the Russian uniform and use a Russian passport.

In 1790 Spain and England disputed the rights to Nootka Sound, and Miranda hoped to convince the younger William Pitt that the time had come to set up an independent empire in Hispanic America where England might enjoy a trade monopoly. He was unsuccessful, but not discouraged, and offered his services to France. He fought in its wars, and his name was later inscribed at the Arch of Triumph, but France had as little use for his schemes as England. He survived imprisonment and the Terror and, in 1797, fled to England, where he found more encouragement for his projects. In 1806 he attempted to invade Venezuela, but the authorities had been forewarned and he was repulsed. Defeated but undaunted, he awaited his hour in London.

Two years later, rebellion in the Spanish Empire seemed to improve Miranda's chances. In 1810 he met the envoy of revolutionary Venezuela, Simón Bolívar, who had gone to Great Britain in an effort to win support for the colonies. Bolívar induced Miranda to return to his native country, and after 40 years of absence, the aging conspirator again set foot in his homeland. In the turmoil that swept Venezuela he was appointed commander in chief, but the challenge to lead a country in revolt and to organize an army from untrained civilians proved too much for him. Rather than plunge Venezuela into civil war, he concluded an armistice with the Spanish counterrevolutionary Monteverde. His officers suspected his motives and threw him into prison. The victorious Monteverde sent him to Spain, where in 1816 he died in Cadiz in the fortress of the Four Towers.

Miranda had both extraordinary gifts and great weaknesses in his private as well as in his public life. But his failures cannot obscure the fact that he was one of the first to raise the banner of liberty in Hispanic America, and though he did not reach his goal, he pointed the way. It is for this reason that he is called "El Precursor."

3. Jose de San Martín

José Francisco de San Martín Gómez y Matorras, known simply as José de San Martín (1778-1850), was an Argentine general and the prime leader of the southern part of South America's successful struggle for independence from Spain. Born in Yapeyú, Corrientes in Argentina, he left his mother country at the early age of seven and studied in Málaga, Spain. In 1808, after joining Spanish forces in the Peninsular War against the French, and after participating in several battles such as the Battle of Bailén, San Martín started making contact with South American supporters of independence from Spain.

In 1812, he set sail for Buenos Aires from England, and offered his services to the United Provinces of South America (present-day Argentina). After the Battle of San Lorenzo of 1813, and some time on command of the Army of the North during 1814, he started to put into action his plan to defeat the Spanish forces that menaced the United Provinces from Upper Perú, making use of an alternative path to the Viceroyalty of Perú. This objective first involved the creation of a new army, the Army of the Andes, in the Province of Cuyo, Argentina. From there, he led the Crossing of the Andes to Chile, and prevailed over the Spanish forces at the Battle of Chacabuco and the Battle of Maipú (1818), thus liberating Chile from Royalist rule. Then he set sail to attack the Spanish stronghold of Lima, Perú, by sea. On 12 July 1821, after seizing partial control of Lima, San Martín was appointed Protector of Perú, and Peruvian independence was officially declared on 28 July 1821. A year later, after a closed-door meeting with fellow libertador Simón Bolívar at Guayaquil, Ecuador, on 22 July 1822, Bolívar took over the task of fully liberating Peru. San Martín
unexpectedly left the country and resigned the command of his army, excluding himself from politics and the military, and moved to France in 1824. The details of the 22 July meeting would be a subject of debate by later historians. Together with Simón Bolívar, San Martín is regarded as one of the Liberators of Spanish South America. He is the national hero of Argentina. The Order of the Liberator General San Martin in his honor is the highest decoration in Argentina.

**EARLY LIFE**

Son of Spaniard Juan de San Martín y Gómez, born in Cervatos de la Cueza on 25 February 1778, and wife Gregoria Matorras, he was born the fifth and last child in Yapeyú, a small village in Corrientes, Argentina. The exact year of his birth is disputed, and there are no records kept of his baptism and later documents formulated during his life (such as passports, military career records, wedding, etc.) give him inconsistent ages. Most of such documents point his year of birth to either 1777 or 1778. His father was a Colonel in office as Lieutenant Governor of Yapeyú beginning in 1774. In 1781, the family moved to Buenos Aires. In 1785, his father was transferred again, this time to Spain, first in Madrid and then in Málaga. And so the family moved to Spain, and San Martín enrolled in Malaga's school of temporalities where he studied from 1785. In 1789, aged 11, San Martín left the Real Seminario de Nobles and enrolled in the Regiment of Murcia, starting his military career as a cadet in the *Unidad de Infantería Murcesa* (Murcian Infantry Unit).

**MILITARY CAREER IN EUROPE**

After joining the Regiment of Murcia, San Martín participated in several campaigns in Africa, fighting in Oran against the Moors in 1791 among other places. Later, by the end of the First Coalition of the French Revolutionary Wars in 1797, his rank was raised to Sub-Lieutenant for his actions against the French in the Pyrenees. On August of the same year, after several engagements, his regiment surrendered to British naval forces in 1798. Soon afterward, he continued to fight in southern Spain, mainly in Cádiz and Gibraltar with the rank of Second Captain of light infantry. He continued to fight Portugal on the side of Spain in the War of the Oranges in 1801, and was soon after promoted to captain in 1804.

When the Peninsular War started in 1808, San Martín was assigned ayudante (Spanish, aide) of the First Regiment Voluntarios de Campo Mayor. After his actions against the French, he became captain in the Regiment of Borbon. On 19 July 1808, Spanish and French forces engaged in the Battle of Bailén, in which Spanish forces prevailed, allowing the Army of Andalucia to attack and seize Madrid. For his actions during this battle, San Martín was decorated with a gold medal, and his rank raised to lieutenant colonel. On 16 May 1811, he participated in the Battle of Albuera under the command of General William Carr Beresford. By this time, the French armies held most of the Iberian Peninsula under their control, with the exception of Cádiz. San Martín resigned from the Spanish army, by controversial reasons, and moved to South America, where he joined the Spanish American wars of independence. With the help of Lord MacDuff, San Martín obtained a passport to England where he met several criollos, American-born Spaniards like himself, who were part of the Logia Lautaro founded by the Venezuelan Francisco de Miranda. According to Argentine historian Felipe Pigna, San Martín was introduced to the Maitland Plan by members of the lodge founded by Miranda and Lord MacDuff. In 1812, San Martín set sail for Buenos Aires aboard the British frigate George Canning. Following his arrival in Buenos Aires on 9 March 1812, his rank of lieutenant colonel was recognized by the Triumvirate and he was thus entrusted with the creation of the Regiment of Mounted Grenadiers, which would become the best-trained military unit of the revolution.
During 1812, he focused on training troops by following the modern warfare techniques he had acquired during the Peninsular War. With Carlos María de Alvear and José Matías Zapiola, he also established the Lodge of Rational Knights, an offspring in Buenos Aires of the independence lodge in Cádiz. On September of the same year, he married Maria de los Remedios de Escalada, a young woman from one of the local wealthy families. In October, when news of the victory of the Army of the North commanded by Manuel Belgrano reached Buenos Aires, the Lautaro Lodge initiated political pressure, backed by San Martín's armed forces and popular demand, to impose its candidates into government, thus forcing the First Triumvirate to an end and initiating the Second Triumvirate with members Juan José Paso, Nicolás Rodríguez Peña, and Antonio Álvarez Jonte (Rodríguez Peña and Álvarez Jonte were members of the lodge). This new government strengthened the position held by the Army, and decided to lay siege to Montevideo, which was controlled by loyalists to the Spanish Crown. On 7 December 1812, San Martín was promoted to Colonel.

**BEGINNING OF HIS MILITARY CAREER IN SOUTH AMERICA**

Although not technically a battle (in Spanish the battle is referred as *Combate de San Lorenzo* ("San Lorenzo Combat")), references in English language refer to the event as the "Battle of San Lorenzo". On 28 January 1813, San Martín with his Regiment of Mounted Grenadiers was sent to protect the Paraná River shore from the Spanish Fleet's ships under command of General José Zavala. On the morning of 3 February, the Spanish forces disembarked and fought against San Martín in the Battle of San Lorenzo. During the fight, San Martín's horse was shot dead. The horse fell, trapping one of San Martín's legs underneath it. This made him an easy target, but Sergeant Juan Bautista Cabral helped him extricate himself. While he was helping the Colonel, Cabral was attacked himself, and died from his wounds after the battle. After the battle, San Martín was promoted to General. This was San Martín's first military action in South America.

**Army of the North**

After the victories of Tucuman and Salta, the Army of the North, commanded by Manuel Belgrano, lost much ground after serious defeats at Vilcapugio (1 October) and Ayohuma (14 November 1813). The Triumvirate then decided to send San Martín to the North with a small infantry army and his cavalry regiment. After joining the defeated Army of the North in Yatayto, he took command of it on January 1814, and Belgrano became second in command. During his command, the Army camped in Tucumán, where he started instructing the troops, created a new military school, and sent Colonel Martín Miguel de Güemes to fight against loyalists coming from Peru to gain time. However, after minor struggles in Salta and Jujuy, news of the victory of Commander Guillermo Brown against the royalists' navy, and the resulting blockade of Montevideo, made the loyalist forces from Peru retreat to regroup. During his command of the Army of the North, San Martín confirmed one of the reasons behind the Maitland Plan's scheme: royalist forces that came down from Upper Perú (roughly present day Bolivia) were easily defeated by the independentist forces in the valleys of Salta and Jujuy. But because of the geographical advantage, forces attacking Upper Peru were easily defeated by the loyalists for the very same reasons.

**Governor of Cuyo**

In Córdoba, San Martín continued preparing his plan of attacking Lima — the Capital city of the Viceroyalty of Peru — through Chile. He realized that it would be impossible to enter the large city
without having conquered the land to the south. To this end, he requested to be appointed governor of the Province of Cuyo. Later, Juan Pueyrredón was sent by the provisional government of the United Provinces of the Rio de la Plata, and gave San Martín full support on his *Liberatory Campaign*. One month after he took office, royalist forces defeated rebel forces under Bernardo O'Higgins' command (O'Higgins fled to the Andes). San Martín strengthened his espionage network with the so-called Guerra de zapa ("War of Zapa"), a pun on the expression *Trabajo de zapa*, which means hidden work done slyly towards some particular aim. He kept his troops in Mendoza to train and prepare them.

On this behalf, San Martín sent his Aide-de-camp and amateur cartographer Álvarez Condarco (carrying a copy of the Declaration of Independence of the "United Provinces of South America" (today Argentina) to Chile as an excuse) through Los Patos pass (the longest path), and returned through the Uspallata (the shortest one), to perform reconnaissance of several locations, mainly the Chacabuco area. Other measures included a disinformation campaign in Chile by sending fake information on the possible attack routes, and information gathering of the situation in Chile in order to prevent a possible attack from there.

During his governorship of Cuyo, he organized the *Army of Cuyo*. On 8 November 1814 he created the 11th Infantry Battalion which included the Argentinian Corps of Chile, which was under command of Lieutenant Colonel Juan Gregorio de las Heras. By October 1815, after contributions of several provinces, the army had 1,600 infantry soldiers, 1,000 men in cavalry, 200 men in artillery and 10 cannons. However many problems arose, such as low supplies of powder, iron, and uniforms. Because existing local industries were not enough to supply the Army, San Martín handled the problem by creating local industries in Cuyo to meet the requirements of it.

On the other hand, despite having the support of the Supreme Director Juan Martín de Pueyrredón, opinions about his campaign were not as favorable on the national level. His efforts were often undermined by the skepticism of some local leaders about the viability of the campaign against the Viceroyalty of Peru through the Andes. However, on 1 August 1816, Pueyrredón renamed the army to Army of the Andes, appointed San Martín as its General in Chief, and gave the Army a *national priority* level. By the end of this difficult process, San Martin’s army had grown immensely.

**Crossing of the Andes**

In September 1816, San Martin relocated the Army of the Andes to El Plumerillo, in the northern part of Mendoza Province, where he finished the details to start his crossing of the Andes. The army was divided in two main columns and four minor ones, keeping the decided paths in secret. On 18 January 1817, a main column parted with the artillery to Chile through Uspallata, under command of Brigadier Juan Gregorio de las Heras, reaching Las Cuevas on 1 February 1817. The second main column, led by San Martín, left on 19 January through Los Patos pass, and reached San Andrés de Tártaro on 8 February, where he was later joined by Las Heras, concluding the first part of the crossing. By the time the main columns reunited, both had already had minor skirmishes: the first column had fought royalists in Potrerillos, while the forces led by San Martín had fought the Battles of Achupallas and Las Coimas. The crossing of the Andes was extremely difficult and took 21 days due to high altitudes and low temperature. It is considered a major feat in military history.

**Campaign in Chile**
After crossing the Andes and entering Chile, the Spanish royalist forces were taking positions in Mount Cuesta Vieja, preparing themselves for the confrontation against the Army of the Andes.

**Battle of Chacabuco**

By 10 February 1817, the Army of the Andes was in the Aconcagua valley, and the Spanish royalist forces had not still taken full positions. San Martín then took the initiative and hastened preparations for his attack. Despite a severe attack of Rheumatoid arthritis, San Martín commanded the battle, and seeing the Spanish forces under numerical inferiority and considering the surprise factor, developed a strategy for the Spanish forces to surrender, avoiding bloodshed. The charge was a stalemate until Soler's division joined the battle turning the odds in favor of the patriot side. After the battle, the royalist forces had suffered five hundred casualties and six hundred royalist soldiers had been taken prisoner. On the Army of the Andes side, there were twelve killed and around one hundred wounded. The army also gained new artillery and other weapons, besides restoring the Chilean revolution. San Martín sent a message reporting the victory: "The Army of the Andes has attained glory and can report: In twenty-four days we have completed the campaign, passed through the highest mountain range on the globe, defeated the tyrants and given freedom to Chile".

On 14 February 1817, San Martín and O'Higgins triumphally entered Santiago, and on 18 February, in a meeting held in the town open hall, San Martín was appointed Governor of Chile. San Martín immediately resigned, thus O'Higgins was elected Supreme Director of the State of Chile. The United Army was created with Chilean and Argentine soldiers. The Chilean soldiers were under O'Higgins command, while San Martín was General in Chief of the whole United Army. Then San Martín, in order to raise funds for a fleet, left for Buenos Aires. After negotiating with Pueyrredón, a delegation was sent to London to provide ships for a new fleet in the Pacific Ocean. Back in Chile in the last days of 1817, San Martín sent a delegation to Lima under the pretext of proposing to the Viceroy Joaquín de la Pezuela of Peru the regularization of the war and exchange of POWs. The real purpose was to gain as much information as possible about the enemy's plans. The delegation brought the news that a Spanish army under General Mariano Osorio was about to set sail in four frigates to southern Chile.

Despite the success in the Battle of Chacabuco, and while leaving Santiago and the northern Chile under patriot control, the royalist forces still had strong presence in southern Chile. The men under Osorio's command joined the royalist forces in the south by sea. The royalists also had allied themselves with Mapuche native Americans.

**Battle of Cancha Rayada**

On 19 March 1818, the royalist forces concentrated and fortified in Talca with around five thousand men under General Osorio, while the independent Osorio was not eager to engage in battle, fortifying in Talca. However, after a suggestion from Colonel José Ordoñez a confrontation was decided upon, under Ordoñez' command. In a bold move, Ordoñez made the kind of attack San Martín had feared: circumventing the city and making a surprise attack at night behind the vanguard where the patriot forces were still taking positions. The surprise attack happened before the patriot army had re-positioned itself, and was directed at the battalion under O'Higgins command, near San Martín's position. Soon, the vanguard soldiers dispersed, leaving O'Higgins in a bad position; his horse was shot dead and he was wounded in one arm. In an uncharacteristic move, instead of ordering retreat San Martín held the position, which made more patriot soldiers
flee under enemy fire, leaving weapons and supplies behind. After the initial disorder, however, he ordered retreat. The rear and reserves had already re-positioned, somewhat withstanding the attack, but had no-one in command (Colonel Hilarión de la Quintana had left to headquarters to receive orders after the re-position and had not yet returned). Las Heras took command, and led the men during the retreat, while trying to recover as much artillery and weapons as possible. San Martín and O'Higgins (who were also retreating at full speed) were being closely chased by royalist forces.

By 21 March 1818, the decimated patriot forces of around three and half thousand men reunited in San Fernando, while news of the defeat reached Santiago. Rumors of deaths of O'Higgins and San Martin were spreading, and an exodus from Santiago to Mendoza started. The battle (which was the only defeat the campaign had suffered) resulted in around 150 killed, and two hundred men taken prisoner. Several hundred had deserted; the whole artillery of the Argentine side was lost along with considerable amounts of horses, mules and weapons from both the Chilean and Argentine parts of the army. Despite the royalist victory, the action proved decimating to their side: two hundred soldiers had been killed, three hundred men captured and around six hundred had deserted, a total comprising more than half the two thousand men that had charged into the battle. Because of historical records these numbers cannot be completely accurate.

**Battle of Maipú**

After the *sorpresa de Cancha Rayada* (surprise of Cancha Rayada), the royalist forces concentrated and marched towards Santiago. On 4 April 1818, the United Army took positions in Loma Blanca, near the Maipú plains. The army separated into three divisions: Las Heras commanding the column on the right, Colonel Rudecindo Alvarado commanding the column on the left, and Quintana at the rear. O'Higgins (still wounded) was in charge of the reserves. The royalist forces under General Osorio's command took defensive positions, despite the convictions of some Colonels (among whom was Ordoñez) that taking the offensive as in Cancha Rayada was the best option. According to Irish Mounted Granadier John Thomond O'Brien, San Martín, seeing Osorio's disposition of the forces, exclaimed "Osorio is clumsier than I thought. Today's triumph is ours. The sun as witness!"

Around 11 am on the morning of 5 April 1818, the patriotic forces charged against the royalist forces with devastating resolution: after the sustained six-hour battle, the royalists were defeated. Osorio attempted to retreat to a property called *Lo Espejos* (The Mirrors) but failing to reach it, fled to Talcahuano with around twelve hundred men, although virtually rendered useless as they had lost most, if not all, of their weapons. The royalist forces suffered two thousand dead, three thousand prisoners taken, and the loss of all its artillery. The patriotic forces, in contrast, suffered one thousand casualties. Historian and Colonel José Luis Picciuolo stated in his book *Argentina Cavalry in the History of the Army* that "this battle was executed as a typical act of annihilation". As result of the battle, the Spanish control over southern Chile ended, and the independence declared on 12 February 1818 was partially accomplished. Viceroy Pezuela considered southern Chile lost, and Osorio set sail for Peru, leaving Colonel Juan Francisco Sánchez in charge of one thousand men in Talcahuano.

**Fleet of the Pacific**

Since the Battle of Chacabuco, San Martín had urged both governments of Santiago and Buenos Aires to build a fleet on the Pacific. Convoys had been sent to the United States and England in order to buy and hire several ships, however, lack of political cohesion in Argentina, a Spanish blockade in Valparaiso, and the Battles of Cancha Rayada and Maipú heavily delayed the project.
On the other hand, the mountainous landscape of the region lent itself to a large dependence of the colonial Chilean economy on maritime trade routes and shipping. This meant that there was an abundance of shipyards and a ready supply of sailors. Right after the Battle of Maipú, San Martín left for Buenos Aires in order to speed up the process (and meet his wife and daughter which he had not seen since the start of the Campaign of the Andes). Once in Buenos Aires, after learning the fact that half a million pesos would not be available for the project from Pueyrredón, San Martín resigned as Commander of the Army under the pretext of being prescribed by his doctor to take rest in Chile's hot springs. The resignation was not accepted and San Martín was granted a license.

**Act of Rancagua**

After Supreme Director José Rondeau was defeated in the Battle of Cepeda, San Martín sent his resignation of the Army's command from Santiago to Rancagua, where Colonel Las Heras had settled with the army, arguing that the authority to which he had to report had ceased to exist, and thus his own authority had expired. The officials of the army rejected his resignation on the basis that the army's goal was to hasten the happiness of the country and the authority was given ultimately by the health of the people, something that was immutable and could not expire.

**PERU**

On August 20th 1820, a fleet of eight warships and sixteen transport ships of the Chilean Navy, under the command of Thomas Alexander Cochrane, 10th Earl of Dundonald, set sail from Valparaíso to Paracas, southern Peru. On September 7th, the army landed on Paracas and successfully attacked Pisco. On 11 September 1820, San Martín sent a "manifesto" to the Peruvian people stating "My announcement is not that of a conqueror that tries to create a new enslavement. I cannot help but be an accidental instrument of justice and agent of destiny. The outcome of victory will make Peru's capital see for the first time their sons united, freely choosing their government and emerging into the face of earth among the rank of nations".

**Expedition of Peru**

While previous campaigns had been militaristic, San Martín avoided confrontation in Peru and emphasized diplomacy; the reason was that Lima, as the center of the Spanish Empire, would be more against the nationalist cause if its forces used violence and/or threatened to break the established monarchical-style order. Also, San Martín's army was smaller than that of the royalist forces in Peru, and he was wary of attacking the Spanish head on. His strategy consisted of waiting for the Peruvian people to begin the uprising by themselves. This resulted in many diplomatic envoys to Lima, urging Viceroy Joaquín de la Pezuela to grant the independence of Peru. However, these diplomatic efforts proved fruitless.

After seizing Pisco, the army set sail on 26 October toward the north and landed at Huacho — a better place from a strategic point of view — on 12 November. Huacho was used by San Martín as his main headquarters from thereon. While there, San Martín first heard of the emancipation of Guayaquil under the leadership of Peruvian Gregorio Escobedo. This and other events such as the maritime blockade of Callao by Cochrane and the victories over royalists by Alvarez de Arenales in Guacarillo (6 October) and Pasco (20 December) strengthened the position of the main independentist effort led by San Martín.
On 29 January, Pezuela was deposed by José de la Serna. On 21 February 1821, San Martín promulgated the Provisional Rules (Spanish, Reglamento Provisional) aimed to provide legal guarantees to the Peruvian citizens, and designed the first flag of Peru. Soon afterwards he started preparing to march on Lima. In March, 1821 the army set sail and landed in Ancón (near Lima), while dispatching general Guillermo Miller to the southern coasts and Álvarez de Arenales toward the eastern hills, furthering Lima's isolation. Diplomatic efforts once again failed, as Viceroy Serna did not agree to declare independence, and San Martín did not accept Serna's proposal of acceptance by the independentists of the Spanish Constitution of 1812 and the sending emissaries to the Cortes Generales. On 2 July, San Martín met Viceroy Serna. This time San Martín proposed to create a constitutional monarchy with a European monarch to be appointed later. Serna, arguing that he did not have the power to make such a decision, asked for two days to discuss the issue. However, after discussing the issue with the royalist forces' commanders, the proposition was turned down on the basis that they did not have the power to grant independence, even to create a monarchy. On 8 July, Serna and his forces simply abandoned the city, in order to reinforce in the countryside.

**Protector of Peru**

San Martín occupied Lima, the capital of Peru, on 12 July 1821. This was a huge loss for the Spanish forces. Independence from Spain for Peru was finally declared on 28 July 1821 and he was voted the "Protector" of the newly independent nation. During the same year, he founded the National Library of Peru, to which he donated his collection of books, and praised the new library as "... one of the most efficient means to spread our intellectual values". After Peru's parliament had been assembled, he resigned his command.

**Meeting in Guayaquil**

On 26 July 1822, he met with Simón Bolívar at Guayaquil to plan the future of Latin America. Most of the details of this meeting were secret at the time, and this has made the event a matter of much debate among later historians. Some believe that Bolívar's refusal to share command of the combined forces made San Martín withdraw from Peru and resettle as a farmer in Mendoza, Argentina. Another theory claims that San Martín yielded to Bolívar's energy and avoided a confrontation. Many argue that San Martín was a military genius but not as charismatic a leader, or as politically ambitious, as Bolivar.

**Last years in Europe**

In 1824, soon after his return to Argentina, his wife Remedios de Escalada de San Martín died. Then he moved to Europe with his daughter Mercedes, first to England, then to Brussels. To keep a neutral position during the 1830 Belgian Revolution he moved to Paris, where he contracted cholera. Cured but weakened, he bought a house and retired at Grand-Bourg, near Évry. His daughter mjuan Manuel de Rosas, married Mariano Antonio Severo de Balcarce, illegitimate son of in Paris on 13 December 1832, and they had two daughters. In 1848, when the revolution started in Paris, he decided to move to London, but settled instead at Boulogne-sur-Mer, where he spent the remainder of his days.

He always excluded himself from every possible meddling at the internecine wars of his native country, and refused several offers he had to do so. He even moved to Buenos Aires, but refused to
leave the ship when he knew that Juan Lavalle had deposed and executed Governor Manuel Dorrego, and returned to Europe. The only occasion in which he offered himself to return to Argentina was at the time of the French blockades of 1838 and 1845. In recognition of the successful defense of Argentine rights in those conflicts, he handed down his sword to Buenos Aires Province Governor Juan Manuel de Rosas through his will. He died on 17 August 1850 in Boulogne-sur-Mer, France. In 1880 his remains were taken from Brunoy to Buenos Aires and reinterred in the Buenos Aires Cathedral. The mausoleum also has the remains of Generals Juan Gregorio de las Heras and Tomás Guido, as well as those of the Unknown Soldier of the Independence.

**Question of Slavery and American Civil War**

Subsequent to the Mexican War, the most important development in the American society was the growth of secessionist tendency in the Southern States. A temporary compromise was achieved in 1850 but once again came up with more vigour through the Kansas–Nebraska Act of 1854. The secessionist tendency gathered momentum after the Dred Scott decision of 1857 and the conflict between Northerners and Southerners in America became more severe. This conflict finally led to the American Civil War and effected disruption in the democratic process of America.

**Causes of the Civil War**

One important cause of the civil war was the basic economic difference between the North and the South. The North had grown greatly in industry and commerce. The areas generally known as the North included in 1850 New England States (Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Connecticut and Rhode Island) New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Ohio. The North was an industrial area and was making progress in many fields America's chief deposits of coal and iron were in the Northern states. America's finance had found its centre at New York. The protective tariff gave the Northern manufactures the chance of capturing the ever growing home market and the railroads enabled them to carry their goods throughout the States, it was not only in trade and industry that the North was making progress but it was forging ahead in other fields. Most of the Northerners were educated and this made democracy loving and hate the institution of slavery. The South on the other hand was agricultural and less progressive. The easiest definition of the South would be “all states where slavery was legal”. The most important southern states were the cotton growing states like South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi etc, the economic life of the South was dependent upon slave labor. Compared to the north the south was making very little progress. Her average standard of living was lower. The people were mostly illiterate and this made them narrow minded. Most of the South was unanimous in defending slavery. This basic difference in the way the northerners and the southerners make a living, some historians say was the basic cause of the Civil War.

Northern congressmen usually wanted a high protective tariff, a centralized banking system and internal improvements at federal expense. Southern Congress men were usually against these proposals. For many southerners federal aid to railroads tying the north and west together, a protective tariff and a centralized bank were means of enriching the northerners at the expense of the South. In the north changes took place quickly and the pace of living was faster. There was constant agitation for free public school women's rights and rights for workers. In the south life was much less hurried and changes came slowly. Many planters lived an aristocratic semi feudal kinds of life. Even many southerners who did not own plantations became accustomed to southern way of
life. Many a southerner hated thought of change. This social difference also brought about a misunderstanding between the north and the south.

Many southern leaders maintained for many years after the war that the southern states had seceded from the Union not to preserve slavery but to protect states right. Some historians blame a number of political leaders of 1850’s for exaggerating the friction between the North and the South. If hot headed abolitionists and hot headed southerners, the historians say, had not stirred that passion of the people the war might have been avoided.

Another important cause of the civil war was the intimacy established between the North and the West. The construction of new roads and canals made the West less and less dependent upon the Mississippi river and this also reduced the contacts between the south and the west. Another reason why the westerners became more friendly with the North was the fact that the Westerner like northerner believed in a strong federal government. They knew that it was the federal Government, which had passed laws and constructed roads that facilitated expansion to the West. Federal laws also gave them protection from Red Indian attacks. In future the Westerners knew that they would need the help for strong federal government. The North at that time was making great progress in industrial field. All the important banks were situated there.

All exports Iron and all imports Lo U.S.A. passed through nor hem ports. The Westerners naturally understood the benefit, of allying, more and more with the rich industrial north. The northern were also eager to cultivate friendship with the west. The West, the north knew, was expanding both in area and in population. The West would supply enough raw materials for the northern factory and profile a ready market for northern goods. The close alliances between the north and the West created fear in the minds of the southerners. The Southerners were worried over the fact that at North with Western votes would make the congress pass laws favorable to their interests. The west would give the north a valuable political ally. The Southerners feared the permanent economic and political domination of the nation by the North supported by the West. Thus by the second half of the 19th Century the relations between the North and South were strained. “I fear northerner and southerner are aliens ….We differ like Celts and Anglo Saxons” This statement of the Southerner in 1860 expresses the feeling of many southerners at this time.

Journalists and writers played an important role in opening the eyes of the Northerners to the evils of slavery and thereby paying the way for the outbreak of the Civil war. In 1831 Garrison an uncompromising anti-slavery leader published his new paper. The Liberator- In this newspaper Garrison spared no violence in his language to rouse the people of U.S.A. to the evils of slavery. He argued that the North must quit the Union if the South does not abolish slavery. Times proved that a single book would exert a far greater influence upon the people than the press. Uncle Tom's Cabin written by Mrs. Herriot Broacher Stowe gave a touching account of the miserable life of the slave. Mrs. Stowe had ever been to slave territory and she had no personal experiences on the miseries of a slave. But her book which describes the story of a faithful slave. Uncle Tom flogged to death by his cruel master and of the barefooted slave girl Eliza pursued by blood hounds as she flees across the frozen river, her baby in her arms, stirred the feelings of many. People in North and in Europe and even some southerners she tears as they read the novel or watched the play based on it. So great was the sensation created by the novel that year later Lincoln greeted Mrs. Stowe as the ’ Little woman who brought about the civil war.

The controversy over the issue of slavery also contributed to the outbreak of the civil war. Soon after the colonization of America Negroes had been brought to America to do the hard work in the
plantations. The northern ship owners and many Europeans profited from this trade. In few cases the African chiefs used to sell the war captives to these men. Also the Arabs used to raid African territories and capture by force many Negroes who were later on brought to America. At first the Negroes were not made slaves but gradually slavery was introduced. Since labor was scarce in America and Americans knew that they would have to return the Negroes after the specified time they decided to convert the Negroes to the position of slaves. The white master imposed many restrictions on the slaves. He was denied all sorts of freedom and used as a tool. The white masters forbade the slaves to carry weapons to go out after dusk and even to learn to read and write. The evils of slavery aroused anger in the minds of the northerners who fought for the liberation of slaves.

The Northerner and Southerner had their own agreements for and against slavery. The southerner argued that slavery was the essential basis of southern prosperity, which depended on cotton growing. Cotton formed two thirds of America’s exports and therefore, it was not wise to abolish slavery. Further it was argued that just as the northerner had invested his money in his factory, machinery, raw materials, etc, the southerner had invested his money in the form of slaves. Therefore, it was unjust to ask him to abolish slavery. Slavery, the southerner argued was the only way of getting the lazy Negroes to work and the only way of civilizing them. The northerner on the other hand argued that slavery was immoral and unjust. It was a great injustice to make human being the slave of another human being. Slavery, they asserted, was a contradiction of the free and democratic ideals for which U.S.A. stood. The Northerner brought economic arguments against slavery. According to him slavery was a heavy capital investment which decreased in value as the slave grew older and become sick. Therefore, cotton growing could be more economically manage on free labor. When these arguments were going on between the northerner and the southerner steps were being taken for the abolition of slavery. In 1808 the legal import of slaves was forbidden. Anti-slavery societies came to be formed in many parts of the North.

The Northerners were divided into two groups those wanted to abolish slavery completely were called Abolitions. Many of the northerners were of the opinion that slavery should be tolerated where it existed. However, they were opposed to the extension into the territories of United States and therefore, the creation of any new slave state. This group was called the free soldiers. The controversy over slavery led to the outbreak of open conflicts between the northerners and southerners. The Missouri compromise of 1820 had provided a temporary solution for the sectional conflicts. In 1846 a bill was introduced in the congress providing that slavery should be forbidden in any territory taken from Mexico. This would not affect Texas already a slave state. But it would apply to California and other territories taken from Mexico. The southerners oppose the bill. In 1848 after a sudden increase of population California was formed into a state. The California constitution prohibited slavery throughout the territory. When California asked for admission to the Union, the southern members protested and refused to accept the constitution. The South even talked of secession from the Union. This meant Civil War. The hopes of the nation rested with Senator Henry Clay who introduced certain proposals which came to be known as the compromise of 1850. The Compromise consisted of these proposals (1) Admission of California as a free State (2) Creation of the territories of Utah and New Mexico without reference to slavery (3) prohibition of slave law trade in the district of Columbia (4) A fugitive slave providing for the capture and return to their owners of escape slaves. The north protested against the fugitive slave law. One important result produced by the compromise of 1850 was that it increased the eagerness to capture the island of Cuba. Being a larger and fertile territory the acquisition of Cuba, the southerners
believed would not only enhance the financial resources of U.S.A. but also provide for the creation of new state which might be admitted slave states.

In 1854 the sectarian conflicts became severe when a new bill Kansas Nebraska Bill was introduced in the Congress. The territory to the West of Lowe and Missouri was formed into two states Kansas and Nebraska. The provision in the bill, which made the northerners angry, was that the principle of popular sovereignty should in these two territories. Both the territories were north of the parallel 36°30 (36 degree 0 minute) where according to the Missouri compromise of 1820 slavers' was forbidden. But the new bill specifically cancelled this provision. Tension arose as a result of the controversy over the Kansas Nebraska Bill. To Kansas went pro-slavery men of the South and free soldiers of the North for the northerners and southerners wanted to have enough of their people to vote whether the territory should be organized as a free state or as slave state. The free soldiers and the pro-slavery men established their Governments in Kansas. Open riots soon broke out and many people were killed. Kansas was referred to as bleeding Kansas. Rivalry between the pro-slavery men and anti-slavery men took its bad form not only outside the Congress but also within the congress. All these strained the relations between the southerner and created an atmosphere in which there was no room for compromise. Finally Kansas was admitted in the union in 1861 as a free state.

Another important incident that stimulated the passions of the people was the red Scott case. Dred Scott was a slave who was taken from the slave state of Missouri into the free state of Illinois, then into a free territory and after a few years back again to Missouri. Later the slave red Scott sued for his freedom. The case was taken to the Supreme Court. The chief justice of the Supreme Court was Roger Jamey. The court stated that no slaves even if free could become the citizen of U.S.A. Accordingly since Scott was not a citizen he was not eligible to sue in a federal court. The Supreme Court's judgments against Scott's right to sue and the Court's opinion have together come to be called the Dred Scott Decision. The opinions given by Roger Jamey contained the following points. The Missouri compromise of 1820 was unconstitutional because the congress has no right to prohibit slavery in Louisiana. The northerners in general protested vehemently against this idea. They argued that if the congress could not prohibit slavery in the territories how could the legislature created by Congress do so. If indeed according to the Court, slavery was legal in all the territories then the principle of popular sovereignty would be illegal. The southerners in general were delighted with the Court's opinion. But the northerners were unhappy over it. What was the reasoning behind this opinion? A slave Taney argued that the Fifth Amendment in the Bill of Rights says that the Congress may not interfere with a man's property with out due process of law.

The newly formed Republican Party demanded the repeal of the fugitives slave law and the Kansas Nebraska Bill. It also demanded the establishment of the principle that the Congress had the right to permit or abolish slavery. Free speech, free press, Free State, freedom and liberty were the slogans of the Republican Party. The Republicans acquired the able leadership of Abraham Lincoln. Though Lincoln was defeated in the Senatorial election from the state of Illinois by Stephen A. Douglas, he won a greater Victory in the presidential election of 1860. Lincoln's victories in the election came as a shock to the southern. The Southerners knew that Lincoln would surely bring about the abolition of slavery. As soon as the news of victory was made known south Carolina and six other slave states Georgia, Florida Texas, Alabamma. Louisiana and Mississippi with drew from the Union and formed the conference States of America. It elected Jefferson Davis as the President. Lincoln's appeal to the conference rate states to come back to the Union and thereby avoid the possibility of the Civil War fell on deaf ears. In April the Confederate army attacked Fort Sumter (sitiuate in S.Carolina) at that time occupied by the Union Army. That began
the Civil War. Soon after four more states N. Carolina, Virginia, Arkansas and Tennessee withdrew from the Union and joined the confederacy thus making the number of Confederate States II.

Course of the Civil War

As soon as the civil war broke out Lincoln concentrated his attention in bringing out victory for the north. He was particular that at any cause the Union should be preserved by bringing the confederate states. The north introduced blockade around southern harbors. The north aimed at capturing Richmond, the capital of the confederate states and Vicksburg and Nashville the two confederate centers in the west. The Union army under Grant captured Nashville and advanced to Vicksburg. On the strength of these victories Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation. This proclaimed the emancipation of all slaves in the rebel states from January 1, 1863. Soon after the Union army was defeated but the confederate army under Lee carried the war in to the north by invading Pennsylvania. The Union army won victory. The confederate defeat at Greensburg (Pennsylvania) and the following day at Vicksburg turned the mood of the northerners from gloom to glee. The darkest days of the confederacy came in April 1865 when Richmond fell into the Union Army. On the April 9, 1866, the confederate army surrendered and the civil war came to an end. The rejoicing of the north was turned into sorrow when Lincoln was shot dead a few days after when he was attending performance at Ford's Theatre.

Results

The civil war brought a lot of destruction in terms of human lives, money etc. A large number of people were killed. It is surprising to note that the civil war cause the death of a larger number of people that the first and second world wars caused. The Civil War left behind it feeling of hatred between the north and the south. The civil war was a victory for democracy. Slavery was abolished and more people were given the right to vote. The power of the Congress increased considerably during the period following the civil war. Before that the congress had almost nothing to say on such questions as to who is a citizen and who has the right to vote. The civil rights Act and the 14th Amendment proved that the congress had acquired great powers in the period after the Civil War. Another important result of the civil war was the victory of the northern industrialists over the southern agriculturists. After the Civil War industrial growth became tremendous when Republican Party passed laws favorable to industry. After the civil -war free public education was made available to southern Negroes. Many schools were built and thousands of Negroes learned how to read and write. Some Negroes even went for higher education. However, many Negroes protested bitterly that the grievances in the 14th and 15th amendments were not respected. The Civil War and the abolition of slavery failed or remove the grievances of Negroes. Even today to a certain extent racial discrimination is going on in U.S.A.

The civil war marked the victory of Republican Party over the Democratic Party. The republicans won votes by asserting that their party had preserved the Union. They also aroused hatred against the Democratic Party repeatedly saying that the Southern democrats were responsible for the death and crippling of many Americans in the Civil War. Almost every important president until the time of Woodrow Wilson was elected from the Republican Party. The Civil war gave an opportunity for a few men to acquired money by unscrupulous methods. Helping to build the strong spirit of nationalism was the memory of the martyred President Abraham Lincoln. The legend even today exerts an influence over the minds of the people of America.
ABRAHAM LINCOLN

The civil war produced for the north a great hero in Abraham Lincoln a man eager, above all others, to weld the union together again, not by force and expression but by warmth and generosity. Although he had to use great powers both in war and in peace, he never ignored the principles of democratic self government. Born in Kentucky in 1809 and brought by his parents to Illinois at an early age Lincoln had worked his way from poverty. He studied law and was soon recognized as one of the ablest lawyers the State. Lincoln became nationally famous in 1858 when he competed for the post of Senator from Illinois against Stephen A Douglas. In the first paragraph of his open campaign speech Lincoln struck the key note of American history for the seven years to follow. "A house divided against itself cannot stand. I believe this government cannot endure permanently half slave and half free. I do not expect the Union to be dissolved. I do not expect the house to fall but I do expect it will cease to divide". Lincoln and Douglas engaged in a series of seven debates in the ensuing months of 1858. Senator Douglas was a little man with a brilliant mind and a deep musical voice. The Little giant his friends called him were always well dressed and always seemed polished. The locally well known Lincoln was tall arid lean with sad eyes and a high pitched voice that was far from musical.

In one debate Lincoln asked Douglas an embarrassing question how could Douglas say that he believed in both the red Scott Decision and the principle of popular sovereignty when they contradicted each other, Douglas was in an embarrassing position. If he said that he favoured the court's opinion opponents of slavery would not vote for him. On the other hand he would not get the votes of slave states. Douglas answered that the slave holders had legal right to keep slaves in the territories but suppose the people of a territory under the principle of popular sovereignty did not want slavery in their territory, then their territorial legislature without prohibiting slavery would not pass laws friendly to slavery. Actually this would mean that slave owners would not have local laws protecting their slave property. As a result they would eventually be obliged either to sell their slaves or to move out of the territory. The answer Douglas gave is called the Free Port Doctrine after Illinois town in which the debate took place. Though Lincoln was defeated in the Senatorial election he won the Presidential election of 1860. In his inaugural address, he refused to recognize the secession considering it a legally void. His speech ended with plea for restoration of the bonds of Union. In your hands Lincoln addressed the Southerners "my dissatisfied fellow country men and not in mine is the momentous issue of the civil war".

The most important problems confronting the president were the problems of how to stop the secession movement and what to do at Fort Sumter. It was now too late to restore the Union by compromise. To withdraw the army from Fort Sumter at the demand of the confederates would be recognition of the legality of secession. On the other hand if the army continues to remain a Fort Sumter to supply it with provisions only and not with arms. The confederate states attacked Fort Sumter on April 12, 1861. This resulted in the out break of the civil war between the north and the south. As soon as the civil war broke out four slave states N Carolina Virginia, Arkansas and Tennessee withdraw from the Union and joined the confederacy. As a war president Lincoln exhibited great ability in fighting the war bringing victory to the north. The first thing that he did was to organize an efficient army to fight against Southern harbors. On measure that Lincoln advocated had been subject to a lot of criticism. There was a group of four slave states that had not joined the confederacy- Maryland Missouri, Kentucky and Delaware. If these states joined the confederacy, then the capital city would be surrounded by enemy states and that would mean the victory of the confederate state. To prevent these states from joining the confederacy Lincoln
suspends the writ Habeas Corpus and tyrannically punished all those who sympathized with the secession movement. This measure prevented the withdrawal of these four states. Critics had condemned this action of Lincoln saying that Lincoln had acted as a dictator. But Lincoln justified the action by saying that it was necessary for that situation.

While the north was winning victorious, Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation. This was to free the slaves in the rebel states from January 1st 1863. The Emancipation Proclamation had many limitations. The whole state to Tennessee was excluded certain parts of Virginia and Louisiana were exempted and none of the Union slave states was included. In fact slaves were to be emancipated only in territories under confederate control. The Richmond Examiner criticized the proclamations as the most stupid political blunder yet known in American history. The London Times wrote- while the President leaves slavery untouched where his decree cannot be enforced. In spite of great opposition London was re-elected in 1864. In his second inaugural address he asked his supporters to follow a policy of "malice towards none and charity for all". Soon after the inauguration, a ceremony was held for the dedication of a national grave yard for the soldiers who died in the battle of Gettysburg. On that occasion Lincoln uttered these memorable words- Four score and seven years ago our forefathers brought forth upon this continent a new nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal. The world will not nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here. It is for us the living rather to be dedicated here to the unfinished work that they have for so nobly carried on that the nation under God shall have a new birth if freedom and that the Government of the people, for the people, by the people shall not perish from the earth. In April 1865 the confederate army surrounded to the Union army and the war came to an end. Few days later Lincoln was shot dead. There seems to be no disagreement on the fact that Lincoln more than anyone else was responsible for the victory of the north in the civil war.

**Contribution of Lincoln to Democracy**

Lincoln had a great faith in democracy. He took inspiration from the Declaration and considered Jefferson as the most distinguished politician of American history. With his great love for democracy Lincoln was from the very beginning opposed to slavery and he was determined that he would fight for the liberties of the Negro slaves. Lincoln's love for liberty made him support the Republican Party. He said ' When there is a conflict between one man's liberty and another man's property the democratic party supports property'. The Republicans, he pointed out, cared more for the liberty of men. Lincoln gave a beautiful definition to democracy in his famous Gettysburg speech. He was a lover of peace and accepted war only when it seemed necessary to save the Union.As an apostle of freedom, a lover of democracy, a champion of the rights of the Negroes and as a President who guided nation successfully during the dark days of the civil war. Lincoln stands great, in the history of U.S.A. The story of Lincoln, as a writer says, is the story of a great man who shoulders the moral burdens of a sinful people suffers for them, redeems them, with Christian virtues malice towards none and charity for all and is destroyed at the pitch of his success.

**UNIFICATION OF GERMANY**

The great land-mass of Central Europe from the Baltic to the Alps, and the Rhine to the Vistula, had, from the earliest times, been inhabited, by groups of people who, though often bound by a common language, govern their own affairs, as tribes in ancient times, as kingdoms, principalities and duchies in later times, each with its own headman or ruler. Throughout history
they had waged war upon one another, made alliances with one another and resisted every attempt to form them into one cohesive nation under one leader. In the latter half of the 8th century. However, there appeared upon the scene a Frankish king known as Charlemagne.

When their father died in 768, Charlemagne and his brother Carloman both became kings of the Franks. The difficult situation to which this arrangement gave rise resolved itself when the death of Carloman left Charlemagne in control of the whole kingdom. In a reign of forty years, most of which Charlemagne devoted to warlike action, he conquered the Kingdom of Lombardy in Italy and brought much of that country under his rule; he passed over the Pyrenees and drove back the Moors behind the Ebro; and over the course of years he brought the Bavarians and the Avars, the Danes and the Saxons under his rule.

By A.D. 800 he was the most powerful ruler in Europe. In this year, in answer to an appeal from the Pope, he visited Rome, and while there, on Christmas Day, he was crowned emperor of what was to become known as the Holy Roman Empire. This new Empire was, in a sense, the successor of the older Empire of Rome, and Charlemagne regarded himself in a large measure as the inheritor of the titles and rights of the earlier Roman emperors, despite the fact that the empire governed from Byzantium was still in existence. From this time, until the Empire was abandoned in 1806, one of the German princes was recognized as having supremacy over the rest. There was no hereditary right of succession, but the dependants of a powerful emperor usually retained the succession for generations. The emperor, therefore, achieved his status by a mixture of descent and election.

The fact that there was an emperor in no way unified the many kingdoms and principalities over which he held sway. Indeed his authority over the individual states was extremely limited. In another aspect, however, the Holy Roman Empire did represent a unifying influence in Christendom. Beside it stood the Papacy, actually dominating the entire ecclesiastical organization of Western Christendom, and claiming for the Pope a spiritual authority overriding that of the emperor as the temporal head of Christendom. Nevertheless, the struggle for imperial status was a constant one among the more powerful princely rulers.

By the end of the 13th century the medieval European system had begun to break up largely as the result of this struggle for the imperial crown which entailed endless war, and in an attempt to prevent this situation from continuing an electoral system was brought into operation. Certain of the more important states were designated in the persons of their rulers, members of an electoral college, whose majority vote bestowed the imperial crown. Though this system reduced the physical struggle, it could not completely eliminate attempts to win votes of the Electors by persuasion or coercion. In time, though the electoral system continued to exist, it developed into a mere matter of form, and functioned only properly when there was more than one claimant to the imperial crown. In 1437, Albert of Hapsburg became emperor, and from this time until 1806, with one exception, Charles of Bavaria, a Hapsburg wore the imperial crown.

In 1519, Charles V succeeded his grandfather Maximilian I as emperor, while the hereditary Austrian and other German possessions of the Hapsburgs were transferred to his brother Ferdinand. Charles attempted to establish the personal supremacy of the emperor throughout Germany, but failed. The German princes, both great and small, refused to surrender any part of their almost complete independence. By the Thirty Years War (1618-1648) Ferdinand II tried to bring the Protestant princes into subjection, while Wallenstein, his outstanding general and favourite, worked
tirelessly, but in vain, to bring about a Germany united under the absolute power of the emperor, but enjoying religious toleration.

After the Thirty Years War, the independence of the greater German princes was an established fact, while the still nominal imperial authority was little more than a fiction. The struggle of the next hundred years between the Bourbons of France and the Hapsburgs was not a struggle between France and the Empire, but between France and the Hapsburgs. Yet another attempt to establish imperial ascendancy by the consolidation of the Hapsburg dominions in Germany failed on account of the formation of the League of Princes by Frederick of Prussia to maintain the constitutional rights of the German princes; in other words, their freedom from imperial control.

When in 1792 the French Republic went to war, it was not against the Empire, but against Austria, despite the fact that the Austrian ruler was the Holy Roman Emperor; and it was Austria, not the Empire, which Napoleon finally brought into submission at Austerlitz in 1805. By this time Napoleon had proclaimed himself emperor, and as there was no longer any plausibility in maintaining the pretense that there was one imperial head of Christendom, in 1806 the Emperor Francis dropped the title and the Holy Roman Empire ceased to exist.

Germany was now in theory what she had long been in practice, a geographical expression; while her master was Bonaparte, who could carve her into pieces as the whim took him. In 1806 the Prussians were defeated at Jena, and in the following years a new spirit arose in that country, and to some extent in other parts of Germany, which resulted in a war of liberation against Napoleon, culminating in Waterloo. In 1806 Napoleon had formed a Confederation of German states. This was dissolved in 1814, but immediately replaced by a more lasting one, which sealed and stamped a territorial revolution of the first magnitude. The Germany of the middle Ages had disappeared; most of its 300 states had vanished; only 39 remained; and these formed the new German Federation or Bund. Austria and Prussia were its chief members; among others were the Kings of Bavaria, Hanover, Saxony and Wurtemburg.

The history of the next fifty years is mainly a struggle for constitutional liberty. Several of the states had a States Assembly consisting of nobles and prelates, but there was nothing in the way of representative institutions nor had any of the rulers any idea of their responsibilities towards their peoples in the modern sense. This movement, however, was too strong to be crushed, and eventually, with Saxe-Weimar leading the way, several rulers granted constitutions to their peoples.

Another movement of the time was towards uniformity in commercial matters. Trade could never flourish in a country where import duties varied with each state, and where every few miles there was a boundary with its inevitable customs house. After several attempts, at last, in 1834, one trade area was formed. Only Austria elected to stand outside this common market; an error which, by making it easier for Prussia to achieve dominance, indirectly led to her own undoing. The popular passion for union now led to a powerful agitation which compelled the Bundestag, the assembly of the Federation, to agree to a meeting of a national Parliament in Frankfurt. The members, elected on a wide franchise, met together to draw up a constitution for a united Germany. Having decided to have an emperor, they offered the honour to the King of Prussia, who declined it; and as far as immediate results went, the Frankfurt Parliament was a failure.

The duel between Prussia and Austria for the leadership of Germany was now entering the final phase. In 1849 Prussia managed to form a union, but trouble in Hesse led to the calling in of...
Prussian and Austrian troops by the conflicting sides. But just as war seemed inevitable, Prussia gave way, and the union was dissolved.

By this time the question of Schleswig-Holstein was dominating German politics. The war against Denmark, though waged nominally by the Confederation, was in reality waged by Prussia with the help of a few other states. The conflict was suspended for diplomatic negotiations, but when no agreement had been reached by 1863, Saxony and Hanover reopened the war. Though Prussia and Austria disapproved of their action, fearing for their prestige, both announced they would act as independent states, marched against the Danes, and annexed Schleswig and Holstein.

From this event, Prussia was able to draw the excuse she was wanting for making war on Austria. The latter wished the Bundestag to decide the future of Schleswig and Holstein. Prussia suggested a drastic reform of the Bund from which Austria, who had chosen to remain out of the trade organization, should be excluded. Both presented their suggestions to the Bundestag, which accepted Austria’s. Prussia at once declared war on Austria, and on 3 July, 1866, after a campaign of seven days, totally crushed her at Sadowa. Since the majority of the other German states had supported Austria, all shared in the humiliation. The war ended the connexion of Austria with the other states of Germany, and led to other changes, which increased both Prussia’s power and her size.

A new union was set up, the North German Confederation. It included all the states north of the Main; its head was the King of Prussia. This King of Prussia was Frederick William IV, who had appointed as his Chancellor, or chief minister, one of the most remarkable men this part of Europe has ever produced, Prince Otto von Bismarck.

Bismarck had first entered upon the political scene in the various Parliamentary assemblies which, in 1848, ended in the granting of a constitution to Prussia, of which he was ever a fierce opponent. A Royalist to the core, it was he who had prompted the king to decline the offer of the imperial crown by the Frankfurt Parliament in 1849, on the grounds that its tender was based on a popular will and not on the concurrent assent of the German sovereigns. As Prussian representative in the Bund from 1851, he had been quick to see that German unification could never be achieved so long as reactionary Austria blocked the way with her claims to the position of leader of a united Germany; a leadership which he was determined should pass to Prussia.

In 1862 he had so impressed the king with his abilities and his ideas that he was appointed Chancellor, a post which automatically gave him the opportunity for implementing his plans for securing Prussian supremacy. On his appointment he proclaimed: “It is not by speechifying and majorities that the great questions of the day will be decided, but by blood and iron.” From that moment he began to plot with cunning and ruthlesslessness unmatched, the policy by which he was determined to achieve his ambition.

As we have seen, within four years he had eliminated Austria, and formed a union of the northern states under Prussian leadership. All he needed now was to prove beyond doubt to the German states remaining outside the Northern Confederation that Prussia was undisputed master of them all. This he hoped to achieve by provoking a war with France from which Prussia would emerge the victor. Over the next four years he continuously goaded France, whose own ruler, Napoleon III, appeared to go out of his way to aid Bismarck in his schemes by announcing a desire to push the frontier of France to the Rhine. For all his talk, however, Napoleon appeared loth to take action to
forward his ambition, until eventually Bismarck decided that he must be forced to it. Once again the Iron Chancellor was favoured by fortune. The Spanish throne fell vacant and there was no hereditary successor.

Among the candidates put forward was a prince of Frederick William’s own house, Prince Leopold of Hohenzollern. Napoleon, fearing Prussian encirclement if Leopold were elected, somehow persuaded the prince to withdraw, and instead of leaving well alone he sent his ambassador to William requesting a promise that Leopold’s candidature would not be renewed. The king refused, and later in the day declined to reopen discussions. From Ems, where he was staying, he sent a telegram to Bismarck in Berlin acquainting him of what had taken place. Bismarck thereupon published the telegram, but with certain alterations which read: “His Majesty refused to receive the ambassador, sending word that he had nothing more to communicate,” which made it appear that instead of a courteous refusal to give his promise which had really happened, the king had dismissed the ambassador. This version reached Napoleon before his ambassador’s report, and without waiting for the latter, in his indignation, he immediately declared war on Prussia to avenge the insult.

This was exactly what Bismarck wanted. His armies were ready; his spies had penetrated French military secrets; he knew Prussia’s strength; and he knew Napoleon’s weaknesses better than Napoleon knew them. With all the German states at Prussia’s side, for Bismarck had made secret treaties with the southern states to come to her aid should she be attacked, she marched. Within two months the Prussian armies were at the gates of Paris; within six months it was all over.

With the brilliance of the campaign and the certain knowledge of victory to support him, Bismarck proposed a new union to the princes, this time of all the German states. All saw, or were persuaded to see, the advantages of such a union, since all would share in the fruits of Prussian successes. So, on 18 January, 1871, the 150th anniversary of the founding of the Prussian state, and six days before peace negotiations were opened with the French, amid scenes of great splendour in the Palace of Versailles, Bismarck read to all the assembled German princes the proclamation of the new German Empire, or Reich, with William its first Kaiser. For the first time in the history of Europe, Germany was united into one nation, under one supreme head.

**OTTO VON BISMARCK**

**Otto Eduard Leopold von Bismarck** (1 April 1815 – 30 July 1898) was a Prussian-German statesman of the late 19th century, and a dominant figure in world affairs. As Ministerpräsident, or Prime Minister, of Prussia from 1862–1890, he oversaw the unification of Germany. In 1867 he became Chancellor of the North German Confederation. He designed the German Empire in 1871, becoming its first Chancellor and dominating its affairs until he was removed by Wilhelm II in 1890. His diplomacy of Realpolitik and powerful rule gained him the nickname "The Iron Chancellor". After his death German nationalists made Bismarck their hero, building hundreds of monuments glorifying the symbol of powerful personal leadership. Historians praised him as a statesman of moderation and balance who was primarily responsible for the unification of the German states into a nation-state. He used balance-of-power diplomacy to keep Europe peaceful in the 1870s and 1880s. He created a new nation with a progressive social policy, a result that went beyond his initial goals as a practitioner of power politics in Prussia. Bismarck, a devout Lutheran who was loyal to his king, promoted government through a strong, well-trained bureaucracy with a hereditary monarchy at the top.
Bismarck had recognized early in his political career that the opportunities for national unification would exist and he worked successfully to provide a Prussian structure to the nation as a whole. On the other hand, his Reich of 1871 deliberately restricted democracy, and the anti-Catholic and anti-Socialist legislation that he introduced unsuccessfully in the 1870s and 1880s left a devastating legacy of distrust and fragmentation in German political culture.

**Early years**

Bismarck was born in Schoenhausen, the wealthy family estate situated west of Berlin in the Prussian Province of Saxony. His father, Karl Wilhelm Ferdinand von Bismarck (Schönhausen, 13 November 1771 – 22 November 1845), was a Junker estate owner and a former Prussian military officer; his mother, Wilhelmine Luise Mencken (Potsdam, 24 February 1789 – Berlin), the well-educated daughter of a senior government official in Berlin. A. J. P. Taylor later remarked on the importance of this dual heritage: although Bismarck physically resembled his father, and appeared as a Prussian Junker to the outside world—an image which he often encouraged by wearing military uniform, even though he was not a regular officer—he was also more cosmopolitan and highly educated than was normal for men of such background. He spoke and wrote English, French, and Russian fluently. As a young man he would often quote Shakespeare or Byron in letters to his wife.

Bismarck was educated at the Friedrich-Wilhelm and Graues Kloster secondary schools. From 1832 to 1833 he studied law at the University of Göttingen where he was a member of the Corps Hannovera before enrolling at the University of Berlin (1833–35). Whilst at Göttingen, Bismarck had become the lifelong friend of an American student John Lothrop Motley, who described Bismarck as *Otto v. Rabenmark* in his novel *Morton's Hope, or the Memoirs of a Provincial* (1839). Motley became an eminent historian and diplomat. Although Bismarck hoped to become a diplomat, he started his practical training as a lawyer in Aachen and Potsdam, and soon resigned, having first placed his career in jeopardy by taking unauthorized leave to pursue two English girls, first Laura Russell, niece of the Duke of Cleveland, and then Isabella Loraine-Smith, daughter of a wealthy clergyman. He did not succeed in marrying either. He also served in the army for a year and became an officer in the Landwehr (reserve), before returning to run the family estates at Schönhausen on his mother's death in his mid-twenties.

Around the age of thirty Bismarck had an intense friendship with Marie von Thadden, newly married to a friend of his. Under her influence, he became a Pietist Lutheran, and later recorded that at Marie's deathbed (from typhoid) he prayed for the first time since his childhood. Bismarck married Marie's cousin, the noblewoman Johanna von Puttkamer (Viartlum, 11 April 1824 – Varzin, 27 November 1894) at Alt-Kolziglow on 28 July 1847. Their long and happy marriage produced three children, Herbert (b. 1849), Wilhelm (b. 1852) and Marie (b. 1847). Johanna was a shy, retiring and deeply religious woman—although famed for her sharp tongue in later life—and in his public life Bismarck was sometimes accompanied by his sister Malwine ("Malle") von Arnim.

Whilst on holiday alone in Biarritz in the summer of 1862 (prior to becoming Prime Minister of Prussia), Bismarck would later have a romantic liaison with Kathy Orlov, the twenty-two year old wife of a Russian diplomat—it is not known whether or not their relationship was sexual. Bismarck kept his wife informed of his new friendship by letter, and in a subsequent year Kathy broke off
plans to meet Bismarck on holiday again on learning that his wife and family would be accompanying him this time. They continued to write to one another until Kathy's premature death in 1874.

**Early Political Career**

In the year of his marriage, 1847, at age 32, Bismarck was chosen as a representative to the newly created Prussian legislature, the Vereinigter Landtag. There, he gained a reputation as a royalist and reactionary politician with a gift for stinging rhetoric; he openly advocated the idea that the monarch had a divine right to rule. His selection was arranged by the Gerlach brothers, who were also Pietist Lutherans and whose ultra-conservative faction was known as the "Kreuzzeitung" after their newspaper, which featured an Iron Cross on its cover. In March 1848, Prussia faced a revolution (one of the revolutions of 1848 in various European nations), which completely overwhelmed King Frederick William IV. The monarch, though initially inclined to use armed forces to suppress the rebellion, ultimately declined to leave Berlin for the safety of military headquarters at Potsdam (Bismarck later recorded that there had been a "rattling of sabres in their scabbards" from Prussian officers when they learned that the King would not suppress the revolution by force). He offered numerous concessions to the liberals: he wore the black-red-and-gold revolutionary colors (as seen on the flag of today's democratic Germany), promised to promulgate a constitution, agreed that Prussia and other states should merge into a single nation, and appointed a liberal, Ludolf Cam, as Minister-President.

Bismarck had at first tried to rouse the peasants of his estate into an army to march on Berlin in the King's name. He traveled to Berlin in disguise to offer his services, but was instead told to make himself useful by arranging food supplies for the Army from his estates in case they were needed. The King's brother Prince William (the future King and Emperor William I) had fled to England, and Bismarck intrigued with William's wife Augusta to place their teenage son (the future Frederick III) on the Prussian throne in King Frederick William IV's place—Augusta would have none of it, and detested Bismarck thereafter, although Bismarck did later help to restore a working relationship between the King and his brother, who were on poor terms. Bismarck was not yet a member of the Landtag—the lower house of the new Prussian legislature. The liberal victory perished by the end of 1848; the movement became weak due to internal fighting, while the conservatives regrouped, formed an inner group of advisers—including the Gerlach brothers—known as the "Camarilla" around the King, and retook control of Berlin. Although a constitution was granted, its provisions fell far short of the demands of the revolutionaries.

In 1849, Bismarck was elected to the Landtag. At this stage in his career, he opposed the unification of Germany, arguing that Prussia would lose its independence in the process. He accepted his appointment as one of Prussia's representatives at the Erfurt Parliament, an assembly of German states that met to discuss plans for union, but only in order to oppose that body's proposals more effectively. The Parliament failed to bring about unification, for it lacked the support of the two most important German states, Prussia and Austria. In 1850, after a dispute over Hesse, Prussia was humiliated and forced to back down by Austria (supported by Russia) in the so-called Punctation of Olmutz; a plan for the unification of Germany under Prussian leadership, proposed by Prussia's Prime Ministers Radowitz, was also abandoned. In 1851, Frederick William appointed Bismarck as Prussia's envoy to the Diet of the German Confederation in Frankfurt. Bismarck gave up his elected seat in the Landtag, but was appointed to the Prussian House of Lords a few years later. In Frankfurt he engaged in a battle of wills with the Austrian representative Count
Thun, insisting on being treated as an equal by petty tactics such as insisting on doing the same when Thun claimed the privileges of smoking and removing his jacket in meetings.

Bismarck's eight years in Frankfurt were marked by changes in his political opinions, detailed in the numerous lengthy memoranda which he sent to his ministerial superiors in Berlin. No longer under the influence of his ultraconservative Prussian friends, Bismarck became less reactionary and more pragmatic. He became convinced that in order to counterbalance Austria's newly restored influence, Prussia would have to ally herself with other German states. As a result, he grew to be more accepting of the notion of a united German nation. Bismarck also worked to maintain the friendship of Russia and a working relationship with Napoleon III's France—the latter being anathema to his conservative friends the Gerlachs, but necessary both to threaten Austria and to prevent France allying herself to Russia. In a famous letter to Leopold von Gerlach, Bismarck wrote that it was foolish to play chess having first put 16 of the 64 squares out-of-bounds. This observation was ironic as after 1871 France would indeed become Germany's permanent enemy and would indeed eventually ally with Russia against Germany in the 1890s.

Bismarck was also horrified by Prussia's isolation during the Crimean War of the mid-1850s (in which Austria sided with Britain and France against Russia; Prussia was almost not invited to the peace talks in Paris). In the Eastern crisis of the 1870s, fear of a repetition of this turn of events would later be a factor in Bismarck's signing the Dual Alliance with Austria-Hungary in 1879. However, in the 1850s Bismarck correctly foresaw that by failing to support Russia (after Russian help in crushing the Hungarian Revolt in 1849, and at Olmutz in 1850, the Austrian leader Schwarzenberg had said that "Austria would astonish the world by the depth of her ingratitude") Austria could no longer count on Russian support in Italy and Germany, and had thus exposed herself to attack by France and Prussia. In 1858, Frederick William IV suffered a stroke that paralyzed and mentally disabled him. His brother, William, took over the government of Prussia as regent. At first William was seen as a moderate ruler, whose friendship with liberal Britain was symbolised by the recent marriage of his son (the future Frederick III) to Queen Victoria's eldest daughter; their son (the future Wilhelm II) was born in 1859. As part of William's "New Course" he brought in new ministers, moderate conservatives known as the "Wochenblatt" party after their newspaper.

Soon the Regent replaced Bismarck as envoy in Frankfurt and made him Prussia's ambassador to the Russian Empire. In theory this was a promotion as Russia was one of the two most powerful neighbors of Prussia (the other was Austria). In reality Bismarck was sidelined from events in Germany, watching impotently as France drove Austria out of Lombardy during the Italian War of 1859. Bismarck proposed that Prussia should exploit Austria's weakness to move her frontiers "as far south as Lake Constance" on the Swiss border; instead Prussia mobilised troops in the Rhineland to deter further French advances into Venetia. As a further snub, the Regent, who scorned Bismarck as a "Landwehrleutnant" (reserve lieutenant), had declined to promote him to the rank of major-general, normal for the ambassador to Saint Petersburg (and important as Prussia and Russia were close military allies, whose heads of state often communicated through military contacts rather than diplomatic channels). Bismarck stayed in Saint Petersburg for four years, during which he almost lost his leg to botched medical treatment and once again met his future adversary, the Russian Prince Gorchakov, who had been the Russian representative in Frankfurt in the early 1850s. The Regent also appointed Helmuth von Moltke as the new Chief of Staff for the Prussian Army, and Albrecht von Roon as Prussian Minister of War and to the job of reorganizing the army. These three people over the next twelve years transformed Prussia.
Despite his lengthy stay abroad, Bismarck was not entirely detached from German domestic affairs. He remained well-informed due to his friendship with Roon, and they formed a lasting political alliance. In 1862 Bismarck was offered a place in the Russian diplomatic service after the Czar misunderstood a comment about his likelihood of missing Saint Petersburg. Bismarck courteously declined the offer. In May 1862, he was sent to Paris, so that he could serve as ambassador to France. He also visited England that summer. These visits enabled him to meet and get the measure of his adversaries Napoleon III, and the British Prime Minister Palmerston and Foreign Secretary Earl Russell, and also of the British Conservative politician Disraeli, later to be Prime Minister in the 1870s—who later claimed to have said of Bismarck's visit "be careful of that man—he means what he says".

**MINISTERPRÄSIDENT (PRIME MINISTER) OF PRUSSIA**

The regent became King Wilhelm I upon his brother's death in 1861. The new monarch was often in conflict with the increasingly liberal Prussian Diet. A crisis arose in 1862, when the Diet refused to authorize funding for a proposed re-organization of the army. The King's ministers could not convince legislators to pass the budget, and the King was unwilling to make concessions. Wilhelm threatened to abdicate (though his son was opposed to his abdication) and believed that Bismarck was the only politician capable of handling the crisis. However, Wilhelm was ambivalent about appointing a person who demanded unfettered control over foreign affairs. When, in September 1862, the *Abgeordnetenhaus* (House of Deputies) overwhelmingly rejected the proposed budget, Wilhelm was persuaded to recall Bismarck to Prussia on the advice of Roon. On 23 September 1862, Wilhelm appointed Bismarck Minister-President and Foreign Minister.

The change of Bismarck, Roon and Moltke occurred at a time when relations among the Great Powers—Great Britain, France, Austria and Russia—had been shattered by the Crimean War of 1854–55 and the Italian War of 1859. In the midst of this disarray, the European balance of power was restructured with the creation of the German Empire as the dominant power in Europe. This was achieved by Bismarck's diplomacy, by Roon's reorganization of the army, and by Moltke's military strategy. Despite the initial distrust of the King and Crown Prince, and the loathing of Queen Augusta, Bismarck soon acquired a powerful hold over the King by force of personality and powers of persuasion. Bismarck was intent on maintaining royal supremacy by ending the budget deadlock in the King's favour, even if he had to use extralegal means to do so. He contended that, since the Constitution did not provide for cases in which legislators failed to approve a budget, he could merely apply the previous year's budget. Thus, on the basis of the budget of 1861, tax collection continued for four years.

Bismarck's conflict with the legislators grew more heated during the following years. Following the Alvensleben Convention of 1863, the House of Deputies passed a resolution declaring that it could no longer come to terms with Bismarck; in response, the King dissolved the Diet, accusing it of trying to obtain unconstitutional control over the ministry. Bismarck then issued an edict restricting the freedom of the press; this policy even gained the public opposition of the Crown Prince, Friedrich Wilhelm (the future Emperor Friedrich III). Despite attempts to silence critics, Bismarck remained a largely unpopular politician. His supporters fared poorly in the elections of October 1863, in which a liberal coalition (whose primary member was the Progress Party) won over two-thirds of the seats in the House. The House made repeated calls to the King to dismiss Bismarck, but the King supported him as he feared that if he dismissed Bismarck, a liberal ministry would follow.
GERMAN UNIFICATION

BLOOD AND IRON SPEECH

German unification had been one of the major objectives during the widespread revolutions of 1848–49, when representatives of the German states met in Frankfurt and drafted a constitution creating a federal union with a national parliament to be elected by universal male suffrage. In April 1849, the Frankfurt Parliament offered the title of Emperor to the Prussian king Friedrich Wilhelm IV. The Prussian king, fearing the opposition of the other German princes and the military intervention of Austria and Russia, refused to accept this popular mandate. Thus, the Frankfurt Parliament ended in failure for the German liberals. On September 30, 1862, Bismarck made a speech to the Budget Committee of the Prussian Chamber of Deputies, at the end of which occurred "[o]ne of Bismark's most famous utterances ... also one of the most imperfectly recorded". Prussia must concentrate and maintain its power for the favorable moment which has already slipped by several times. Prussia's boundaries according to the Vienna treaties are not favorable to a healthy state life. The great questions of the time will not be resolved by speeches and majority decisions—that was the great mistake of 1848 and 1849—but by iron and blood.

DEFEAT OF DENMARK AND AUSTRIA-HUNGARY

Germany prior to the 1860s consisted of a multitude of principalities loosely bound together as members of the German Confederation. Bismarck used both diplomacy and the Prussian military to achieve unification, excluding Austria from unified Germany. Not only did he make Prussia the most powerful and dominant component of the new Germany, but also he ensured that Prussia would remain an authoritarian state, rather than a liberal parliamentary regime. Bismarck faced a diplomatic crisis when Frederick VII of Denmark died in November 1863. Succession to the duchies of Schleswig and Holstein was disputed; they were claimed by Christian IX (Frederick VII's heir as King) and by Frederick von Augustenburg (a German duke). Prussian public opinion strongly favoured Augustenburg's claim, as Holstein and southern Schleswig were (and are) German-speaking. Bismarck took an unpopular step by insisting that the territories legally belonged to the Danish monarch under the London Protocol signed a decade earlier. Nonetheless, Bismarck did denounce Christian's decision to completely annex Schleswig to Denmark. With support from Austria, he issued an ultimatum for Christian IX to return Schleswig to its former status; when Denmark refused, Austria and Prussia invaded; commencing the Second war of Schleswig and Denmark was forced to cede both duchies. According to Harold Temperley "Britain was humiliated and left impotent, as it was unwilling to commit ground troops to Denmark and failed to receive support from France".

At first this seemed like a victory for Frederick of Augustenburg, but Bismarck soon removed him from power by making a series of unworkable demands, namely that Prussia should have control over the army and navy of the Duchies. Originally, it was proposed that the Diet of the German Confederation (in which all the states of Germany were represented) should determine the fate of the duchies; but before this scheme could be effected, Bismarck induced Austria to agree to the Gastein Convention. Under this agreement signed 20 August 1865, Prussia received Schleswig, while Austria received Holstein. In that year he was made Graf (Count) von Bismarck-Schönhausen. But in 1866, Austria reneged on the prior agreement by demanding that the Diet determine the Schleswig-Holstein issue. Bismarck used this as an excuse to start a war with Austria by charging that the Austrians had violated the Convention of Gastein. Bismarck sent Prussian
troops to occupy Holstein. Provoked, Austria called for the aid of other German states, who quickly became involved in the Austro-Prussian War. With the aid of Albrecht von Roon's army reorganization, the Prussian army was nearly equal in numbers to the Austrian army. With the organizational genius of Helmuth von Moltke the Elder, the Prussian army fought battles it was able to win. Bismarck had also made a secret alliance with Italy, who desired Austrian-controlled Venetia. Italy's entry into the war forced the Austrians to divide their forces.

As the war began, a German radical named Ferdinand Cohen-Blind attempted to assassinate Bismarck in Berlin, shooting him five times at close range. Cohen-Blind was a democrat who hoped that killing Bismarck would prevent a war among the German states. Bismarck survived with only minor injuries. Cohen-Blind committed suicide while in custody. To the surprise of the rest of Europe, Prussia quickly defeated Austria and its allies, at the Battle of Königgrätz (aka "Battle of Sadowa"). The King and his generals wanted to push on, conquer Bohemia and march to Vienna, but Bismarck, worried that Prussian military luck might change or that France might intervene on Austria's side, enlisted the help of the Crown Prince (who had opposed the war but had commanded one of the Prussian armies at Sadowa) to change his father's mind after stormy meetings. As a result of the Peace of Prague (1866), the German Confederation was dissolved; Prussia annexed Schleswig, Holstein, Frankfurt, Hanover, Hesse-Kassel (or Hesse-Cassel), and Nassau; and Austria promised not to intervene in German affairs. To solidify Prussian hegemony, Prussia and several other North German states joined the North German Confederation in 1867; King Wilhelm I served as its President, and Bismarck as its Chancellor. From this point on begins what historians refer to as "The Misery of Austria", in which Austria served as a mere vassal to the superior Germany, a relationship that was to shape history up to the two World Wars.

Bismarck, who by now held the rank of major in the Landwehr, wore this uniform during the campaign, and was at last promoted to the rank of major-general in the Landwehr cavalry after the war. Although he never personally commanded troops in the field, he usually wore a general's uniform in public for the rest of his life, as seen in numerous paintings and photographs. He was also given a cash grant by the Prussian Landtag, which he used to buy a new country estate, Varzin, larger than his existing estates combined. Military success brought Bismarck tremendous political support in Prussia. In the elections to the House of Deputies in 1866, liberals suffered a major defeat, losing their large majority. The new, largely conservative House was on much better terms with Bismarck than previous bodies; at the Minister-President's request, it retroactively approved the budgets of the past four years, which had been implemented without parliamentary consent.

**German unification**

Following the 1866 war, Prussia annexed the Kingdom of Hanover, which had been allied with Austria against Prussia. An agreement was reached whereby the deposed King George V of Hanover was allowed to keep about 50% of the crown assets. The rest were deemed to be state assets and were transferred to the national treasury. Subsequently Bismarck accused George of organizing a plot against the state and sequestered his share (16 million thalers) in early 1868. Bismarck used this money to set up a secret fund (the "Reptilenfonds" or Reptiles Fund), which he used to bribe journalists and to discredit his political enemies. In 1870 he used some of these funds to win the support of King Ludwig II of Bavaria for making Wilhelm I German Emperor. Bismarck also used these funds to place informers in the household of Crown Prince Friedrich and his wife Victoria. Some of the bogus stories that Bismarck planted in newspapers accused the royal couple of acting as British agents by revealing state secrets to the British government. Frederick and
Victoria were great admirers of her father Prince Albert of Saxe-Coburg-Gotha, prince consort of Victoria of the United Kingdom. They planned to rule as consorts, like Albert and Victoria. Friedrich described the Imperial Constitution as "ingeniously contrived chaos." The office of Chancellor responsible to the Kaiser would be replaced with a cabinet based on the British style, with ministers responsible to the Reichstag. Government policy would be based on the consensus of the cabinet.

The Crown Prince and Princess shared the outlook of the Progressive Party, and Bismarck was haunted by the fear that should the old Emperor die—and he was now in his seventies—they would call on one of the Progressive leaders to become Chancellor. He sought to guard against such a turn by keeping the Crown Prince from a position of any influence and by using foul means as well as fair to make him unpopular. In order to undermine the royal couple, when the future Kaiser William II was still a teenager, Bismarck would separate him from his parents and would place him under his tutelage. Bismarck planned to use Wilhelm as a weapon against his parents in order to retain his own power. Bismarck would drill Wilhelm on his prerogatives and would teach him to be insubordinate to his parents. Consequently, Wilhelm II developed a dysfunctional relationship with his father and especially with his English mother. In 1892, after Bismarck's dismissal, Kaiser Wilhelm II stopped the use of the fund by releasing the interest payments into the official budget.

**Establishment of the German Empire**

Prussia's victory over Austria increased tensions with France. The French Emperor, Napoleon III, feared that a powerful Germany would change the balance of power in Europe (the French opposition politician Adolphe Thiers had correctly observed that it had really been France who had been defeated at Sadowa). Bismarck, at the same time, did not avoid war with France. He believed that if the German states perceived France as the aggressor, they would unite behind the King of Prussia. In order to achieve this Bismarck kept Napoleon III involved in various intrigues whereby France might gain territory from Luxembourg or Belgium - France never achieved any such gain, but was made to look greedy and untrustworthy. A suitable premise for war arose in 1870, when the German Prince Leopold of Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen was offered the Spanish throne, which had been vacant since a revolution in 1868. France blocked the candidacy and demanded assurances that no member of the House of Hohenzollern become King of Spain. To provoke France into declaring war with Prussia, Bismarck published the Ems Dispatch, a carefully edited version of a conversation between King Wilhelm and the French ambassador to Prussia, Count Benedetti. This conversation had been edited so that each nation felt that its ambassador had been disrespected and ridiculed, thus inflaming popular sentiment on both sides in favor of war.

France mobilized and declared war on 19 July, five days after the dispatch was published in Paris. It was seen as the aggressor and German states, swept up by nationalism and patriotic zeal, rallied to Prussia's side and provided troops. After all, it came as a sort of déjà vu: current French public musings of the river Rhine as "the natural french border" and the memory of the French revolutionary/Napoleonic wars 1790/1815 (many German territories were devastated serving as theatre of war, and sacking the old German empire by Napoleon) was still alive. Russia remained aloof and used the opportunity to remilitarise the Black Sea, demilitarised after the Crimean War of the 1850s. Both of Bismarck's sons served as officers in the Prussian cavalry. The Franco-Prussian War (1870) was a great success for Prussia. The German army, under nominal command of the King but controlled by Chief of Staff Helmuth von Moltke the Elder, won victory after victory. The major battles were all fought in one month (7 August till 1 September), and both French armies
were captured at Sedan and Metz, the latter after a siege of some weeks. (Napoleon III was taken prisoner at Sedan and kept in Germany for a while in case Bismarck had need of him to head a puppet regime; he later died in England in 1873.) The remainder of the war featured a siege of Paris, the city was "ineffectually bombarded"; the new French republican regime then tried, without success, to relieve Paris with various hastily assembled armies and increasingly bitter partisan warfare.

Bismarck acted immediately to secure the unification of Germany. He negotiated with representatives of the southern German states, offering special concessions if they agreed to unification. The negotiations succeeded; while the war was in its final phase King Wilhelm of Prussia was proclaimed 'German Emperor' on 18 January 1871 in the Hall of Mirrors in the Château de Versailles. The new German Empire was a federation: each of its 25 constituent states (kingdoms, grand duchies, duchies, principalities, and free cities) retained some autonomy. The King of Prussia, as German Emperor, was not sovereign over the entirety of Germany; he was only primus inter pares, or first among equals. But he held the presidency of the Bundesrat, which met to discuss policy presented from the Chancellor (whom the president appointed). At the end, France had to surrender Alsace and part of Lorraine, because Moltke and his generals insisted that it was needed as a defensive barrier. Bismarck opposed the annexation because he did not wish to make a permanent enemy of France. France was also required to pay an indemnity.

**CHANCELLOR OF THE GERMAN EMPIRE**

In 1871, Otto von Bismarck was raised to the rank of Fürst (Prince) von Bismarck. He was also appointed Imperial Chancellor of the German Empire, but retained his Prussian offices (including those of Minister-President and Foreign Minister). He was also promoted to the rank of lieutenant-general, and given another country estate, Friedrichsruh, near Hamburg, which was larger than Varzin, making him a very wealthy landowner. Because of both the imperial and the Prussian offices that he held, Bismarck had near complete control over domestic and foreign policy. The office of Minister-President (M-P) of Prussia was temporarily separated from that of Chancellor in 1873, when Albrecht von Roon was appointed to the former office. But by the end of the year, Roon resigned due to ill health, and Bismarck again became M-P.

In the following years, one of Bismarck's primary political objectives was to reduce the influence of the Catholic Church in Germany. This may have been due to the anti-liberal message of Pope Pius IX in the Syllabus of Errors of 1864, and especially to the dogma of Papal infallibility (1870). Bismarck feared that Pope Pius IX and future popes would use the definition of the doctrine of their infallibility as a political weapon for creating instability by driving a wedge between Catholics and Protestants. To prevent this, Bismarck attempted, without success, to reach an understanding with other European governments, whereby future papal elections would be manipulated. The European governments would agree on unsuitable papal candidates, and then instruct their national cardinals to vote in the appropriate manner. Prussia (except the Rhineland) and most other northern German states were predominantly Protestant, but many Catholics lived in the southern German states (especially Bavaria). In total, approximately one third of the population was Catholic. Bismarck believed that the Roman Catholic Church held too much political power; he was further concerned about the emergence of the Catholic Centre Party (organised in 1870). Accordingly, he began an anti-Catholic campaign known as the Kulturkampf. In 1871, the Catholic Department of the Prussian Ministry of Culture was abolished. In 1872, the Jesuits were expelled from Germany. More severe anti-Roman Catholic laws of 1873 allowed the government to supervise the education
of the Roman Catholic clergy, and curtailed the disciplinary powers of the Church. In 1875, civil ceremonies were required for weddings, which could hitherto be performed in churches. These efforts strengthened the Catholic Centre Party, and Bismarck abandoned the Kulturkampf in 1878 to preserve his remaining political capital. Pius died that same year, replaced by a more pragmatic Pope Leo XIII who would eventually establish a better relationship with Bismarck.

The Kulturkampf had won Bismarck a new supporter in the secular National Liberal Party, which had become Bismarck's chief ally in the Reichstag. But in 1873, Germany and much of Europe had entered the Long Depression beginning with the crash of the Vienna Stock Exchange in 1873, the Gründerkrise. A downturn hit the German economy for the first time since vast industrial development in the 1850s after the 1848–49 revolutions. To aid faltering industries, the Chancellor abandoned free trade and established protectionist tariffs, which alienated the National Liberals who supported free trade. The Kulturkampf and its effects also stirred up public opinion against the party that supported it, and Bismarck used this opportunity to distance himself from the National Liberals. This marked a rapid decline in the support of the National Liberals, and by 1879 their close ties with Bismarck had all but ended. Bismarck instead returned to conservative factions — including the Centre Party — for support. He helped foster support from the conservatives by enacting several tariffs protecting German agriculture and industry from foreign competitors in 1879. To prevent the Austro-Hungarian problems of different nationalities within one state, the government tried to Germanize the state's national minorities, situated mainly in the borders of the empire, such as the Danes in the North of Germany, the French of Alsace-Lorraine and the Poles in the East of Germany.

His policies concerning the Poles of Prussia were generally unfavourable to them, furthering enmity between the German and Polish peoples. The policies were usually motivated by Bismarck's view that Polish existence was a threat to the German state; Bismarck, who himself spoke Polish, wrote about Poles: "One shoots the wolves if one can." He also said: "Beat Poles until they lose faith in a sense of living. Personally, I pity the situation they're in. However, if we want to survive - we've got only one option - to exterminate them. Bismarck worried about the growth of the socialist movement — in particular, that of the Social Democratic Party. In 1878, he instituted the Anti-Socialist Laws. Socialist organizations and meetings were forbidden, as was the circulation of socialist literature. Socialist leaders were arrested and tried by police courts. But despite these efforts, the movement steadily gained supporters and seats in the Reichstag. Socialists won seats in the Reichstag by running as independent candidates, unaffiliated with any party, which was allowed by the German Constitution.

Then the Chancellor tried to reduce the appeal of socialism to the public by trying to appease the working classes. He enacted a variety of social programs. Bismarck’s social insurance legislations were the first in the world and became the model for other countries. The Health Insurance Act of 1883 entitled workers to health insurance. Accident insurance was provided in 1884, old age pensions and disability insurance in 1889, he even thought of insurance for unemployment. Other laws restricted the employment of women and children. Irrespective of these progressive programs, the working classes largely remained unreconciled with Bismarck's conservative government.

**FOREIGN POLICIES**

Bismarck had unified his nation and now he devoted himself to promoting peace in Europe with his skills in statesmanship. He was forced to contend with French revanchism — the desire to avenge the loss in the Franco-Prussian War. Bismarck therefore engaged in a policy of diplomatically
isolating France while maintaining cordial relations with other nations in Europe. Bismarck had little interest in naval or colonial entanglements and thus avoided discord with the United Kingdom. In 1872, he offered friendship to the Austro-Hungarian Empire and Russia, whose rulers joined Wilhelm I in the League of the Three Emperors, also known as the Dreikaiserbund. Also in 1872, a protracted quarrel began to fester between Bismarck and Count Harry von Arnim, a career diplomat and the imperial ambassador to France. Arnim was a member of a prominent Pomeranian family, related to Bismarck by marriage, and someone who saw himself as a rival and competitor for the chancellorship. The ambassador disagreed unsuccessfully with Bismarck over policy vis-à-vis France. As a penalty for this indiscretion, Bismarck intended to remove Arnim from Paris and reassign him as ambassador to the Ottoman Empire at Constantinople, which given the relative importance of France to Germany as compared with that of the Ottoman Empire, was seen by Arnim as a demotion. Arnim refused and continued to put forth his views in opposition to Bismarck, going so far as to remove sensitive records from embassy files at Paris to back up his attacks on Bismarck. The controversy lasted on for two years with Arnim being ‘protected’ by powerful friends before he was formally accused of misappropriating official documents, indicted, tried, and convicted. While his sentence was under appeal, he fled to Switzerland and died in exile. After this episode, no-one again openly challenged Bismarck in foreign policy matters until his resignation.

**France**

By 1875 France had recovered from defeat in the Franco-Prussian War and a new government began to militarily expand and reassert itself again as a player in European politics. The German general staff under Moltke was alarmed and managed to have Bismarck ban a French procurement of ten thousand cavalry horses from Germany. There followed some informal debate of the necessity of preventive war. The printing by a prominent newspaper of an article entitled "Is War in Sight?" caused a crisis to develop that was not to Bismarck’s advantage. The British government dispatched a polite warning to Berlin. Russia’s Tsar Alexander II and his chancellor Prince Gorchakov, at the time on a state visit to Germany, seized the opportunity to inject themselves as European peace makers. This action initiated a lasting estrangement between Bismarck and Gorchakov over the latter’s ‘interference’ in a Franco-German spat. Between 1873 and 1877 Germany repeatedly intervened in the internal affairs of France's neighbors. In Belgium, Spain, and Italy, Bismarck exerted strong and sustained political pressure to support the election or appointment of liberal, anticlerical governments. This was not merely a by-product of the Kulturkampf but part of an integrated strategy to promote republicanism in France by strategically and ideologically isolating the clerical-monarchist regime of President Marie Edme MacMahon (1808–93). It was hoped that by ringing France with a number of liberal states, French republicanism could defeat MacMahon and his reactionary supporters. The modern concept of containment provides a useful model for understanding the dynamics of this policy.

**Italy**

Bismarck maintained good relations with Italy, although he had a personal dislike for Italians and their country. He can be seen as marginal contributor to Italian Unification. Politics surrounding the 1866 war against Austria allowed Italy to annex Lombardy-Venetia, which had been a kingdom of the Austrian Empire since the 1815 Congress of Vienna. In addition, French mobilization for the Franco-Prussian War of 1870–1871 made it necessary for Napoleon III to withdraw his troops from Rome and The Papal States. Without these two events, Italian unification would have been a more prolonged process.
RUSSIA

After Russia's victory over the Ottoman Empire in the Russo-Turkish War (1877-1878), Bismarck helped negotiate a settlement at the Congress of Berlin. The Treaty of Berlin, 1878, revised the earlier Treaty of San Stefano, reducing the size of newly independent Bulgaria (a pro-Russian state at that time). Bismarck and other European leaders opposed the growth of Russian influence and tried to protect the potency of the Ottoman Empire. As a result, Russo-German relations further suffered, with the Russian chancellor Gorchakov denouncing Bismarck for compromising his nation's victory. The relationship was additionally strained due to Germany's protectionist trade policies.

TRIPLE ALLIANCE

The League of the Three Emperors having fallen apart, Bismarck negotiated the Dual Alliance (1879) with Austria-Hungary, in which each guaranteed the other against Russian attack. This became the Triple Alliance in 1882 with the addition of Italy, while Italy and Austria-Hungary soon reached the "Mediterranean Agreement" with Britain. Attempts to reconcile Germany and Russia did not have lasting effect: the Three Emperors' League was re-established in 1881, but quickly fell apart (the end of the Russian-Austrian-Prussian solidarity which had existed in various forms since 1813), and the Reinsurance Treaty of 1887 (in which both powers promised to remain neutral towards one another unless Russia attacked Austria-Hungary) was allowed to expire in 1890 after Bismarck’s departure.

COLONIES

Bismarck all along opposed colonial acquisitions, arguing that the burden of obtaining, maintaining and defending such possessions would outweigh any potential benefit. But during the late 1870s and early 1880s public opinion shifted to favor colonies, and Bismarck converted to the colonial idea. "The pretext was economic." Bismarck was influenced by Hamburg merchants and traders, his neighbors at Friedrichsruh, "and the creation of Germany’s colonial empire proceeded with the minimum of friction." Other European nations, with Britain and France in the lead, had earlier and rapidly acquired colonies.During the 1880s, Germany joined the European powers in the Scramble for Africa. Among Germany's colonies were Togoland (now part of Ghana and Togo), Cameroon, German East Africa (now Rwanda, Burundi, and Tanzania), and German South-West Africa (now Namibia). The Berlin Conference (1884–1885) established regulations for the acquisition of African colonies; in particular, it protected free trade in certain parts of the Congo basin. Germany later also acquired colonies in the Pacific.

AVOIDING WAR

In February 1888, during a Bulgarian crisis, Bismarck addressed the Reichstag on the dangers of a European war. He warned of the imminent possibility that Germany will have to fight on two fronts; he spoke of the desire for peace; then he set forth the Balkan case for war and demonstrates its futility: "Bulgaria, that little country between the Danube and the Balkans, is far from being an object of adequate importance... for which to plunge Europe from Moscow to the Pyrenees, and from the North Sea to Palermo, into a war whose issue no man can foresee. At the end of the conflict we should scarcely know why we had fought."Bismarck also repeated his emphatic warning against any German military involvement in Balkan disputes. Bismarck had first made this famous comment to the Reichstag in December 1876, when the Balkan revolts against the Ottoman Empire threatened to extend to a war between Austria and Russia.
Only a year later [1876], he is faced by the alternative of espousing the cause of Russia or that of Austria. Immediately after the last crisis, in the summer of 1875, the mutual jealousies between Russia and Austria had been rendered acute by the fresh risings in the Balkans against the Turks. Now the issues hung upon Bismarck’s decision. Immediately after the peace, he had tried to paralyse the Balkan rivals by the formation of the Three Emperors’ League. "I have no thought of intervening," he said privately. "That might precipitate a European war. [...] If I were to espouse the cause of one of the parties, France would promptly strike a blow on the other side. [...] I am holding two powerful heraldic beasts by their collars, and am keeping them apart for two reasons: first of all, lest they should tear one another to pieces; and secondly, lest they should come to an understanding at our expense." In the Reichstag, he popularises the same idea in the words: "I am opposed to the notion of any sort of active participation of Germany in these matters, so long as I can see no reason to suppose that German interests are involved, no interests on behalf of which it is worth our risking — excuse my plain speaking — the healthy bones of one of our Pomeranian musketeers. According to Taylor, "The more familiar grenadier took the musketeer's place in a speech of 1888".

**Last Years**

In 1888, the German Emperor, Wilhelm I, died leaving the throne to his son, Friedrich III. The new monarch was already suffering from an incurable throat cancer and died after reigning for only 99 days. He was replaced by his son, Wilhelm II. The new Emperor opposed Bismarck's careful foreign policy, preferring vigorous and rapid expansion to protect Germany's "place in the sun". Bismarck was sixteen years Friedrich's senior - prior to the latter's illness Bismarck did not expect to live to see Wilhelm II assume the throne, let alone plan for how he might serve as a chancellor under the new Emperor. Conflicts between Wilhelm II and his chancellor soon poisoned their relationship. Perhaps on account of his prominent role in Wilhelm's upbringing, Bismarck believed that he could dominate the young Kaiser and showed little respect for his policies in the late 1880s. Their final split occurred after Bismarck tried to implement far-reaching anti-Socialist laws in early 1890. *Kartell* majority in the Reichstag, of the amalgamated Conservative Party and the National Liberal Party, was willing to make most of the laws permanent. But it was split about the law allowing the police the power to expel socialist agitators from their homes, a power used excessively at times against political opponents. The National Liberals refused to make this law permanent, while the Conservatives supported only the entirety of the bill and threatened to and eventually vetoed the entire bill in session because Bismarck wouldn't agree to a modified bill.

As the debate continued, Wilhelm became increasingly interested in social problems, especially the treatment of mine workers who went on strike in 1889, and keeping with his active policy in government, routinely interrupted Bismarck in Council to make clear his social policy. Bismarck sharply disagreed with Wilhelm's policy and worked to circumvent it. Even though Wilhelm supported the altered anti-socialist bill, Bismarck pushed for his support to veto the bill in its entirety. But when his arguments couldn't convince Wilhelm, Bismarck became excited and agitated until uncharacteristically blunting out his motive to see the bill fail: to have the socialists agitate until a violent clash occurred that could be used as a pretext to crush them. Wilhelm replied that he was not willing to open his reign with a bloody campaign against his own subjects. The next day, after realizing his blunder, Bismarck attempted to reach a compromise with Wilhelm by agreeing to his social policy towards industrial workers, and even suggested a European council to discuss working conditions, presided by the German Emperor. Despite this, a turn of events eventually led to his distancing from Wilhelm. Bismarck, feeling pressured and unappreciated by the Emperor and undermined by ambitious advisers, refused to sign a proclamation regarding the
protection of workers along with Wilhelm, as was required by the German Constitution, to protest Wilhelm's ever increasing interference to Bismarck's previously unquestioned authority. Bismarck also worked behind the scenes to break the Continental labour council on which Wilhelm had set his heart.

The final break came as Bismarck searched for a new parliamentary majority, with his Kartell voted from power due to the anti-socialist bill fiasco. The remaining forces in the Reichstag were the Catholic Centre Party and the Conservative Party. Bismarck wished to form a new block with the Centre Party, and invited Ludwig Windthorst, the parliamentary leader to discuss an alliance. This would be Bismarck's last political manoeuvre. Wilhelm was furious to hear about Windthorst's visit. In a parliamentary state, the head of government depends on the confidence of the parliamentary majority, and certainly has the right to form coalitions to ensure his policies a majority. However, in Germany, the Chancellor depended on the confidence of the Emperor alone, and Wilhelm believed that the Emperor had the right to be informed before his minister's meeting. After a heated argument in Bismarck's office Wilhelm, whom Bismarck had allowed to see a letter from Tsar Alexander III describing him as a "badly brought-up boy", stormed out, after first ordering the rescinding of the Cabinet Order of 1851, which had forbidden Prussian Cabinet Ministers to report directly to the King of Prussia, requiring them instead to report via the Prime Minister. Bismarck, forced for the first time into a situation he could not use to his advantage, wrote a blistering letter of resignation, decrying Wilhelm's interference in foreign and domestic policy, which was only published after Bismarck's death. As it turned out, Bismarck became the first victim of his own creation, and when he realized that his dismissal was imminent:

All Bismarck’s resources were deployed; he even asked Empress Frederick to use her influence with her son on his behalf. But the wizard had lost his magic; his spells were powerless because they were exerted on people who did not respect them, and he who had so signally disregarded Kant’s command to use people as ends in themselves had too small a stock of loyalty to draw on. As Lord Salisbury told Queen Victoria: 'The very qualities which Bismarck fostered in the Emperor in order to strengthen himself when the Emperor Frederick should come to the throne have been the qualities by which he has been overthrown.' The Empress, with what must have been a mixture of pity and triumph, told him that her influence with her son could not save him for he himself had destroyed it. Bismarck resigned at Wilhelm II's insistence on 18 March 1890, at age 75, to be succeeded as Chancellor of Germany and Minister-President of Prussia by Leo von Caprivi. Bismarck was discarded ("dropping the pilot" in the words of the famous Punch cartoon), promoted to the rank of "Colonel-General with the Dignity of Field Marshal" (so-called because the German Army did not appoint full Field Marshals in peacetime) and given a new title, Duke of Lauenburg, which he joked would be useful when travelling incognito. He was soon elected as a National Liberal to the Reichstag for Bennigsen's old and supposedly safe Hamburg seat, but was embarrassed by being forced to a second ballot by a Social Democrat rival, and never actually took up his seat. He entered into restless, resentful retirement to his estates at Varzin (in today's Poland). Within one month after his wife died on 27 November 1894, he moved to Friedrichsruh near Hamburg, waiting in vain to be petitioned for advice and counsel.

As soon as he had to leave his office, citizens started to praise him, collecting money to build monuments like the Bismarck Memorial or towers dedicated to him. Much honour was given to him in Germany, many buildings have his name, books about him were best-sellers, and he was often painted, e.g., by Franz von Lenbach and C.W. Allers. Bismarck spent his final years gathering his memoirs (Gedanken und Erinnerungen, or Thoughts and Memories), which criticized and
discredited the Emperor. He died in 1898 (at the age of 83) at Friedrichsruh, where he is entombed in the Bismarck-Mausoleum. He was succeeded as Fürst von Bismarck-Schönhausen by Herbert. On his gravestone it is written "Loyal German Servant of Kaiser William I".

**LAST WARNING AND PREDICTION**

In December 1897, Wilhelm II visited Bismarck for the last time. Bismarck again warned the Kaiser about the dangers of improvising government policy based on the intrigues of courtiers and militarists. Bismarck’s last warning was: ‘Your Majesty, so long as you have this present officer corps, you can do as you please. But when this is no longer the case, it will be very different for you’. Subsequently, Bismarck made these accurate predictions:

"Jena came twenty years after the death of Frederick the Great; the crash will come twenty years after my departure if things go on like this" — a prophecy fulfilled almost to the month. "One day the great European War will come out of some damned foolish thing in the Balkans". Bismarck had warned in February 1888 of a Balkan crisis turning into a world war (although when that war did come in 1914, the Balkan country was Serbia, not Bulgaria):

He warned of the imminent possibility that Germany will have to fight on two fronts; he spoke of the desire for peace; then he set forth the Balkan case for war and demonstrates its futility: *Bulgaria, that little country between the Danube and the Balkans, is far from being an object of adequate importance... for which to plunge Europe from Moscow to the Pyrenees, and from the North Sea to Palermo, into a war whose issue no man can foresee. At the end of the conflict we should scarcely know why we had fought.*

**BISMARCK'S SOCIAL LEGISLATION**

Bismarck, working closely with big industry and aiming to head off the Socialists, implemented the world's first welfare state in the 1880s. Bismarck especially listened to Hermann Wagener and Theodor Lohmann, advisers who persuaded Bismarck to give workers a corporate status in the legal and political structures of the new German state. On 20 March 1884, Bismarck declared:

The real grievance of the worker is the insecurity of his existence; he is not sure that he will always have work, he is not sure that he will always be healthy, and he foresees that he will one day be old and unfit to work. If he falls into poverty, even if only through a prolonged illness, he is then completely helpless, left to his own devices, and society does not currently recognize any real obligation towards him beyond the usual help for the poor, even if he has been working all the time ever so faithfully and diligently. The usual help for the poor, however, leaves a lot to be desired, especially in large cities, where it is very much worse than in the country.

The 1880s were a period when Germany started on its long road towards the welfare state it is today. The Social Democratic, National Liberal and Center parties were all involved in the beginnings of social legislation, but it was Bismarck who established the first practical aspects of this program. Bismarck’s idea was to implement welfare programs that were acceptable to the conservatives without any of the overtly socialist aspects. He was dubious about laws protecting workers at the workplace, such as safe working conditions, limitation of work hours, and the
regulation of women's and child labor, because he believed that such regulation would force workers and employers to reduce work and production, and thus harm the economy.

Bismarck opened debate on the subject on 17 November 1881 in the Imperial Message to the Reichstag, using the term *practical Christianity* to describe his program. On 4 May 1881 Bismarck had also referred to this program as *Staatssozialismus*, when he made the following accurate prediction to Moritz Busch:

It is possible that our policy may be reversed at some future time when I am dead; but State Socialism will make its way.

Another translation of this accurate prediction is: ‘It is possible that all our politics will come to nothing when I am dead but state socialism will push itself through’. (Der Staatssozialismus pault sich durch.)

Bismarck’s program centered squarely on insurance programs designed to increase productivity, and focus the political attentions of German workers on supporting the Junker's government. The program included health insurance, accident insurance, disability insurance, and a retirement pension, none of which were then currently in existence to any great degree. Based on Bismarck’s message, the Reichstag filed three bills designed to deal with the concept of Accident insurance, and one for Health Insurance. The subjects of Retirement pensions and Disability Insurance were placed on the back burner for the time being. The social legislation implemented by Bismarck in the 1880s played a key role in the sharp rapid decline of German emigration to America. Young men considering emigration looked at not only the gap between higher hourly 'direct wages' in the United States and Germany but also the differential in 'indirect wages,' that is, social benefits, which favored staying in Germany. The young men went to German industrial cities, so that Bismarck's insurance system partly offset low wage rates in Germany and furthered the fall of the emigration rate.

**HEALTH INSURANCE BILL OF 1883**

The first bill that had success was the Health Insurance bill, which was passed in 1883. The program was considered the least important from Bismarck’s point of view, and the least politically troublesome. The program was established to provide health care for the largest segment of the German workers. The health service was established on a local basis, with the cost divided between employers and the employed. The employers contributed 1/3rd, while the workers contributed 2/3rds. The minimum payments for medical treatment and Sick Pay for up to 13 weeks were legally fixed. The individual local health bureaus were administered by a committee elected by the members of each bureau, and this move had the unintended effect of establishing a majority representation for the workers on account of their large financial contribution. This worked to the advantage of the Social Democrats who – through heavy Worker membership – achieved their first small foothold in public administration.

**ACCIDENT INSURANCE BILL OF 1884**

Bismarck’s government had to submit three draft bills before they could get one passed by the Reichstag in 1884. Bismarck had originally proposed that the Federal Government pay a portion of the Accident Insurance contribution. Bismarck’s motive was a demonstration of the willingness of the German government to lessen the hardship experienced by the German workers as a means of
weaning them away from the various left-wing parties, most importantly the Social Democrats. The National Liberals took this program to be an expression of State Socialism, which they were dead set against. The Center party was afraid of the expansion of Federal Power at the expense of States Rights. As a result, the only way the program could be passed at all was for the entire expense to be underwritten by the Employers. To facilitate this, Bismarck arranged for the administration of this program to be placed in the hands of “Der Arbeitgeberverband in den beruflichen Korporationen”, which translates as “The organization of employers in occupational corporations”. This organization established central and bureaucratic insurance offices on the Federal and in some cases the State level to perform the actual administration. The program kicked in to replace the health insurance program as of the 14th week. It paid for medical treatment and a Pension of up to 2/3rds of earned wages if the worker was fully disabled. This program was expanded in 1886 to include Agricultural workers.

**Old Age and Disability Insurance Bill of 1889**

The Old Age Pension program, financed by a tax on workers, was designed to provide a pension annuity for workers who reached the age of 65 years. At the time, the life expectancy for the average Prussian was 45 years. Unlike the Accident Insurance and Health Insurance programs, this program covered Industrial, Agrarian, Artisans and Servants from the start. Also, unlike the other two programs, the principle that the Federal Government should contribute a portion of the underwriting cost, with the other two portions prorated accordingly, was accepted without question. The Disability Insurance program was intended to be used by those permanently disabled. This time, the State or Province supervised the programs directly.

**Legacy and Memory**

Historians have reached a broad consensus on the content, function and importance of the image of Bismarck within Germany’s political culture over the past 125 years. Bismarck's most important legacy is the unification of Germany. Germany had existed as a collection of hundreds of separate principalities and Free Cities since the formation of the Holy Roman Empire. Over the next hundred years various kings and rulers had tried to unify the German states without success until Bismarck. Largely as a result of Bismarck's efforts, the various German kingdoms were united into a single country. Following unification, Germany became one of the most powerful nations in Europe. Bismarck's astute, cautious, and pragmatic foreign policies allowed Germany to retain peacefully the powerful position into which he had brought it; maintaining amiable diplomacy with almost all European nations. France, the main exception, was devastated by Bismarck's wars and his harsh subsequent policies towards it; France became one of Germany's most bitter enemies in Europe. Austria, too, was weakened by the creation of a German Empire, though to a much lesser extent than France. Bismarck believed that as long as Britain, Russia and Italy were assured of the peaceful nature of the German Empire, French belligerency could be contained; his diplomatic feats were undone, however, by Kaiser Wilhelm II, whose policies unified other European powers against Germany in time for World War I. Historians stress that Bismarck's peace-oriented, 'saturated continental diplomacy' was increasingly unpopular, because it consciously reined in any expansionist drives. In dramatic contrast stands the ambition of Wilhelm II’s Weltpolitik to secure the Reich’s future through expansion, leading to World War I. Likewise Bismarck’s policy to deny the military a dominant voice in foreign political decisionmaking was overturned by 1914 as Germany became an armed state.

In British writing (e.g. the biographies by Taylor, Palmer or Crankshaw) Bismarck is often seen as an ambivalent figure, undoubtedly a man of great skill but who left no lasting system in place to
guide successors less skilled than himself. Being a committed monarchist himself, Bismarck could not envision any effective constitutional check to the power of the Emperor, thus placing a time bomb in a foundation of the State he created. During most of his nearly 30 year-long tenure, Bismarck held undisputed control over the government's policies. He was well supported by his friend Albrecht von Roon, the war minister, as well as the leader of the Prussian army Helmuth von Moltke. Bismarck's diplomatic moves relied on a victorious Prussian military, and these two people gave Bismarck the victories he needed to convince the smaller German states to join Prussia.

Bismarck took steps to silence or restrain political opposition, as evidenced by laws restricting the freedom of the press, the *Kulturkampf*, and the anti-socialist laws. His king (later Emperor) Wilhelm I rarely challenged the Chancellor's decisions; on several occasions, Bismarck obtained his monarch's approval by threatening to resign. However, Wilhelm II intended to govern the country himself, making the ousting of Bismarck one of his first tasks as Kaiser. Bismarck's successors as Chancellor were much less influential, as power was concentrated in the Emperor's hands.

**MEMORIALS**

Numerous statues and memorials dot the cities, towns, and countryside of Germany, and the famous Bismarck Memorial in Berlin, not to mention numerous Bismarck towers on four continents. The only memorial showing him as a student at Göttingen University (together with his dog *Tiran*) and as a member of his Corps Hannovera was re-erected in 2006 at the Rudelsburg. The gleaming white The Bismarck-Denkmal (German for Bismarck monument) is a monument in the city of Hamburg. It stands in the centre of the St. Pauli district. Built in 1906, it is the largest and probably most well-known memorial to Bismarck worldwide. The statues depicted him as massive, monolithic, rigid and unambiguous. Two ships of the German Imperial Navy (Kaiserliche Marine), and the Bismarck from the World War II–era, were named after him.

**Bismarck Myth**

Gerwarth (2005) shows that the Bismarck myth, built up predominantly during his years of retirement and even more stridently after his death, proved a powerful rhetorical and ideological tool. The myth made him out to be a dogmatic ideologue and ardent nationalist when, in fact, he was ideologically flexible. Gerwarth argues that the constructed memory of Bismarck played a central role as an anti-democratic myth in the highly ideological battle over the past which raged between 1918 and 1933. This myth proved to be a weapon against the Weimar Republic, and exercised a destructive influence on the political culture of the first German democracy. Frankel (2005) shows the Bismarck cult fostered and legitimized a new style of right-wing politics, and made possible the post-Bismarckian crisis of leadership, both real and perceived, that had Germans seeking the strongest possible leader and asking, ‘What Would Bismarck Do?’

For example, Hamburg's memorial, unveiled in 1906, which is considered one of the greatest expressions of imperial Germany's Bismarck cult and an important development in the history of German memorial art. It was a product of the desire of Hamburg's patrician classes to defend their political privileges in the face of dramatic social change and attendant demands for political reform. To those who presided over its construction, the monument was also a means of asserting Hamburg's cultural aspirations and of shrugging off a reputation as a city hostile to the arts. The
memorial was greeted with widespread disapproval among the working classes and did not prevent their increasing support for the Social Democrats.

**UNIFICATION OF ITALY**

The Italian Unification or Italian Risorgimento is known as the chain of political and military events that produced a united Italian peninsula under the Kingdom of Italy in 1861. These events can be broken down in five stages: Pre-Revolutionary, Revolutionary, Cavour’s Policy and the Role of Piedmont, Garibaldi’s Campaign in Southern Italy, and the creation of the Italian Kingdom.

**Pre-Revolutionary Phase:**

After the Napoleonic Wars and Napoleon Bonaparte’s second defeat, the major powers that had resisted met at a conference called the Congress of Vienna in 1815. The topic of discussion was to limit France’s power, set limits on nations so no one nation become too strong, and divide up the territory conquered up by Napoleon. In its negotiations, the congress returned domination of the Italian Peninsula to Austria. Austria now occupied Lombardy and Venice and had considerable influence on other Italian states. One of the few places of independence was the Kingdom of Sardinia, which now controlled Piedmont, Nice, Savoy and Genoa. Some of the things that conflicted and interfered with the unification process were: Austrian control of Lombardy and Venice, several independent Italian states, the autonomy of the Papal States, and the limited power and influence of Italian leaders.

**Revolutionary Phase:**

During the first half of the 19th century, only aristocrats, intellectual, and upper middle class took the cause for unification. The masses showed no concern. However, the people with a passion for unification started to form secret societies, namely the Carbonari. Although at first, they only demanded more rights from their respective government, the cause began to grow. By 1820, the Carbonari were involved in numerous failed revolutions against the Kingdom of Two Sicilies, the Kingdom of Sardinia, Bolonga, and other Italian states. However, the Austrian Empire crushed all of these revolutions; thus leading to more resentment from the Italians.

The soul and spirit of the Carbonari and the revolutions was a man named Giuseppe Mazzini. Mazzini was an idealized who wanted not only wanted a united Italy, but an Italy with a republican form of government. Mazzini brought the campaign for unification into the mainstream when in 1831 he created **Young Italy**, a group created for the sole purpose to spread the ideas unification, revolutions, and republicanism. In 1846, a liberal pope, Pius IX, was elected who enacted numerous reforms. Soon, other states followed but these reform movements were not enough. A series of uprising known as the Revolution of 1848 occurred throughout Europe including France, Germany, the Austrian Empire, and northern Italy.

The revolution also occurred in the Kingdom of Two Sicilies were the king signed a constitution. In the Papal States, radical took over Rome, causing the Pope to flee. In the absence of the pope, Garibaldi and Mazzini created a republic called the Roman Republic. In Piedmont, after the insistence of nationals, the King Charles Albert sent to Lombardy in their fight for freedom from Austrian rule.

Although some of the revolutions were successful in the beginning, they were quickly crushed. In
1849, France sent troops to Rome and destroyed the short-lived Roman Republic. Piedmont lost to Austria and the king was forced to abdicate, causing his son, Victor Emanuel II to become king in 1849. After the unsuccessful events of the last few years, unification would seem as a distant dream. However, things were about to change with the appointment of Count Camillo di Cavour as prime minister of Piedmont in 1852. With the use of all the political and military tricks in the book, Cavour tackled and succeeded in making this dream into a reality. Italy and Europe would never be the same again.

III. Cavour’s Policy and the Role of Piedmont

After the numerous failed uprisings throughout Italy, Camillo di Cavour became the prime minister of the Piedmont (Kingdom of Sardinia) in 1852. By the use of bargaining, putting great powers against each other, war, and political cunning, Cavour was able to unite Italy in a short time. Although Piedmont was a small state, it had considerable influence due to its military strength, conservative philosophy, and admirable political leader. In addition, Victor Emmanuel II ruled in conjunction with a parliament, thus establishing a legitimate stable form of government and not giving cause to an internal revolution. Although Piedmont exercised a conservative policy, it was loose and constructive in many areas, especially commerce and industry. With the use of commercial treaties, Piedmont began to play an increasing role in commerce in the region as it started to win trade away from Austria. These actions served very popular with the public and were received further progress with Cavour’s appointment in 1852. Cavour had a strong belief in scientific and economic progress, and was a firm supporter of unification. However, he did not share the same republic views as Mazzini and Garibaldi. In Cavour’s view, unification needed a strong state to lead, namely Piedmont. And Piedmont can only become strong with railroads, economic freedom, stable finances, and a higher standard of living. Cavour immediately began by implementing some liberal (but necessary) ideas. He encouraged people to participate in government, started to change public opinion by skillfully using the press and the government, and economic freedom, and most importantly spread the propaganda of Italian unity under Victor Emmanuel II.

In order to achieve his goals, Cavour needed the help of a strong ally, the leader of France, Napoleon III. France proved to be a good partner because it was a traditional enemy of Austria and any loss of Austrian influence would be beneficial. Also, Napoleon III showed favor to a liberated and united Italian peninsula. To seal the deal of this partnership, both leaders met secretly at Plombieres, a French spa. Piedmont would stir up trouble in one of the territories controlled by Austria, thus forcing Austria to go to war against Piedmont. France would help Piedmont in exchange for Nice and Savoy.

In April 1859, war broke out between Piedmont and Austria. The plan worked very well the joined forces of Piedmont and France won at Magenta and Solferino. Pretty soon, Prussia started to mobilize an army in Austria defense and more Italian provinces wanted to join Piedmont under one nation. Both of these events alarmed Napoleon III because Prussia was starting to have a strong presence in European affairs and more Italian states wanting unification greatly exceeded what he had envisioned for Italy. So he signed an armistice with Austria and ended the war but angered Cavour.

Piedmont received Lombardy from Austria as a result of the war. After the war and the political maneuvering, Piedmont had greatly increased its size. However, Garibaldi’s campaign in southern
Italy would more than double the size of the kingdom.

IV. Garibaldi’s Campaign in Southern Italy

If Mazzini was the soul of the unification process, then Garibaldi was the hero. In early 1860, he started to gather volunteers in Genoa for an expedition to Sicily. As Cavour neither opposed nor helped, thousands of soldiers from Romagna, Lombardy, and Venetia set sail for Sicily in May 1860.

The Expedition of Soldiers, as it was called, was an instant hit with the public. The Kingdom of Two Sicilies had long been a corrupt government and now it was seeing its last days. Although the Garibaldi Red Shirts were less skilled and ill equipped, they were a tremendous success. They occupied Sicily within two months and already Garibaldi was setting his eyes on mainland Italy. However, after his declaration to advance to Rome, instead of stopping in Naples, Cavour became increasingly worried. If Rome was attacked, France and Austria would immediately help the Pope and crush the opposing army, thereby discrediting and destroying the unification agenda.

In yet another brilliant move, Cavour encouraged riots and uprisings in the Papal States thus giving the Piedmontese troops a reason to come under the pretext of maintaining order. In 1860, two thirds of the Papal States joined Piedmont and Rome was left alone. As the Piedmontese army bypassed Rome and the remaining Papal States and marched south, Garibaldi would surprise everyone with one of the most memorable gestures in history. On September 18, Garibaldi gave up command of his army and shook hands with Victor Emanuel II, signifying the unity and formation of the Kingdom of Italy in 1861.

V. Creation of the Italian Kingdom.

Although a Kingdom of Italy had been formed, it did not include all of Italy. The missing parts were Rome and Venetia. Neither could be gained easily because Rome was under the protection of Napoleon III and French troops while Venetia was controlled by Austria and its troops. But an opportunity arrived and Venetia was annexed in 1866. That opportunity was the Seven Weeks’ War between Austria and Prussia. Austria promised Venetia if Italy stayed neutral and Prussia promised Venetia if Italy joined them in the war. Italy decided to join Prussia due to a previous agreement. Although the Italian army did poorly, Prussia won the war and it held up its part of the bargain.

In 1870, the Franco-Prussian War occurred between France and Germany and Napoleon III was forced to pull the French troops from Rome to aid the war effort. While Rome and the remaining Papal States remained unprotected, Italian troops marched in unopposed. In October 1870 Rome voted to join the union and in July 1871, it became the capital.

The unification was a long and arduous process. But all the problems that remained before the unification were not solved after the unification. As the last quarter of the century unfolded, this was evident. But, Italy stayed united and focused on solving its new problems. In the end, Cavour, Garibaldi, and Mazzini became the founding fathers of a nation and were immortalized.
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